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Resumen
Con los años, el uso de la tecnología en la enseñanza del inglés como lengua extranjera ha tenido muchos beneficios y el uso de su literatura se ha incrementado notablemente. En este estudio se utilizó un método mixto cuyo objetivo fue el de determinar si el uso de dos WebQuests diseñados por el investigador mejoraba la comprensión lectora en una clase de 21 estudiantes de inglés de nivel A2 del Instituto Universitario de Lenguas de la Universidad de Cuenca. Los estudiantes recibieron dos WebQuests con estrategias basadas en tareas para proporcionarles más opciones de lectura en el silabo de habilidades integradas. Una prueba previa y una posterior fueron utilizadas para determinar el nivel de comprensión lectora, cuya información fue analizada con la prueba de rango con signo de Wilcoxon. Además, se aplicaron tres cuestionarios de escala Likert en diferentes fases de la intervención, y dos grupos de enfoque que permitieron explorar las percepciones de los estudiantes sobre la efectividad de la intervención en relación con la comprensión lectora. Para triangular los datos, el profesor registró sus percepciones sobre la actitud de los estudiantes acerca del uso del WebQuests. A pesar de que la prueba de comprensión lectora no demostró una mejora estadística, el análisis de los cuestionarios con la prueba de Mann-Whitney U, indicó que la herramienta WebQuest tuvo un potencial significativo para promover la comprensión lectora del inglés. Por lo tanto, el WebQuest brinda al docente la posibilidad de preparar a los estudiantes de ILE para un mundo competitivo.

Palabras claves: WebQuest, EBT, ILE, Comprensión Lectora, TIC.
Abstract

Over the years, the use of technology in the EFL classroom has demonstrated to be beneficial and has become increasingly prominent in literature. The goal of the present mixed-method study was to determine whether the use of two researcher designed WebQuests enhanced the reading competence in a class of 21 A2 EFL level students at the University Language Institute at the University of Cuenca in Ecuador. The participants received two WebQuests based on the principles of task-based instruction to provide them with more reading opportunities within an integrated-skill syllabus. A pre-test and a post-test were used to determine the students’ reading comprehension level. Later, a Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test was used to analyze this data. In addition, three Likert scale questionnaires were applied at different phases of the intervention, and two focus groups were conducted which made it possible to explore students’ perceptions about the effectiveness of the intervention. In order to triangulate the data, a teacher's journal was kept to obtain information from the teacher's perceptions about the students’ attitude towards the use of WebQuests in the EFL classroom. Despite the fact that the reading comprehension test did not demonstrate a statistical enhancement of the reading skill, the analysis of the questionnaires with the Mann-Whitney U Test indicated there was significant potential to promote reading comprehension in the EFL classroom. Thus, a WebQuest gives the teacher the possibility to prepare EFL students for a competitive and challenging world.
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Introduction

The fact that technology has become an inseparable part of our lives, especially with globalization and internationalization presents new challenges for English as Foreign Language (EFL) educators. The importance to prepare students for productive lives ahead plays an essential role and much more in the university environment. English has become the international academic publishing language and it is a necessary requirement for Ecuadorian students who have to read literature in their field of study.

Currently, the University Language Institute (ULI) concentrates on EFL instruction, promoting the balanced development of the 4 language skills, through the application of the Communicative Language Teaching approach, according to the parameters of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR).

The reading skill is important in academic settings because students are required to find relevant information, get a general understanding of a text or article, learn from as well as critique or evaluate sources (Grabe & Stoller, 2011). Reading, as such, can be described as a complex cognitive process, which has to be learned and practiced. That means students have to be constantly exposed to texts in print or digitally to develop fluency. According to the external evaluator, Dr. Lois Meyer (2015), there is a lack of material and space in the EFL classrooms at the ULI to improve reading comprehension of the students at the University of Cuenca.

The amount of digital information available via Internet gives EFL teachers’ numerous new possibilities to facilitate the access to authentic texts or material. Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL) is an effective way to integrate technology in the EFL classroom for literacy and learning in the twenty-first-century (Cramer, 2007). The Internet offers not only a large amount of authentic material but also tools such as WebQuest, Facebook, Wiki, and YouTube provide rich input for students (Alias, Rahman, Ujang,
Gelamdin & Said, 2013). The implementation of WebQuests is seen as a positive alternative in the literature to promote learning through the incorporation of authentic material and information from the Web in an exploratory and communicative manner (Lara-Reparaz, 2007).

This study aims to determine whether the use of two researcher/teacher designed WebQuests enhance the reading competence of A2 EFL level students. Different studies underpin the favorable use of WebQuest in the EFL classroom to enhance language skills (Ayfer & Neufeld, 2006; Pomboza, 2014; Puthikanon, 2009; Portilla & Camacho, 2017; Chuo, 2007; Kocoglu, 2010; Barros & Carvalho, 2007; Tuan, 2011; Al-Shamisi, 2016; Alshumaimeri & Almasri, 2012). The present study is divided into seven chapters: Research description, Theoretical Framework, Literature Review, Methodology, Results, Discussion, Conclusions and Recommendations.

The research description focuses on the purpose of the current embedded mixed-methods study to enhance the reading skill of EFL students at the ULI in the University of Cuenca through the use of WebQuests. A short overview of the background and justification of the chosen context will be discussed. In addition, the statement of the problem will be explained. All of the emerging research questions and objectives will be thoroughly explored.

Chapter two, theoretical framework, describes the different theories, approaches and learning tools used in this study. This chapter is divided based on these theories, which are: social constructivism, task-based instruction (TBI), reading comprehension performance in the EFL context, Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL), and the WebQuest tool.

Chapter three discusses and analyzes the existing literature written about the general use of WebQuests in the classroom and EFL environments, with particular focus on reading comprehension. Chapter four describes the research design and methodology used in this study. It explains, in detail, the corresponding context, research participants, intervention
procedure, the quantitative and qualitative data collection instruments, and an overview of the
data analysis. Chapter five presents the detailed results of the data analysis from the research
instruments.

Chapter six discusses the results obtained from the study, based on each general and
specific research objective and relates these findings to the previously presented literature in
this field.

Finally, chapter seven presents the summary and discussion of the conclusions,
recommendations, and some perceived research limitations to get a clear vision of the
contribution of the current study for teaching English as a Foreign Language.
Chapter I

Research Description

1.1 Background and Justification

English is widely accepted as the language of science and technology; authors such as Godwin-Jones (2004) even call it the Lingua Franca. In a university environment, English proficiency is a prerequisite to better access the most recent book publications, and articles in every field of study. This is why the Council for Higher Education in Ecuador requires every student who graduates from university, regardless of their field of study, must attain a B1-level proficiency in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) in accordance with the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) guidelines (Consejo de Educación Superior, 2014). Due to this requirement, and the 2009 curricular reform at the University of Cuenca, the University Language Institute (ULI) established mandatory English Credit Courses for undergraduate students. These English courses are university-wide and consist of three levels, each corresponding to the CEFR. The levels are distributed as follows: English 1 corresponds to A1, English 2 corresponds to A2, and finally, English 3 corresponds to B1.1.

In order to prepare students at the University of Cuenca for their professional future in this globalized world where English is a prerequisite to read current book publications and articles, students should have the opportunity to use more authentic material in the EFL classrooms. Authors such as Richards and Renandya (2002), Berardo (2006), and Beresova (2015) emphasize the advantages of the implementation of authentic material in EFL settings. Authentic material is an example of real and contemporary language use and can be the source of cultural information along with current events and topics.

In general, there is a lack of material and space in the EFL classrooms and course content at the ULI to improve reading comprehension (Meyer, 2015). Reading, as such, can be described as a complex cognitive process, which has to be learned. The reading process
implies the integration of different abilities and processes, without which, would be impossible to understand a text. The decoding of a written text involves recognition of words and their meaning in a special structure as well as to store them in the working memory. To describe the reading process Grabe and Stoller (2011) differentiate between lower-level processes and higher-level processes and their necessary correlation. The lower-level process can be summarized as the “lexical access, syntactic parsing, and semantic proposition formation” (Grabe & Stoller, 2011, p. 14). On the other hand, higher-level processes are “text model of comprehension, situation model of reader interpretation, background knowledge use and inferencing, and executive control processes” (Grabe & Stoller, 2011, p. 14). This unilateral exchange of content and its interpretation also depends on the background knowledge and world experience of the reader. It is possible to talk about a text understanding, when the new content of the text can be related with the existing background knowledge. Keeping in mind these different processes which are involved if we read in our first language (L1), we can imagine that the acquisition of reading proficiency in a foreign language must be even more complex (Grabe & Stoller, 2011). Every reading material used in EFL contexts convey not only information of a topic, but can also stimulate discussions, introduce new vocabulary, grammar in use, and the indication of a good writing model. Additional reading comprehension counts toward the positive reception of language skills, which are not directly observable and are more difficult to measure than written or speech production (Brown, 2007). The reading ability is important for the academic future of our students who should be able to read authentic articles in their subject of interest or field of study. Reading in academic settings has stressed the importance of finding relevant information, reading for general understanding, reading to learn, reading to critique and evaluate (Grabe & Stoller, 2011). This means that students have to be constantly exposed to texts in print or digitally in order to develop fluency and not only be shown artificially
simplified texts in the EFL classroom (Thornbury & Slade, 2006). On the other hand, the use of authentic material is not easy for the student because authentic material contains frequently irrelevant or new vocabulary, slang, and difficult language structures (Berardo, 2006).

The common use of computers in our daily lives and the amount of digital information available via Internet gives EFL teachers’ numerous possibilities to facilitate the access to authentic texts or material. Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL) is a practical tool in the EFL classroom, which can be used to enhance instructional techniques, traditional teaching style, and promote an exploratory teaching methodology for communication (Alshumaimeri, 2008; Kern, 2006; Warschauer & Kern, 2000). The information and communication technology (ICT) is a terminology related to CALL and used by Warschauer and Kern (2000) and Van den Branden (2006) mentioned different benefits of its use in a language-learning context. They emphasize the positive effect on learners’ motivation and engagement through working with ICT. It not only offers the possibility to integrate more content and, at the same time, implement a learning process that involves several physical senses, but also a teaching methodology in which the learners are active participants and the teacher is a facilitator that supports them in their learning process. The integration of computer and multimedia tools in the classroom context simplify the access to extend material and ensure intercommunication between learners as well as between the learner and teacher. The recent use of Internet learning tools such as WebQuest, Facebook, Wiki, YouTube and Web-Based material are not only a new possibility to provide rich input, but they also help students enter authentic social discourses in the target language (Alias et al., 2013).

This proposal is focused on the implementation of the WebQuest model as an additional technological tool to change the way students are taught and interpret the way they deal with their reading skill. WebQuest, designed by Bernie Dodge and Tom March, represents an
inquiry-oriented lesson format (Ayfer & Neufeld, 2006). It insists on having the students take an active role in their learning process through the confrontation of problem-solving tasks, which they have to work on (Hakverdi-Can & Sonmez, 2012). All the information students have to use in order to solve the task is available on the Web, which offers a large amount of authentic material. “The basic elements of WebQuest design include: title page, introduction, explanation of the task, list of relevant resources and links, and a set of step-by-step instructions for completing the cumulative task” (Sox & Rubinstein-Ávila, 2009, p. 39).

WebQuest gives students the opportunity of a task-based learning approach in a digital environment (Stoks, 2002). On the other hand, it allows the teacher to design an appropriate task-based reading comprehension performance, which is based on authentic reading material from the Internet.

1.2 Statement of the problem

The new trend at the University Language Institute (ULI) is to employ technology in different ways to expand the learning possibilities for language students. The WebQuest as an optimal technological tool is not used very much in Ecuador according to the literature review and is not part of the English course syllabus at the ULI at the University of Cuenca. WebQuest is an optimal tool because it integrates web-based resources in an effective way through its structured format thus guiding students to different sources without the danger of losing sight of the learning objectives (Al-Shamisi, 2016). Furthermore, the WebQuest model concurs with the idea that EFL instruction should prepare students for autonomous and productive lives ahead (Sox & Rubinstein-Ávila, 2009). It provides activities that promote critical thinking, higher order reasoning, collaborative problem solving, and individual learning opportunities (Dodge, 2001). In addition, the WebQuest model supports foreign
language learning through its ideal social constructivist CALL environment that enriches the EFL classroom (Simina & Hamel, 2005).

WebQuest can provide students at the ULI with more reading opportunities through its task-based approach and, according to the literature review, it can also help improve reading comprehension (Barros & Carvalho, 2007; Kocoglu, 2010; Tuan, 2011; Alshumaimeri & Almasri, 2012; Al-Shamisi, 2016). Students are required to read authentic texts on the Internet about a topic, get a general understanding of the topic, and find relevant information to learn more about the topic in order to accomplish the provided task. Thus, a WebQuest task provides meaningful input to raise output in the target language, which focuses on meaning rather than on linguistic accuracy.

The aim of this research is to expand the current knowledge about the use of WebQuest to enhance the reading skill of EFL students at the University Language Institute and to encourage other language teachers at the University of Cuenca to integrate the WebQuest tool in their classrooms.

1.3 Research Questions

This study is guided by two research questions which arose upon consulting the literature discussed in further chapters. The first question is: will the use of two researcher/teacher designed WebQuests improve the reading skill of EFL A2 level students? The second research question is: what are the students’ perceptions about the effectiveness of the WebQuest intervention in relation to their reading comprehension?
1.4 Research Objectives

1.4.1 General

To determine whether the use of two researcher/teacher designed WebQuests enhance the reading competence of the EFL A2 level students.

1.4.2 Specific

The three specific objectives of this study detail each aspect of WebQuest and students’ perceptions:

- To determine the reading competence of A2 EFL level students before and after the application of two WebQuests.
- To explore students’ perceptions about the effectiveness of the intervention in relation to reading comprehension.
- To examine the teacher's perceptions about the students’ attitude towards the use of WebQuests in the EFL classroom.

1.5 Context

This study took place at the ULI of the University of Cuenca during the September 2016-January 2017 semester. An embedded mixed methods design was used to address the enhancement of the reading skill of a convenience sample of 21 EFL third-level credit course students through the use of two WebQuests. The dependent variable in this study is the reading skill and the independent variable is the implementation of two researcher/teacher designed WebQuests. The data collection instruments made it possible to obtain quantitative and qualitative data. The chosen WebQuest tasks focused on the enhancement of the reading skill using authentic texts from the Internet to practice general understanding of the text, finding relevant information and knowledge acquisition. This then resulted in the production
of paragraphs, essays, oral presentations, and podcasts. The listening skill was also practiced during the WebQuest process at different stages of the intervention such as introducing the WebQuest topic as well as a reflection exercise to promote higher order thinking skills.

WebQuest can be seen as an effective and favorable learning tool for the EFL instruction that promotes motivation, the integration of the different language skills, higher order thinking skills, knowledge application, cooperative learning, and scaffolding (Zheng, Perez, Williamson & Flygare, 2008; Dodge, 2001; March, 1998).
Chapter II

Theoretical Framework

This chapter focuses on the main theoretical foundations which underpin the main theories used to conduct this study. Social Constructivism will be discussed below as it outlines the roles of both teachers and students. Task-Based Instruction will discuss the relevance of giving students specific tasks to work on and how this helps the learning process. Reading Competence discusses what students need and what teachers should provide in order to develop this important skill. Computer Assisted Language Learning is also fundamental for this study since most of the intervention was conducted through the use of computers to complete the given tasks. Finally, the WebQuest Model is discussed, without a doubt this is the most important aspect of the study since it guides the way each WebQuest was built and applied.

2.1 Social Constructivism

Constructivism, as a learning theory, consists of influential theories from the developmental psychologist Jean Piaget and the psychologist Lev Vygotsky. Piaget described 1953 the cognitive development of the individual in four different stages: sensorimotor, intuitive or preoperational, concrete operational, and the formal operational. In these stages, learners construct their knowledge through combining new understandings with prior knowledge.

As stated by Williams and Burden (2006), the learner is viewed as an active constructor of knowledge and is no longer a passive recipient. In other words, constructivism is a student-centered theory based on observation and scientific study about how people learn. The main principle of this theory is that people construct their own understanding and knowledge of the world through experience and reflecting on those experiences. It states that
learning is an active and constructive process where the learner is an information constructor since new information is linked to prior knowledge. Learning, therefore, is simply the process of adjusting our mental models to accommodate new experiences.

Unlike Piaget, Vygotsky (1978) stated, “learning is a necessary and universal aspect of the process of developing culturally organized, specifically human psychological function” (p. 90). The social interaction through language and culture helps the individual create knowledge and understand reality. Vygotsky (1978) brought about the concept of Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), which he defined as: “the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers” (p. 86).

The active support or collaboration from others can improve the individual’s thinking process through the interchange of words, ideas, and interpretations. Social Constructivism underscores the ZPD and assumes that cognitive development initiates through social interchange, which is followed by individual cognitive development.

### 2.2 Task-Based Instruction

The transition from grammar-based and teacher-dominated language instruction initiated in the 1970s with the emergence of the communicative language teaching (CLT) approach, which paved the way for task-based language teaching. Van den Branden (2006) mentioned, Prabhu (1987) was one of the first to implement task-based projects in a language acquisition classroom based on the idea that the acquisition of the target language occurs with meaningful input to raise output. Task-based language teaching (TBLT) is accepted and has been used, according to Van den Branden (2006), for more than twenty years in second language acquisition. TBLT has also gained ground through the Common European
It focuses on the use of authentic tasks in the classroom that help students use the target language in a meaningful way rather than on linguistic accuracy. Nunan (1989) defined a task as: “A task is a piece of classroom work, which involves learners in comprehending, manipulating, producing, or interacting in the target language while their attention is principally focused on meaning rather than form” (p. 10). Skehan (1998) identifies four criteria to describe a task: “meaning is primary; there is a goal, which needs to be worked towards; the activity is outcome evaluated; there is a real-world relationship” (p. 268). Consequently, tasks can be differentiated from exercises, which concentrate on the production and internalization of correct linguistic forms. As stated in Ellis (2003), in order to design a TBLT lesson three principle phases have to be considered: pre-task, during the task, and the post-task. The pre-task normally consists of activities that prepare the students for the task performance. In the next phase, during the task, the students perform the task. The third phase, post-task, provides follow up activities according to the accomplished task.

In this student-centered approach, the teacher acts as a facilitator, supporting task completion. It is essential that the teacher attempts to engage and motivate students during the whole process to accomplish the given task, which would benefit their language acquisition. The teacher’s main role, then, is to assist the students if they are confronted with linguistic and cognitive problems.

2.3 Reading Competence

If we want to understand the reading process of second language (L2) learners, it is necessary to review the literature of first language (L1) research findings in this area. The act of reading is not always the same since people read for different reasons. Grabe and Stoller
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(2011) summarized some of the main reasons people read as: as reading to search for simple information, to skim quickly, to learn from texts, to integrate information, to write, to critique a text, and to comprehend in general. The purpose is essential for the reader to decide which kind of reading process will be used. “The term reading processes refers to cognitive activity involving skills, strategies, attentional resources, knowledge resources, and their integration” (Grabe & Stoller, 2011, p. 9). Additionally, to be able to interpret a text, readers have to combine linguistic information obtained from the text with their background knowledge during the reading process. To simplify the explanation of the complex reading process, Grabe and Stoller (2011) divided it into “lower-level” and “higher-level” processes.

Lower-level processes involve “lexical access, syntactic parsing, and semantic proposition formation” (Grabe & Stoller, 2011, p.14). The first process, lexical access, refers to automatic word recognition, which for a first language (L1) reader is between 98 and 100 percent of the written words in a text. The second one, syntactic parsing, is recognizing the meaning of words in a sentence through their grammatical function; this helps understand them in context. The third one, semantic proposition formation, is when the meaning of a word and information about structure are identified and connected to previous words or sentences to make sense (Grabe & Stoller, 2011).

Higher-level processes are composed of “text model of comprehension, situation model of reader interpretation, background knowledge use and inferencing, and executive control processes” (Grabe & Stoller, 2011, p. 14). They are necessary to supplement lower-level processes. The first process, text model of comprehension, is essential to distinguish between the main and supporting ideas, which helps get an idea from the whole text. The second, situation model of reader interpretation, is the way the reader begins to interpret and understand the text content according to their reading purposes as well as reading attitudes. Background use and inferencing, is essential for total reading comprehension because only
through the use of background knowledge is the reader able to interpret the text content and then make conclusions. Finally, the fourth process, executive control processes, can be interpreted as the way we think, appraise and feel about a text.

Having considered the processes involved in reading comprehension, the literature describes three main models to explain the learning process as it pertains to reading: the bottom-up models, top-down models, and interactive models. The first, are the bottom-up models, which interpret the reading process as a mechanical hierarchical process. This process begins with the recognition of letters and words and develops into phrases and clauses for understanding (Carrell, Devine, & Eskey, 1988). A process like this requires basic knowledge about the foreign language system such as vocabulary, morphology, phonology, syntax, and discourse structure to ensure comprehension of a text (Saville-Troike, 2006). In this context the popular bottom-up model from LaBerge and Samuels (1974) should be mentioned. They contribute to the idea of an automatic information process of the reader's mind that receives sequential data input of letters and sounds. Because these models interpret reading as a step-by-step decoding process, many authors have criticized this view due to the extreme view it represents (Grabe & Stoller 2011).

In contrast to the bottom-up models, top-down models have also been discussed (Bringe, 2007; Grabe & Stoller 2011). This kind of reading concentrates on the reader’s expectations that are based on content, context and cultural background knowledge (Saville-Troike, 2006). On the basis of the reader's background information on the topic, the new information from the text is related and interpreted to teach sub process such as letters and word recognition. When taking background knowledge into account, the reader can guess the meaning of new words in the context and understand larger texts with ease.

The third are the interactive models, which combine the main ideas from the bottom-up models with the top-down models and overcome the weaknesses of both. This gives
importance to the lexical-recognition such as background knowledge and assumes that both processes occur simultaneously (Bringe, 2007). In this model, reading is seen as an interactive process, that includes cognitive skills such as identification and text interpretation on the basis of background knowledge to obtain a complete comprehension of a text.

2.3.1 Reading Comprehension Teaching in the EFL Classroom

Compared to L1 reading processes, the L2 reading procedure is limited by “vocabulary, grammar, discourse, orthography, and metalinguistic and metacognitive issues” (Grabe & Stoller, 2011, p. 36). In an EFL setting, for instance, learners do not have several thousand words and their respective pronunciation stored in their memory. An L2 learner’s lack of knowledge of a large vocabulary, hinders the development of fluency that usually helps an L1 reader handle longer texts or articles.

Thus, to accomplish the activation of “higher-level” processes, that make use of background knowledge and inference for gaining textual understanding, it is even more challenging in an L2 classroom where students are still struggling with lower-level processes (Grabe & Stoller, 2011). Additionally, it has to be mentioned that the L2 reading process does not imply the use of only one language, but both the L1 and the L2, which can be described according to Koda (2005) as a cross-linguistic process. The L1 can influence the reading process in the L2 positively as well as negatively (Grabe & Stoller, 2011). Spanish and English, for instance, share many cognates as well as false cognates, which can either facilitate understanding or cause misinterpretations. This is why it is important to combine the comprehension of a text and language acquisition in EFL reading instruction, which can be done through different types of reading approaches, further described below.

The two most used approaches when it comes to teaching reading in the EFL classroom are extensive and intensive reading. The typical extensive reading (ER) program can be described as silent reading where students have to read a large amount of printed
material that they are interested in outside of the class. This is in order to enhance reading confidence and reading fluency. This type of reading is sometimes described as reading for pleasure, which emphasizes the importance of students’ motivation in this reading process (Hunt & Beglar, 2002). However, the dilemma for EFL students is with insufficient vocabulary knowledge and recognition of words, it is difficult to become a fluent reader (Grabe, 2002). That means that the linguistic level of the reading materials has to be appropriate regardless of the topic and genre. Teachers have to motivate and monitor their students’ reading in order to help them develop reading autonomy. The ER program enhances the cognitive processes of fluent reading, which demands a large amount of vocabulary and language knowledge (Grabe, 2002).

Intensive reading (IR), in comparison, works with reading material that is normally higher than a student’s current reading comprehension level. IR provides short texts with clear directions and guidance from the teacher. In the classroom, students read the text line by line and focus on essential vocabulary, especially grammar use, and text content. The idea is that the student gets a profound understanding of the text and of its production (Carrell & Carson, 1997).

Apart from the extensive and intensive reading approaches, results of L1 and L2 research have concluded that the use of reading strategies is common not only for less proficient readers but for all reading levels. A proficient reader applies different types of strategies during the reading process (Richards & Renandya, 2002; Grabe & Stoller, 2011). The significance of reading strategies, and their use in the foreign language classroom is recommended by different authors (Klingner, Vaughn & Schumm, 1998; Palinscar & Brown, 1984; Paris, Lipson & Wixson, 1983). Many textbooks, for instance, Skillful by Rogers and Wilkin (2013), includes reading strategies as part of its content. In order to facilitate the
reading process, the learning strategies such as social-affective, cognitive, and metacognitive, should be regarded according to Dhieb-Henia (2006).

First, the social-affective strategy is used to enhance the learning process through interaction and cooperation within group or pair work. It is important to give students the opportunity to ask for clarification through rephrasing new knowledge and receiving feedback from their peers or the teacher (Dhieb-Henia, 2006). This feedback helps students get more self-confidence and redirect anxiety to accomplish a task (O’Malley & Chamot, 1990).

Second, the most common cognitive strategies in the reading context are skimming and scanning. Skimming can be described as a preview of the reading material, which helps get a general idea of the topic, including visual marks of the text like captions, pictures, and tables. Scanning, on the other hand, is a way to read a text quickly in order to find specific information or details without the necessity to understand every word in the text. Of less consideration in the classroom context is skipping, a strategy used to ignore unknown words during the reading process or rereading paragraphs or texts to verify meaning. These strategies are mostly introduced but not practiced enough so that the student has the possibility to internalize them. If internalized, they can help the student read any type of text more effectively and efficiently in the future (Dhieb-Henia, 2006).

Lastly, the use of metacognitive strategies is appropriate to increase students’ self-awareness towards their learning process through self-monitoring and self-evaluation. The idea is, for instance, not only to teach a reading strategy, but also to implement it in the classroom through students’ regular and frequent contact with reading material, and to modify and adapt the strategy according to the appropriate reading purposes (Dhieb-Henia, 2006). In the best case, a reading strategy, as a conscious process to overcome difficulties in a text, can be transformed into a reading skill, and then into an automatic process (Grabe &
Stoller, 2011). This transformation can be done by structuring the reading lesson in a particular way.

The literature recommends English teachers divide reading lessons in three phases: pre-reading, while reading, and post-reading (Williams, 1987; Yazar, 2013). The first phase, pre-reading, attempts to give students a reason to read the text through activating interest and background knowledge about the topic. This phase gives space for linguistic preparation such as vocabulary exercises in order to facilitate reading (Williams, 1987).

The second phase, while-reading, describes the direct reading of the text, in which the reader tries to understand the writer’s purpose and the text content according to pre-text questions or other posed comprehension exercises (Yazar, 2013).

The third phase, post-reading, has the purpose to give space to reflect on the content and comprehension of the reading material and how can it be connected with the background knowledge or it has to be discussed on the basis of new viewpoints or opinions (Williams, 1987). On the other hand, this phase can be combined with the speaking or writing skill to get a clear product of the student’s achievements (Yazar, 2013).

2.3.2 The use of Authentic Material in Reading Comprehension

The use of authentic material in the foreign language classroom is seen as something positive and beneficial (Richards & Renandya, 2002; Beresova, 2015; Berardo, 2006).

Berardo (2006) defines authentic texts as passages that are written by and for native speakers. Therefore, these kinds of texts, in contrast to the written material used in second or foreign language instruction, are not elaborated with the idea of introducing and practicing specific grammar constructions.

The employment of authentic text in the language classroom can be beneficial according to Nuttall (1996) if the teacher considers “suitability of content, exploitability, and the readability” when selecting a text (p. 172). With suitability of content, Nuttall refers to a
necessary reflection required by the instructor to choose a topic that matches the students’ interest such as the consideration of topic relevance. The word exploitability, indicates that the text has to be in accordance with the student’s language proficiency because the use of unknown grammatical and lexical text structures can cause difficulties (Nuttall, 1996).

Berardo (2006) also emphasizes the relevance of variety and the presentation of the reading material at the preparation step. Additionally, the employment of various texts about the same topic can be favorable due to the use of similar vocabulary that is presented in different writing styles by different authors.

The presentation of a text, although may seem irrelevant, can be crucial to engage students with the text because it is the first encounter with the passage. A picture or diagram which accompanies a text transmits more context information for the reader and supports a better and faster understanding.

The idea behind the use of authentic material is to confront students with authentic language use outside of the classroom. Authentic material in foreign language acquisition gives students the opportunity to become familiar with other sources of political, cultural or subject-specific information.

Guariento and Morley (2001) describe different ways to introduce and support students with handling authentic material. The first common method is to simplify the print material for lower level students. The second method is to create text-related tasks that consist of pre-reading, while-reading, and post-reading activities. According to these authors, an alternative could be the creation of text-related tasks in which students learn to use “compensatory strategies for extracting the information” of authentic material, to take advantage of their lack of understanding (Guariento & Morley, 2001, p. 348). It is difficult to ensure absolute comprehension of printed material in real life, but Widdowson (1978) states that authenticity is ensured if we receive students’ feedback.
The reading task and the teacher as facilitator should help engage the student with the reading material and give space for communication and interaction in the target language. A reading task differs from traditional reading exercises because it focuses primarily on meaning and not on form in language production (Poorahmadi, 2012). The typical reading exercises to answer true and false questions aim to get a linguistic outcome that should prepare the students for real-life situations. In contrast, TBLT resembles real-life situations that are goal-centered which leads to language production.

2.4 Computer Assisted Language Learning

The emergence of computers as a new and useful addition in our daily lives has also influenced language education. The use of computers in language learning is generally referred to as Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL), which Levy (1997) in his seminal work defined as “the search for and study of applications of the computer in language teaching and learning” (p. 1). CALL appeared approximately in the 1960s when Behaviorism as a language theory was still prevalent but was coming under criticism. The use of computers seemed to be perfect at this time to support habit formation through the audio-lingual method, for instance, to internalize grammar rules (Warschauer & Kern, 2000). This approach of language teaching changed with Noam Chomsky’s cognitive revolution in 1959, and with the importance of sociolinguistic competence introduced by Dell Hymes in 1971. Language acquisition was seen as a social and collaborative act to understand and master meaning. These advances in language teaching theories provoked a development in the use of CALL, according to the multiple roles a computer could play in language teaching (Crook, 1996; Warschauer & Kern, 2000). Charles Crook (1996) described these changes of computer-based learning in four metaphors: “computer-as-tutor, computer-as-pupil, computer-as-simulation and computer-as-tool” (p. 10).
The computer as a tool provides the learner resources and different possibilities to investigate and to construct new knowledge (Warschauer & Kern, 2000). The impact of the Internet and the new possibilities it brought, made it possible to interact socially and collaborate via computers among language learners through the use of authentic material. Finally, the role of CALL shifted from a tool for repetition to an interactive one (Warschauer & Kern, 2000).

The recent use of the Internet’s learning tools such as WebQuest, Facebook, Wiki, YouTube and Web-Based material is not only a new possibility to provide rich input, but it also helps students enter authentic social discourses in the target language (Alias et al., 2013). In the specific case of WebQuest, this model supports foreign language learning through its ideal social constructivist CALL environment (Simina & Hamel, 2005).

González-Lloret and Ortega (2014) outlined a new framework called technology-mediated TBLT for the new generation of students, for whom technology is an important part of their life and knowledge acquisition. The integration of technology in a teaching environment can be summarized based on the literature in four benefits; it offers a high degree of differentiation and space for the needs and abilities of every individual; learners are highly motivated and involved; the learning process stimulates different senses and provides extensive content; it gives the educator the chance to support the learner more because they are not preoccupied in the communication of content (Van den Branden, 2006). However, the use of Internet in the classroom as translation support or a source for additional material is not adequate without a design that is based on an educational language teaching approach. Van den Branden (2006) underpins the possibilities of the integration of information and communication technologies in task-based language teaching. The two fields TBLT and CALL can mutually benefit from one another (González-Lloret & Ortega, 2014). The TBLT approach offers a framework that supports a technological design in language acquisition.
environments and on the other hand, CALL promotes students’ engagement in learning (Doughty & Long, 2003). González-Lloret and Ortega (2014) identify five task features that should be considered to create technology-mediated TBLT:

1. **Primary focus on meaning**: even if there is a preplanned language learning goal, part of the learning must be incidental and any particular language focus is hidden from learners, or ‘implicit’, at least for a good part of the task module;

2. **Goal orientation**: the task plan must offer a language-and-action experience, which means the task must entail by design (a) some communicative purpose (i.e. considering student needs and wants) engineered through some gap in information or some element that encourages language use that involves informational transfer also recruiting affective and/or aesthetic identity investment, and (b) some outcome resulting from task completion, including communicative outcomes (e.g. the production of an oral or written message, the accomplishment of a desired perlocutionary effect on interlocutors or on the world) and/or non-communicative outcomes (securing a flight booking, producing a plan, gathering knowledge, playing/winning a game, and so on);

3. **Learner-centeredness**: learners’ needs and wants must be addressed by the task, which demands some form of needs analysis; the task must summon and enable learners to recruit and use their own linguistic and non-linguistic resources, as well as their digital skills, thus allowing for flexibility and diversity rather than uniformity in the task processes and means;

4. **Holism**: a task draws on real-world processes of language use, integrating form-function-meaning; this definitional feature goes to notions of ‘authenticity’ and ‘real-world relationship,’ which are contested and complex but nevertheless central to all TBLT definitions of tasks;
5. Reflective learning: following Deweyan principles of education, experiential learning always involves cycles of reflection and self-reflection, because the goal of education (including language education) is construction of knowledge and intellectual and moral growth; thus, while a task must offer learning through direct experience or doing things with words, it must also involve opportunities for reflective higher-order learning. (p. 6)

According to Mishan (2013), “the technology-mediated task that most closely resembles classic TBL in structure and pedagogy, is the webquest” (p. 290).

2.5 The WebQuest Model

The WebQuest model integrates technology in a useful way in the classroom teaching process since its development in 1995 by Bernie Dodge and Tom March. WebQuest is defined as:

an inquiry-oriented activity in which most or all of the information used by learners is drawn from the web. WebQuests are designed to use learners' time well, to focus on using information rather than looking for it, and to support learners' thinking at the levels of analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. (Dodge, 2001, p. 7)

The use of WebQuest as a tool cannot be compared to common Internet use or search because the idea is not only to obtain information, but also to activate the learner’s higher thinking skills. Its design aims to have students take an active role in their learning process through the confrontation of problem-solving tasks, which they have to work on (Hakverdi-Can & Sonmez, 2012, p. 341). WebQuests offer a task-based learning approach in a digital environment (Stoks, 2002). In other words, a WebQuest is a task-based technique that students undertake using provided websites.
2.5.1 Why WebQuests?

Authors such as March (1998), Žavski (2014); Zheng et al., (2008) describe the WebQuest as an effective and beneficial learning tool. WebQuest offers different favorable components as a clear framework of guidance for students; it promotes motivation, higher order thinking skills, knowledge application, cooperative learning, and scaffolding (Zheng et al., 2008; Dodge, 2001; March, 1998).

The increment of students’ motivation can be explained through the use of the Internet, which makes it possible to extend the implementation of different materials like authentic texts, videos, and pictures, which are helpful for a complete learning process and are not limited to textbooks (March, 1998).

Dodge (2001) states that the creation of a challenging WebQuest task supports the development of high-order thinking skills (HOTS). Lewis and Smith (1993) define HOTS as: “Higher order thinking occurs when a person takes new information and information stored in memory and interrelates and/or rearranges and extends this information to achieve a purpose or find possible answers in perplexing situations” (p. 136).

Polly and Ausband (2009) correlate HOTS with Bloom’s Taxonomy. This taxonomy, classifies cognitive processes in lower- and higher-order skills to describe the increasing complexity in the learning progress (Adams, 2015). Learning is a step-by-step process, which begins, according to the revised version of Bloom’s taxonomy, with remembering that can be described as identification of information and its repetition. The second step, understanding, involves more than only recalling facts. It enables students to express with their own words their understanding of the new material. Applying is the third step where the student demonstrates the transfer of theory in practice. The fourth step, analysing includes the critical thinking aspect with the purpose that students begin to differentiate between facts and
opinions. The fifth step *evaluating* should encourage students to produce new creations and compositions after a critical analysis. At the top of this learning pyramid is *creating*, which expresses a critical reflection of the process through feedback, and appraisal of the results (as cited in Adams, 2015).

On the other hand, another important component is the knowledge application that can be described as the transfer of the acquirement of knowledge, to solve a problem, to create an innovative product, or to judge or give their opinion about something (Zheng *et al.*, 2008). Additionally, Dodge (2001) emphasizes the significance of cooperative learning. The designer of a WebQuest has to contemplate how to ensure a favorable cooperative learning environment, and provide individual, and group work activities. According to Johnson and Johnson (1999), in a cooperative learning group, members share more than the same goal, since the individual performance has to contribute to a higher academic knowledge acquisition for the whole group. That means, the interchange of information and knowledge between students is fundamental. The authors Johnson and Johnson (1999), outline five critical attributes to ensure beneficial cooperative learning as: “positive interdependence, individual accountability, face-to-face interaction, social skills, and group processing” (p. 71).

Finally, Dodge (2001) emphasizes scaffolding as an important component of the WebQuest model, which facilitates the students’ learning process. It is not enough to only guide the students to rich authentic sources, they also need sufficient support to create impressive outcomes. “Scaffolding is a temporary structure used to help learners act more skilled than they really are” (Dodge, 2001, p. 58). The expression was introduced by Wood, Bruner, and Ross (1976) and can be transferred metaphorically to the learning process. If we want to construct a house, we should use a scaffold to ensure the house can be built adequately. Scaffolding in this sense, supports the learning process to reach a new level of
understanding by the student to the point that the students can achieve it on their own in the future (Gibbons, 2002). Dodge (2001), lists collaborative learning and multimedia elements such as online glossaries, dictionaries, templates, and writing guides as adequate scaffolding tools for a WebQuest.

WebQuest can be seen as an adequate EFL learning tool, because it promotes motivation, higher order thinking skills, knowledge application, cooperative learning, and scaffolding, all of which, are components that should be established in every learning context. The social constructivist CALL environment, which works with the task-based learning approach, and the employment of authentic material, can enrich the EFL teaching and learning environment (Stoks, 2002).

2.5.2 Types of WebQuests

WebQuests can be classified in short-term, long term, well-defined, and ill-defined assignments (Ayfer & Neufeld, 2006; Kleemans, Segers, Droop, & Wentink, 2011; Žavski, 2014). The difference between well-defined and ill-defined assignments depends on the posed task question, and therefore on the teacher’s learning objective (Kleemans et al., 2011).

The well-defined task, as the name suggests, has one clear formulated task with an answer or solution, on account of the posed information. The ill-defined task challenges students through the possibility of different answers and points of views about the topic.

According to Ayfer and Neufeld (2006), the difference between a short-term and a long-term WebQuest is only the time-span. The short-term WebQuest is normally conducted in three or four lessons with the idea that students acquire concrete information about a particular field of knowledge. In contrast, a long-term WebQuest can be carried out in more or less five weeks, with the idea to expand or to acquire deeper knowledge.
2.5.3 The Different Components of WebQuests

The instructional framework of a WebQuest makes it easy for the students to complete a task step by step. A WebQuest should include six different steps: introduction, task, process, information sources, evaluation, and conclusion (Sox & Rubinstein-Ávila, 2009; Zheng et al., 2008). The first step, the introduction, aims at presenting the topic of the WebQuest through visual and written information to create the student’s interest in the topic. The task, as the second step, is the most important part of the WebQuest, because the designer has to formulate and explain what students have to do to accomplish the task successfully. The task has to reflect an authentic situation in which different groups have to work on different tasks. Within a group, each member has to assume a distinct role, for instance, as a journalist or designer to accomplish the task. The third step, the process, should ensure a step-by-step instruction, and the process should lead to a final result, for example, a PowerPoint presentation, a poster, a blog entry, a podcast etc. The fourth step, known as the information source, is a guide to the provided digital sources. During this step, students have to analyze and compare the sources provided to get the necessary information to conclude their work process. The evaluation step demonstrates the designer’s expectation of the student’s product after using instruments such as the applied parameter rubric. The final step, the conclusion, should sum up the learning process through a reflection exercise. This reflection exercise should help students become more aware of their learning process.

In the digital environment of the WebQuest, the designer is responsible for ensuring reliable and professional websites that guarantee the completion of the task through a pre-selection of the material to guide the students (Aydin, 2016). According to Dodge (2001), there are five areas of concern if a teacher wants to create an adequate WebQuest. The first concern is the selection of adequate sites which provide an interesting topic and represent a contemporary, readable text from a convincing source. The second requirement, to
orchestrate learners and sources, underlines the significance of the essential planning of classroom activities. The use of WebQuests can enhance cooperative learning only if the use of computers fosters teamwork and the role of each group member is clearly defined. The third one, challenges learners to think, and it states that a WebQuest should have the students acquire factual information from the Internet. This approach is based on a task that demands students create something and learn to look at information from different viewpoints. The fourth requirement is to use the medium adequately, as Dodge emphasizes, by exploiting the variety of possibilities that the Internet offers to create a productive WebQuest. The last requirement, to scaffold high expectations, asserts the necessity of the integration of reception, transformation, and production in a WebQuest task.

2.5.4 WebQuest Design that Meets EFL Learners’ Needs

As mentioned by Žavski (2014), Sox and Rubinstein-Ávila (2009), Luzón and Ruiz-Madrid (2008), WebQuests are not directly constructed for the use of EFL instruction. The use of the normally recommended Design Rubrics by Dodge (2001) and March (1998) are not enough of a guideline to create effective WebQuests for an EFL classroom. The critical revision of eight existing WebQuests recommended for secondary classrooms by Sox and Rubinstein-Ávila (2009) make it clear that it is not recommended to use one of them in a foreign language classroom without carrying out appropriate changes.

The article “WebQuests for English-Language Learners: Essential Elements for Design” proposes a rubric, which also considers the knowledge of second-language acquisition (SLA) theories such as new literacy studies (NLS) to evaluate a WebQuest (Sox & Rubinstein-Ávila, 2009). The authors give advice to improve the linguistic-, multimedia-, and organizational features of a normal WebQuest design to meet linguistic needs for a foreign language learner.
Linguistic features represent the importance of the appropriate language use for the EFL students in the presentation and explanation of the WebQuest procedure. WebQuest instructions and steps should be clear and understandable for the student, thus the use of complex sentence structures and overwhelming information should be avoided (Sox & Rubinstein-Ávila, 2009).

The appropriate use of multimedia features can facilitate the transmission of printed information. In the case of WebQuests, they can be integrated easily and efficiently as additional material such as images, graphics, tables, videos, interactive maps, audio clips, and bilingual dictionaries such as encyclopedias. It is recommended by authors such as Žavski (2014); Sox and Rubinstein-Ávila (2009) to limit the use of multimedia features only to support background knowledge and accomplishment of the task.

Organizational features should provide students with a clear idea of what they have to do step by step in order to complete the WebQuest. This process can be enhanced through brief descriptions of material or steps, the use of numbering, highlighting of key information or an effective use of hyperlinks. It is important to ensure that all links included in the WebQuest are current and that they lead students directly to the appropriate information.

To conclude, many linguists believe that there are many significant reasons for using WebQuests in the EFL classroom because they are an easy way for teachers to begin to incorporate the Internet into the language classroom and to enhance language skills. Additionally, they motivate, encourage critical thinking, offer group activities that let students communicate and share knowledge, and provide opportunities for scaffolding. Finally, the use of authentic tasks encourages learners to view the activities they are doing as something real or useful, since this leads them to make more effort, and get a real interest in task achievement.
Chapter III

Literature Review

This chapter provides summaries of the major findings and analysis of various studies, which demonstrate the influence WebQuest has in classroom contexts. The various research projects are from a variety of countries, providing a wider scope of the use of WebQuests and its efficacy. In addition, the use of task-based reading comprehension will be discussed. Through task-based reading comprehension, the usefulness of the WebQuest tool will be highlighted. It is through the effective incorporation of this web-based tool that specific language skills are enhanced. As with WebQuest, the studies discussed below will focus on the enhancement of the reading comprehension performance of EFL students.

WebQuest first appeared in 1995 and has since proved to be a successful opportunity to integrate Internet resources, more specifically authentic material, in different subjects and classroom contexts. According to Dodge (2001), “the WebQuest model has been incorporated into hundreds of education courses and staff development efforts around the globe” (p. 7). Thus, enhancing various aspects of education such as the learning environment through its clear framework, promotion of motivation, higher order thinking skills, knowledge application, cooperative learning, and scaffolding.

In the study by Ayfer and Neufeld (2006), the WebQuest model was implemented to give EFL students the opportunity to acquire the target language based on a real task relevant to their department’s needs. This study incorporated web-based resources in a beneficial way and demonstrated the usefulness of WebQuest through an experimental mini-scale study at the Faculty of Communications and Media Studies (FCMS) in the School of Foreign Language at the Eastern Mediterranean University (EMU). Forty-three English I and thirty-four English II students participated in this study. Students’ perceptions were observed.
throughout the process of completing two WebQuests. The first WebQuest was designed by five teachers who were in charge of the EFL courses at FCMS, while the second WebQuest was developed in tandem with students. Each WebQuest process lasted one month. Completion of the task consisted in students writing an essay and preparing a presentation on the respective topics.

Questionnaires were taken at different stages of the study in order to obtain more information about students’ experience with the WebQuests. The five teachers involved in this process also had to fill out the same questionnaires and express their perception of the students’ experience during the process. The results were classified as: relevance, instructions and timing, task, evaluation and feedback, collaborative learning, and student involvement.

The results of the first classification, relevance, indicated that the first WebQuest was positively accepted from both students and teachers and was seen as useful and important. The second WebQuest, in contrast, demonstrated that the students evaluated it as neutral and the teacher’s results were irrelevant. The second category, instructions and timing, showed that students only partly concurred with the teachers, whose results were overall more positive in the first WebQuest. Under the same classification, the second WebQuest was seen more negatively from both students and teachers. The third category, task, was evaluated as neutral from students for both WebQuests. In contrast, teachers expressed their dissatisfaction with the task of WebQuest 2. The fourth category, evaluation and feedback, demonstrated that students and teachers were only partly concerned with WebQuest 1 and neutral from both sides for WebQuest 2. The fifth category, collaborative learning, was indicated as neutral in WebQuest 1 compared to the teacher’s responses which were more positive. WebQuest 2, was evaluated negatively from the students and neutral from the teachers. The last category, student involvement in the creation of WebQuests 1 and 2, was seen as neutral from the students, in contrast, the teachers expressed more willingness in working together to improve
the design. At the end of the study, the authors affirmed the effectiveness of the WebQuest model in the EFL context and gave various suggestions on the basis of the research experience to ensure a successful WebQuest implementation in future classes. Some suggestions were: to integrate WebQuests into the course syllabus, to create meaningful and challenging tasks, and to give students the possibility to accomplish the task during class time. The results of this study underpin the effective use of web-resources and the enhancement of student collaboration.

Similarly, the research by Andrade Álvarez (2015), which aimed to analyze the academic performance impact of the WebQuest tool through the implementation of a prototype in the EFL classroom from students in their third year at the Public Technical High School “Juan de Velasco”, Ecuador. The author used deductive and comparative methods that consisted of data analysis techniques, critical analysis, direct observation, structured interview, pre-test and post-test to evaluate the effectiveness of the WebQuest learning in contrast to the traditional teaching method. The 71 participants were divided into experimental group (A) and control group (B) to get clear results about the learning effectiveness of the WebQuest tool. The experimental group used a WebQuest prototype and the control group received traditional teaching. The results of the post-test of the experimental and control group were analyzed with the t-test for two samples and demonstrated that the implementation of the WebQuest had a positive impact on the academic performance of the students in their third year of the Public Technical High School “Juan de Velasco”. The WebQuest tool effectively results in engaging students to develop higher level cognitive skills due to its structure. The author states that the WebQuest tool innovates teaching possibilities and enriches the classroom. On the basis of these results the author recommended teachers use WebQuest since there are free websites to create them with ease.
At this point, the research by Pomboza (2014) must be mentioned. This study demonstrated the interdisciplinary aspect of WebQuest use as well as the lack of existing literature in the Ecuadorian context. Pomboza (2014) applied the WebQuest model at the Polytechnic Mechanical Engineering School of Chimborazo (ESPOCH), in Ecuador. This model was used in a programming course by virtue of its characteristic nature of collaborative work for a cognitive-constructivist research “framed under the National Plan for Good Living 2013-2014” (p. 211). The programming course had 54 students who were divided into experimental and control groups with 27 students each during five months. The control group was taught in the traditional way, while the experimental group was oriented on collaborative project-based methodology with the implementation of the researcher designed WebQuest. The data collection included a survey, direct observation, content analysis, and the revision of student elaborated documents. The researcher compared the results of both groups using the t-Students Test, and Chi-square. The results demonstrated that the WebQuest methodology had a significant impact on the learning process and therefore, is seen as an efficient technological tool for higher education. The author emphasized that the WebQuest gives students the possibility to learn in a different way, and teachers also have the opportunity to change their teaching style.

In contrast, the research by Puthikanon (2009) focused on the implementation of two WebQuests to promote critical thinking in an EFL Reading Class at the University in Bangkok, Thailand. The aim of this study was to examine the amount intermediate English students use critical thinking during the accomplishment of a WebQuest task. Additionally, the researcher aimed to focus on the teacher’s role during the process as well as the student’s use of the target language. Two modified WebQuests were used as supplementary material/tasks to the main textbook Reading for Opinions in the mandatory reading course with the title “English for Opinions”.
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The 39 participants were divided into two groups, class A and class B. In order to gain a deeper discussion of student’s critical thinking process, two smaller groups were created in each classroom. The research was based on a case study approach that used mixed methods to collect data through different research instruments such as: classroom observation, student group discussions, student written products, semi-structured interviews, and questionnaires. The four classes that were dedicated to the WebQuest intervention were videotaped and transcribed. The theoretical framework was based on Bloom's Taxonomy and the four-dimensional model (Critical Web Reader). To analyze the data, the Washington State University Thinking Rubric was adapted. The results indicated that the WebQuest process was beneficial as it enhanced students critical thinking skills and gave enough opportunities to integrate the four language skills. Furthermore, the research results demonstrated that the WebQuest topic influenced students’ engagement and their critical thinking process.

According to the author, time constraints were one of the main limitations of the study that made it impossible for students to search for additional information on the Internet and compare sources. Another important limitation was that some lower proficiency students had limited reading and writing skills which made it difficult for them to accomplish the WebQuest task effectively. The researcher suggested searching for more ways to support the lower proficiency students during the WebQuest process and to investigate to what extent familiar and unfamiliar topics affect the critical thinking process.

Not only has WebQuest demonstrated its effectiveness in a general sense, there are also studies that focus on the improvement of a specific language skill. One important study is the research conducted at a public University in Colombia by Portilla & Camacho (2017). They implemented a researcher designed WebQuest based on the principles of Communicative Language Teaching and Task-based Instruction, with the objective to develop the communicative competence of 24 A2 level English students. In order to collect
data, the researchers focused on different aspects of the WebQuest. One was the designer of
the WebQuest and the other was the observer. The authors used direct observation during the
WebQuest intervention and interviews after the WebQuest implementation as research
instruments. The results of the direct observations and interviews by the designer and the
observer indicated favorable outcomes for the communicative competence. The WebQuest
made it possible for students to interact with authentic material and practice real life
conversations in shops, restaurants, and tourist offices, all within the EFL classroom. Despite
time limitations, design difficulties and problems with computer availability, the authors
emphasized the positive influence of the WebQuest implementation apart from the
communicative competence on motivation, critical thinking, autonomous learning, and
differentiated learning.

Another example is the research from a southern Taiwanese EFL classroom. Chuo
(2007) explored the effects of a WebQuest Writing Instruction (WQWI) program which
focused on writing performance and apprehension, as well as students’ perceptions of
integrated web-resources and language learning.

Two junior classes were selected for a total of 54 native Mandarin-Chinese speaking
students. Participants were randomly divided into control and experimental groups. The
experimental group completed four WQWI, which were based on a reading-to-writing
approach, adapted from Dodge’s Matrix of WebQuest Examples over the course of fourteen
weeks. The control group, in contrast, received traditional writing instruction. Even though
the results of the applied Writing Performance Pre-test and Writing Performance Post-Test
were oriented to the ESL Composition Profile in Jacobs, Zinkgraf, Wormuth, Hartfiel, and
Hughes (1981), statistical analysis with the t-test, indicated a higher post-test mean score by
the experimental group than by the control group, which also improved their writing
performance significantly.
The authors additionally applied a modified version of the Daly-Miller Writing Apprehension Test, which was employed at the beginning and at the end of the course. This test was used to indicate whether the use of Web-Based resources diminished student’s anxiety while writing or had no effect. Between the two classes, no significant reduction in writing apprehension was registered. The analysis of the 23 items taken from the Post-Instruction Perception Questionnaire based on a 4-point Likert scale, demonstrated a favorable perception from the students in relation to the implementation of the WQWI program. The researcher concluded that the use of the WebQuest was not only a beneficial experience, but also a useful model to integrate Web material in a writing instruction program. According to the students' perception of WQWI, they felt they enhanced both the writing and reading skill. The author recommended future studies administer a supplementary reading test to provide additional Internet materials apart from texts or to integrate collaborative projects with other groups.

Research conducted by Kocoglu (2010), implemented WebQuest tasks in a reading/writing instruction course for EFL students at a Turkish university. The author used a control group of 13 students and an experimental group of 14 students to explore the impact of WebQuests on reading comprehension and writing performance. The aim was to compare the results of the experimental group, which accomplished four adapted WebQuests from Dodge’s WebQuest examples integrated in the syllabus as an internet-based language learning opportunity during the first four weeks of instruction. The control group received teacher-led reading/writing tasks. For data collection, a reading and writing performance test was created and these scores were used. The results of both reading performance pre-test and reading performance post-test were analyzed with the independent sample t-test. The experimental group significantly improved their reading comprehension. However, the results of the independent sample t-test of both writing performance pre-test and writing
performance post-test did not indicate a significant difference between the groups. The researcher concluded that the implementation of WebQuests as an internet-based model had a positive impact on language instruction. Based on the research results, WebQuests enhance reading comprehension but not necessarily writing performance.

It can be said, then, that the use of the WebQuest model in the EFL classroom additionally affects the other language skills and various aspects of education that should be part of every classroom such as the integration of different kinds of web material, promoting motivation, cooperative learning, autonomous learning, scaffolding, and higher order thinking skills.

In order to understand how WebQuests help students enhance their reading comprehension skill, there are four studies that will be analyzed further. First, a study that focused on the influence of the WebQuest model in relation to reading in an EFL classroom was done by Barros and Carvalho (2007). A ReadingQuest was implemented to improve 8th grade Portuguese EFL students’ reading skill through an extensive reading approach in a quasi-experimental study (a control group and an experimental group). This study verified whether the ReadingQuest as a constructivist environment engages students in an extensive reading task, promoting reading understanding and interest in reading other texts in English.

The research process began with a characterization questionnaire to analyze students’ attitude towards reading English texts and a knowledge pre-test to evaluate the reading skill of both groups. The control group of 27 students received traditional reading classes through the study of the text “A Scandal in Bohemia” and the use of worksheets. In contrast, the experimental group of 26 students used a researcher designed ReadingQuest, merged all the components of a WebQuest with the same text and little opportunity to use web-resources. During the process, the authors kept filling notes to establish students’ reactions and attitudes throughout the treatment phase. At the end of the process the author applied a knowledge
post-test, to determine the level of text comprehension and the newly acquired knowledge.

The statistical result of the comparison of the knowledge pre-test and post-test of experimental and control group indicated that both learning approaches were effective. At the end of the ReadingQuest application, an opinion questionnaire was administered to both groups to obtain information about students’ attitude toward the interventions. The results of the experimental group indicated a positive attitude toward the ReadingQuest even though they had problems with vocabulary. The scores toward the question about interest in reading other texts in English were higher in the experimental group, despite initial difficulties. Based on these results, the authors determined that the ReadingQuest was beneficial for students and contributed to increase students’ autonomy and collaborative ability. The authors added that one of the limitations was that the experimental group felt overwhelmed at the beginning because the ReadingQuest was written in English and the teacher would not translate anything.

Another important study was carried out by Tuan (2011), in Vietnam at the Faculty of English Linguistics and Literature from the University of Social Sciences and Humanities in Ho Chi Minh City. This action research, based on Krashen’s input theory, aimed to explore whether the use of WebQuest helped enhance the reading skill of 44 second-year EFL students as well as students’ attitude to WebQuest- based teaching of reading. The 14 week newly-designed WebQuest-based reading course included intensive and extensive reading to take advantage of both types and ensure students better understood the text. The analysis of the pre-test and the post-test results demonstrated a considerable improvement in the students’ reading skill.

To examine students’ attitude towards the implementation of WebQuest, an online survey with 13 items was taken after the completion of the course. 90.91% of the participants responded to this survey. The majority of the students agreed that the WebQuest-based
reading instruction had a positive and interesting experience. 95% of them admitted that they preferred to learn with the new WebQuest model rather than with the traditional paper-based approach. Additionally, the majority of students agreed on the questions which focused on the enhancement of the reading skill. Based on these findings, the author concluded that the WebQuest promotes the active teaching of reading and gives teachers the ability to share an amount of resources and material to complete an authentic task for students, which prepares them for their professional lives ahead.

Similarly designed, there is a quasi-experimental study that was used to investigate the effect of WebQuests on reading comprehension of Grade 11 students in a secondary school in the United Arab Emirates (UAE) by Al-Shamisi (2016). This study was based on the idea that the use of technology helps enhance the reading skill and examine the students’ perceptions about the implementation of WebQuests in the EFL environment. The research was applied during a six-week period with an experimental and control group of 28 female students in each group. The experimental group received a researcher designed WebQuest with project-based tasks. In contrast, the control group received traditional reading instruction, which consisted of handouts and group activities. The statistical analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) and descriptive statistics indicated a significant improvement of reading comprehension by the experimental group. At the end of the research process a five-point Likert scale questionnaire was used to examine students’ perceptions about WebQuest implementation. The students’ positive responses stated that they felt they were improving their reading comprehension skill through WebQuests. Despite the restriction of the study, only being implemented with female students, the author could demonstrate statistically that the instruction based on WebQuests improved the reading skill of the Grade 11 students in a secondary school in the United Arab Emirates.
In line with the studies above, Alshumaimeri and Almasri (2012) used a quasi-experimental non-equivalent control group design aimed to report the effects of the WebQuest use on reading comprehension performance of Saudi Arabian students. Results were based exclusively on quantitative data. This research was conducted with 42 male students in the experimental group and 41 male students in the control group. All participants had a pre-intermediate English level, and were enrolled in the first-year preparatory program at Saudi Arabian University. The experimental group received four researchers designed WebQuests, which directed students to websites in order for them to read and collect information on a particular topic in addition to traditional instruction. Students completed every WebQuest in two to three 50-minute sessions during the summer semester that lasted ten weeks. The researcher used the Standardized Reading Part 4 from “the Preliminary English Test (PET) of the University of Cambridge ESOL examination” (p. 299) as a reading comprehension pre-test and a reading comprehension post-test for the experimental and control group to answer the research questions. To answer the first research question, whether both groups significantly improved their reading comprehension performance, the data was analyzed with the paired sample t-test. To answer the second research question, if the experimental group improved more due to the WebQuest tool, the analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was used. The results indicated that the experimental group increased their reading comprehension performance more than the control group, even though both groups improved significantly. According to the results from this study, the authors proved that the WebQuest model was useful in promoting reading comprehension in EFL classrooms; however, some of them mentioned that research limitations were time constraints for the administration of four WebQuests. In addition, there were only male students as research participants, and the lack of qualitative data. The authors suggest that teachers have to be
trained and prepared to use WebQuests in an effective way. The WebQuest use implies a new role for the teacher that should be investigated in the future.

An exception in the corpus of WebQuest research according to the reading comprehension skill is the small-scale action research of Makrogiorgou and Antoniou (2016) in Greece. They analyzed the development of online reading strategies of 6th grade EFL learners through the use of one WebQuest. The authors applied one researcher designed WebQuest called “Christmas without borders” which adopted the stages of a project-based framework. This lasted for five days split into two-hour sessions. According to the first research question, if the application of WebQuests can be combined with teaching techniques, such as modeling, scaffolding, exemplifying, and demonstrating the use of graphic organizers in the pre-reading phase to enhance the reading comprehension, the teacher presented different preparation activities. After an instruction through a video presentation and brainstorming activities, the students had to read texts about Christmas traditions in a country of their choice and keep notes. The teacher provided lists of possible unknown keywords and demonstrated the use of online dictionaries to facilitate the reading process. The end product of the students’ investigation was a written text, which was published at the end of the WebQuest in the learners’ wiki. The 40 participants of a state primary school in Thessaloniki did not present homogeneity in their English level. The research, based on mixed methods, included a needs analysis questionnaire, a post-WebQuest 3-point Likert scale questionnaire, a stimulated recall after the reading of the Internet texts and at the end of the WebQuest implementation, and a teacher journal. In accordance with the second research question, the results of the qualitative and quantitative data proved that students used a large amount of reading comprehension strategies simultaneously to accomplish the reading objective of the WebQuest. This research emphasized the usefulness of the WebQuest tool in the EFL classroom, and its potential to engage reading strategies.
such as goal-setting, monitoring, rereading, scanning-skimming, and making inferences. Additionally, the author emphasized that this tool motivated learners to read online and provided enough support to engage them in an autonomous learning process. This study indicates that the online reading comprehension process implies the application of different reading strategies, which the WebQuest task facilitates through scaffolding and student involvement.

Regarding the literature review, the corpus of studies that examine the use of WebQuests to improve the reading comprehension in EFL contexts is still limited. The common research trends in this field are based on a quasi-experimental design and qualitative data collection. The mentioned studies demonstrate that reading classes based on WebQuests or as a supplementary activity improve students’ reading comprehension performance significantly and describe their implementation as beneficial for students and teachers. Unfortunately, in studies such as Barros and Carvalho (2007), the integration of web-based resources is not focused on. Another typical problem in the literature according to WebQuest implementation is the missing explanation of the WebQuest design, the chosen task or the number of WebQuests used in the research, see Tuan (2011).

WebQuest offers a task-based learning approach in a digital environment (Stoks, 2002; Portilla & Camacho, 2017). The central point of the WebQuest implementation in this study is the posed task-based reading comprehension performance, a field where not much research has been conducted in EFL classrooms at the university level. The following two studies demonstrate the positive impact that task-based reading activities had on students’ reading performance in the Iranian context.

The research by Golchin and Kheirabadi (2013), used an experimental study design to demonstrate that task-based reading activities enhanced the reading comprehension of Iranian advanced EFL learners at Zabansara Institute in Tehran. 60 participants were selected on the
basis that they scored 70% on the reading comprehension questions on the paper-based TOEFL language proficiency test. To meet the objective of the study, the participants were divided in experimental and control groups with 30 participants in each group. The experimental group received task-based reading activities based on First Certificate Gold Practice Exams in Paran (1996) and IELTS reading tasks-instruction over 10 sessions. Every session, the experimental group was divided into three phases: pre-task, during task, and post-task. The first phase introduced the text topic and activated the students’ pre-knowledge. In the second phase, students had to read and discuss their answers in groups of two or three. The final phase supported the students’ accomplishment of the posed task. In contrast to the experimental group, the control group received traditional reading instruction with selected texts from Readings Upper-intermediate in Bernard and Lee (2004). The reading part of a paper-based TOEFL was used for the pre-test and the post-test. The results of the experimental and control group were compared and analyzed with the independent-samples t-test. The results indicated that the experimental group improved their reading comprehension ability significantly. The authors concluded that the traditional reading class was not challenging enough for upper-intermediate EFL learners in contrast to the efficient task-based reading instruction, which encouraged the learner to communicate and complete tasks efficiently. The authors mentioned that research on task-based reading is limited and therefore promoted it for future research.

Similarly, the quasi-experimental design study by Chalak (2015), aimed to examine the effect of task-based instruction on the reading comprehension ability of high school female junior and senior Iranian EFL students. In each grade (junior, senior) the participants were divided in experimental and control groups for four months. The experimental groups received flexible and interactive tasks such as group discussion, role play, interviews, information gap, group work, mystery task, simulation and journalist task, based on the
material of Özönder (2010). The control groups in contrast worked according to the traditional method with material from the textbook, translation activities and reading comprehension questions. The quantitative data of this study was collected during the regular English classes through a reading comprehension pre-test and a reading comprehension post-test which were taken from additional study material provided by the Ministry of Education in accordance with the grade of every treatment group. To answer the first research question, if there is a difference of the reading achievement between the control and experimental group, the pre-test and the post-test results were analyzed with the paired sample t-test. According to the statistical results, the reading comprehension achievement of the experimental groups were significant in comparison with the control groups. Additionally, the independent sample t-test was used to answer the second research question, which investigated the difference between the female junior and senior Iranian EFL students. The junior students showed definitive higher improvement of the reading performance than the senior students. The researcher concluded that TBI is an effective alternative to the traditional methods in the EFL classroom, which created more space for communication, student participation and feedback. The author suggested to investigate the influence of the TBI approach on other language skills and to include qualitative instruments to enhance deeper understanding about the TBI learning process. The conclusion of the two studies above is that task-based instruction has positive influence on the reading comprehension ability of EFL students. This reading approach is compatible with a WebQuest intervention through its task-based framework.

In sum, it is evident according to the literature review, that the use of WebQuest in the EFL instruction can be recognized as a beneficial technological tool that motivates and engages students in their language acquisition through a challenging task that provides input.
and output. The idea for this research study emerged due to the necessity to employ technology for higher education in an adequate way that expands the learning opportunities for language students as well as provides more reading opportunities based on authentic material at the ULI at the University of Cuenca, Ecuador. To integrate WebQuest effectively, different aspects should be regarded according to the literature such as the incorporation of web-based resources, scaffolding material and space to promote higher order thinking skills. The current study correlates WebQuest implementation and the task-based reading approach according to the positive findings of the mentioned studies. The study will examine if the use of WebQuest can enhance the reading skill of EFL students in the Ecuadorian context. The study is important because there still exists a lack of studies in Ecuador that recognize WebQuest tasks as useful tools in modern EFL instruction.
Chapter IV
Methodology

The aim of this chapter is to describe the research design and methodology used in this study to achieve the general objective, which was to determine whether the use of two teacher-designed WebQuests enhance the reading competence of a group of A2 level EFL students at the University of Cuenca. The methodology of the present study based on the mentioned theories of the theoretical framework and the findings of the literature review. This chapter explains, in detail, the different steps of the process and the use of quantitative and qualitative data collection instruments, which leads to the completion of the research.

4.1 Research Context

The University Language Institute (ULI) offers university-wide English Credit Courses that consist of three mandatory levels, each equivalent to the CEFR. The levels are distributed as follows: credit course 1 corresponds to an A1 level, credit course 2 corresponds to an A2 level, and finally, credit course 3 corresponds to a B1.1 level.

The goal of these credit courses is to develop the 4 language skills: reading, listening, speaking, and writing, according to the CEFR with reference to English as a Foreign Language (EFL), through the application of the Communicative Language Teaching approach. Additionally, the Moodle platform, e-virtual, is used as part of the teaching methodology in these courses. English credit courses are offered at each Faculty.

In this context, the present study included a 32-hour intervention, conducted in the researcher/teacher's third level EFL credit course during the September 2016-January 2017 semester. Classes took place from Monday to Thursday from 1 pm to 2:30 pm, for 16 weeks.
4.2 Participants

The course began with a convenience sample of twenty-four undergraduate students (14 females and 10 males) from the University of Cuenca. However, during the first three weeks, three students withdrew from the course due to scheduling conflicts. The remaining students’ ages ranged between 19-25 years old. From the 21 students, 12 were female (57.1%) and 9 were male (42.9%). Eighteen students (85.7%) were from the Faculty of Architecture, one student (4.76%) was from the Faculty of Psychology, and two students (9.52%) were from the Faculty of Philosophy.

4.3 Research Design

The mixed-methods research, which has been increasingly used since the 1980s, emerged as an alternative to the traditional qualitative and quantitative methods. The definition “multiple ways of seeing and hearing” (Creswell, 2014, p.2) highlights the advantages to using this method. The mixed method gives the possibility of combining qualitative data collection with the analysis of quantitative data collection. Because both methods have strengths as well as weaknesses, the use of one method is not enough (Creswell, 2014). A mixed-method approach allows contemplating a phenomenon from different points of views, enhancing deeper understanding, and ensuring an objective corroboration of the results (Creswell, 2014).

From the six major mixed-methods research designs recommended by Creswell (2014), this study used an embedded mixed method design to address the enhancement of the reading skill of EFL third-level credit course students through the design of two WebQuests. In this embedded design “the researcher added the qualitative strand within a quantitative design” (Creswell, 2014, p.71). The dependent variable in this study is the reading skill and the
independent variable is the implementation of two WebQuests. The chart below illustrates the used design.

![Chart illustrating the used design](chart.png)

*Figure 1 Embedded Mixed Methods Design (Creswell, 2014)*

### 4.4 Research Permission and Student’s Informed Consent

Through the official permission of University of Cuenca’s Institute of Languages (see Appendix A), the researcher/teacher began to prepare the intervention of two WebQuests. The research objective was explained and introduced to the EFL third-level Credit course students. Having understood the purpose of the research, the participants then signed a paper-based Informed Consent (see Appendix B) written in Spanish for ethical considerations. The Informed Consent introduced the title of the research project, the confirmation of the student’s voluntary participation, and that the research was conducted under the supervision of the University of Cuenca’s Institute of Languages. Finally, it assured the responsible handling of participants’ data, including the protection of their anonymity.

### 4.5 Materials

The two WebQuests were developed with the following objectives:

- To provide more reading possibilities through a task-based reading approach within an integrated-skills syllabus.
- To promote reading authentic, online texts and enhance critical thinking.
To provide practice in reading strategies to improve understanding of authentic online texts.

To engage learners to create effective collaborative learning groups.

As previously mentioned, the WebQuest included six different steps: introduction, task, process, information sources, evaluation, and conclusion (Sox & Rubinstein-Ávila, 2009; Zheng et al., 2008). For organizational purposes, the information source step and the process step were combined into one, and the process step was subdivided into different sub-steps in both WebQuests. The lexical topics and tasks were chosen according to the syllabus used for all the EFL level-three credit courses (see Appendix C). Consideration was given to students' English proficiency level, as well as their linguistic needs. Lessons were modelled after the Language WebQuests of the Goethe-Institut Krakau (2016) and QuestGarden (2016) to create the two WebQuests entitled: Technology and Great People. Google Sites, as an application of Google Drive, was used to design the WebQuests because all students had access to this app through their university accounts. The WebQuests were designed based on the “Five Rules for Writing a Great WebQuest” by Dodge (2001), and the Rubric for WebQuest Effectiveness for English-Language Learners developed by Sox and Rubinstein-Ávila (2009) was used.

The WebQuest Technology was first planned to be a short-term, well-defined assignment, and the WebQuest Great People was designed as a long-term, ill-defined assignment (Ayfer & Neufeld, 2006; Kleemans et al., 2011). In the research process, both WebQuests became long-term WebQuests with an ill-defined assignment through the combination of writing, speaking and listening activities to better accomplish the syllabus expectations. In the case of writing, for instance, students received the instructions for writing a descriptive paragraph within the first WebQuest and the instructions for writing a four-paragraph essay within the second WebQuest.
Three different readings for every topic in both WebQuests were provided in order to present the students with similar vocabulary in different contexts and styles as recommended by Berardo (2006). The texts were chosen according to the students’ English level and included pre-reading, while-reading, and post-reading activities within the WebQuest design. Hyperlinks in the WebQuests provided students with additional material at different steps. For instance, hyperlinks with information about paraphrasing, citing, tutorials, and Internet pages with useful phrases or vocabulary were provided to support the accomplishment of the WebQuest task.

To guarantee the validity of the developed WebQuests, two teachers from the University of Cuenca’s Institute of Languages revised the linguistic features according to the recommendations of Sox and Rubinstein-Ávila (2009) for content and clarity of WebQuest instructions, such as design consistency.

Thus, the WebQuest was integrated into the normal course process and promoted an effective learning environment. The WebQuest activities combined autonomous work, group work, and idea exchange in the classroom. The main part of the intervention took place at one of the university’s computer labs due to the fundamental need for each student to work online and to have a computer with a good Internet connection.

As additional support to the activities that would be done, the Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR) was introduced in the fourth week of classes to help students understand longer texts. The CSR reading strategy is an approach generated to support struggling readers in L1 and L2 reading programs that combine cognitive reading strategies with metacognitive strategies and create a cooperative learning environment through the use of group work. The reading process was subdivided into pre-reading, during reading and post-reading stages and involves the use of four reading strategies: “a) preview (before reading), b) click and clunk (during reading), c) get the gist (during reading), d) wrap-up (after reading)” (Karabuga &
The use of the “Collaborative Strategic Reading Learning Log” indicates the different reading stages, thus making it possible for the teacher/researcher to supervise the students' reading comprehension process.

The next step was to practice technological skills with the students in the computer lab, which is recommended by Lipscomb (2003); Prapinwong & Puthikanon (2008). The exercise “Social Network Implications” helped the students become familiar with the use of Google Drive. Students had to prepare a group presentation with Google Slides about the positive and negative implications of the use of Facebook. The students shared their Google Slides in class during the preparation process. This option made it possible to work together in groups on different computers at the same time and to see the changes every student or classmate made. Through sharing the slides, the researcher was able to observe and monitor the work process of each group. This step was necessary to ensure that the students knew how to use Google Drive, thus avoiding confusion during the completion of the two assigned WebQuest.

### 4.6 Procedure

The study began with an official Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) English pre-test, to examine the students’ English reading comprehension level. An additional questionnaire at the beginning of the course gave more information about the students’ attitude toward reading exercises in the EFL classroom as well as provided information about interrelated difficulties. After that, the WebQuest tool and its structure was introduced. After the implementation of the first WebQuest, a focus group of five volunteer students was conducted to gain a space for sharing experiences and perceptions of the collaborative learning process. An additional online-survey was administered to get more information about the students’ experience with the first WebQuest implementation. The implementation of the second WebQuest followed, and also ended with a focus group of two
volunteer students. During the entire research process, a teacher journal was kept to record observations of the students’ different interactions with the WebQuests, for example when problems or questions arose. The last step of the research was the administration of the reading comprehension CEFR post-test and a final perception questionnaire.

4.7 Intervention

The WebQuest intervention took place during the semester September 2016-January 2017 semester. The the students were prepared during the first two weeks of class for the use of the WebQuest model as mentioned before. After the completion of the WebQuest design and the introduction of the lexical topic Technology, the intervention with the first WebQuest Technology began on the fifth week of classes before the midterm exam. The second WebQuest, Great People, was implemented at the fourteenth week after a prior presentation of the lexical topic Interpersonal Relationships and Personal Interests as indicated in the syllabus before the final exam.

4.7.1 WebQuest Technology

The application of the WebQuest Technology was designed to be developed during nine 1.5-hour sessions (see Appendix D). The objective was for students to consider different points of view about very common inventions, through the analysis of three online texts for every invention, which explained who the inventor was and the historical and industrial processes behind it (see lesson plan Appendix E).

In the first step, the introduction, students were presented with the topic of inventions. The task step informed the students about their mission which was to find the three most important British inventions for a mock exhibition titled “The Most Useful Inventions Worldwide” set at the Museo Pumapungo in Cuenca, Ecuador. The reason why students were asked to complete this task was because the museum had missed the British contribution. The
Museo Pumapungo, was used as the authentic environment for the task because it is a place student could relate to, as it is a very well-known museum in Cuenca. The process/information source step, which was divided into five sub-steps, informed the students how to complete the task. Students had to form their groups and chose the invention they were going to focus on. The options for this were: tin can, electric vacuum cleaner, telephone, electric telegraph, television, photography, World Wide Web, and the light bulb. In the first sub-step, every group had to read the three web pages provided after the revision of the vocabulary list on the WebQuest. The eight groups had to fill out a “Collaborative Strategic Reading Learning Log” (see Appendix F) after every reading and to share it with the researcher/teacher through “Google Docs”. Through this additional tool, the reading progress of every group inside and outside the classroom could be monitored every two days.

The second sub-step required every group to complete five general questions in the document “Task Sheet 1” (see Appendix G) that helped check their global understanding of the three readings.

For the third sub-step, the group had to divide their work and were each assigned to be different specialists (the writer, the graphic designer, the speaker). For every specialist, the researcher provided one or two hyperlinks with support material. After the individual work was completed, the group had to come together again to create their poster, which defended and promoted their chosen British invention. One example can be seen in Appendix H.

The fourth sub-step gave students more information about the necessary structure and content to create the required poster. At this point, the students reviewed the rubrics of the evaluation step, which allowed them to consider the criteria that would be used to evaluate their group work adequately.

The fifth and last sub-step, students had to present their group work in the EFL classroom. During the presentations, the audience completed a worksheet called “Learning
sheet: the most useful British invention” (see Appendix I). This exercise was aimed at helping students give and receive feedback not only from the teacher but also from their classmates and to apply certain criteria when voting. The three exhibits that had the most votes were photography, the telephone, and the World Wide Web.

In the conclusion step, the students had to reinforce their knowledge through a reflection exercise, by watching the video “Crazy Inventions That Never Made It.” In pairs, they wrote a descriptive paragraph about a chosen crazy invention and specified why it never made it. This critical reflection about crazy inventions helped students become more aware of their learning process.

The WebQuest reading comprehension activities offered the possibility to support the critical thinking in the reading process of every group and could be combined with a listening activity. The researcher implemented an additional a TED-Ed video exercise “How inventions change history (for better and for worse)” by Kenneth C. Davis (2012), through the e-virtual which built part of the course material. After watching the video students had to complete a listening worksheet and rethink the positive and negative consequences of their inventions through group discussion.

4.7.2. WebQuest Great People

The WebQuest, Great People, was implemented in the fourteenth week, in connection with the lexical topic, aimed to bring the Nobel Prize Award Ceremony on December 10th, 2016, closer to the students’ awareness (see Appendix J). The application of the WebQuest lasted six 1.5-hour sessions (see lesson plan Appendix K).

For this WebQuest, students had to imagine being a trainee in the editorial department for a radio station. They had to prepare a short podcast about one of the most popular Nobel Peace Prize laureates. In this short podcast, every group carried out an imaginary interview
with one of the laureates and related it to the Ecuadorian audience. After the presentation of the introduction step and the task step, students had to watch the video “How does the Nobel Peace Prize work?” by Cuvelier and Rokseth (2016), and the video “Mahatma Gandhi” by Deoskar (2010) of the TED-Ed video collection, to generate general background information about the topic. At the beginning of the following class, students had to form groups of two or three people and choose one of the five suggested Nobel Peace Prize laureates (Aung San Suu Kyi, Elie Wiesel, the 14th Dalai Lama, Martin Luther King Jr., and Malala Yousafzai) to accomplish the WebQuest task. The process/information source step of the WebQuest was divided into three sub-steps. In the first sub-step students had to read the provided resources of three webpages. During the cooperative reading activity, the students had to fill out three “Collaborative Strategic Reading Learning Logs” and to share them with the researcher through a “Google Docs” document.

The second sub-step required that students distribute their roles as interviewer and interviewee and planned their podcast.

The third sub-step and the evaluation step of the WebQuest provided detailed information of what was expected of the podcast. During the third sub-step, the students also had to create a script and share it through “Google Docs” before recording their podcast (see Appendix L).

In the WebQuest’s conclusion step, the students had to reinforce their knowledge through a written exercise. In pairs they had to write a four-paragraph essay to explain why their chosen Nobel Peace Prize laureate was awarded this great honor.

**4.8 Data Collection Instruments**

To ensure an objective corroboration of the results the current study applied quantitative and qualitative data collection. The quantitative data was collected with the
application of the pre-reading and post-reading comprehension test, the five-point Likert scale reading questionnaire, the application of a five-point Likert scale survey after the first WebQuest, and at the end of the implementation the five-point Likert scale perception questionnaire. The qualitative data, in contrast, was collected during the intervention process through the use of the students’ Collaborative Strategic Reading Learning Log, the application of a focus group after each WebQuest, as well as the teacher journal’s annotation of students’ handling of the WebQuest activities and their working attitude through the whole research process.

4.8.1 Quantitative Data Collection Instruments

In this section the quantitative data collection instruments used in this research will be explained in detail in chronological order: five-point Likert scale reading questionnaire, reading comprehension pre-test /post-test, a five-point Likert scale survey, and the five-point Likert scale perception questionnaire.

4.8.1.1 Reading Questionnaire

A 22-item questionnaire was used to analyze the students’ awareness and experience with reading comprehension in the EFL context at the University of Cuenca Institute of Languages (see Appendix M). It focused on students’ attitude toward the use of reading strategies. The paper-based questionnaire was answered anonymously by the 23 participants who were originally registered for the course. To ensure understanding, the language used was Spanish, the native language of the participants. It included one open-ended and twenty-one closed-ended questions. Through a five-point Likert scale (i.e. where 5=always; 4=frequently; 3=sometimes; 2=seldom, and 1=never), students were asked to answer all the
questions. The questionnaire was based on the study by Mokhtari and Sheorey (2002), and Tous, Tahriri and Haghighi (2015).

The reading questionnaire was validated through a pilot test conducted with 11 students (3 males and 8 females) from another third level EFL credit course at the ULI.

4.8.1.2 Reading Comprehension Pre-and Post-Test

The students’ English reading comprehension level was determined before and after the intervention with the same five reading exercises from the official Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) English test adapted from the official web page “Exam English” (Exam English Ltd., 2014). The CEFR, established by the European Council of Europe, offers a common scale to measure the language level of European Languages (Council of Europe, 2001). The different language levels are divided into six categories: A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, and C2 which are generally known as the basic, intermediate, and advanced level. In every level, the learner has to reach a specific proficiency in the four skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing (Richards & Rodgers, 2014, p.165). The paper-based pre-test was taken on September 29th, 2016 and after the application of the two WebQuests the paper-based post-test was taken on January 5th, 2017 (see Appendix N).

A pilot test was conducted with 5 students (1 male and 4 females) of a co-worker’s third level EFL credit course at the ULI in order to ensure clarity of the instructions and items. The researcher decided to administer the same reading exercises in the pre-test and the post-test in order to obtain comparable results.

The reading comprehension test consisted of five readings: three readings at an A2 level and two readings at a B1 Level. The first three A2-level readings consisted of 15 questions and the two B1-level readings consisted of 20 questions. The selected readings
were oriented on the scales for “Overall Reading Comprehension, Reading Correspondence, and Reading for Orientation,” according to the CEFR (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 68-69).

The reading comprehension exercises consisted of multiple-choice questions with between three and six options. An exception was the last reading task in which the students had to assign the right heading for each of the ten given paragraphs. Every correct answer in the five reading comprehension tasks was worth one point.

4.8.1.3 Survey

The 11-item online survey with a five-point Likert scale (i.e. where 1=strongly agree; 2=agree; 3=not sure; 4= disagree, and 5 =strongly disagree) was completed anonymously after the completion of the first WebQuest “Technology,” (see Appendix O). This was developed with Google Forms, which allows for the creation and analysis of surveys for free. It was written in Spanish and consisted of 1 open-ended and 10 closed-ended questions. The survey content was based on the study by Ayfer and Neufeld (2006) and Tuan (2011). The link to the survey was shared in an email message and sent to all the students and the link was also accessible over the e-virtual of the EFL third level credit course in the Faculty of Architecture.

4.8.1.4 Perception Questionnaire

The 12-item online-perception questionnaire with a five-point Likert scale (i.e. where 1=strongly disagree; 2=disagree; 3=not sure; 4=agree; 5= strongly agree) was anonymously completed at the end of the semester (Appendix P). It was also developed in Google Forms and was written in Spanish and consisted of 1 open-ended and 11 closed-ended questions. The questionnaire content was based on the study by Mokhtari and Sheorey (2002). The link to the perception questionnaire was shared in an email message to all the participants.
4.8.2 Qualitative Data Collection Instruments

The quantitative data collection was important to contemplate the influence of the WebQuest implementation, on the reading competence of a group of A2 level EFL students, from different points of view. Thus, the application of the Collaborative Strategic Reading Learning Log after each reading and the two focus groups helped to get more information of the students’ perceptions of the implementation as well as the teacher’s perceptions of students’ acceptance of the implementation recorded in teacher notes.

4.8.2.1 Collaborative Strategic Reading Learning Log

The Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR) Learning Log instrument created by Klingner & Vaughn (1999) is not part of the principal research design, but it was adapted by the researcher. It supported the students in the handling of the authentic texts within the two WebQuests. The CSR Learning Log was shared through the WebQuests as a Google Doc. It was meant to promote the active participation of every group member and prepared the students through the annotation of every step for follow-up activities (Klinger & Vaughn, 1999). The CSR reading strategy was introduced in the fourth week of the mentioned semester.

4.8.2.2 Focus Group

The focus group was one of the qualitative techniques used in this research. After each WebQuest the researcher asked for volunteers to participate in the focus group that was recorded. The language used during the two focus group conversations was Spanish to encourage mutual comprehension among participants and researcher. The researcher tried to stimulate discussion with questions during the conversation to encourage all students present participated.
The first focus group with a subset of five volunteer students was held after the WebQuest Technology on December 12th, 2016 (see Appendix Q). Students’ perceptions, both negative and positive, and impressions of the WebQuest implementation were discussed; additionally, possible suggestions for the next WebQuest implementation were presented.

Following the WebQuest Great People, the second focus group with a subset of two volunteer students was conducted on January 16th, 2017 (see Appendix R). This group discussed their perceptions of this WebQuest, the use of authentic material to enhance their reading comprehension, and the possible use of WebQuests in their English education in the future.

4.8.2.3 Teacher’s Journal

The teacher’s journal described the research process of the intervention of both WebQuests to enhance the reading comprehension of the EFL third-level credit course students at the University Language Institute. The teacher took notes with this document after every class during the whole intervention process (see Appendix S). This was done to annotate the chronological order of the intervention as well as problems which might have occurred during the process. The journal recorded the teacher’s perceptions based on the students’ participation and task performance.

4.9 Data Analysis

The general objective of this research was to determine whether the use of two teacher-designed WebQuests enhance the reading competence of the A2 EFL level students at the University of Cuenca. In order to define their reading level before and after the application of the two WebQuests, a pre-test and a post-test were administered as instruments to collect quantitative data. The results from this data were tabulated and classified in two
categories based on the readings that were included in each test according to CEFR descriptors, specifically A2 and B1 levels. These results in turn, were statistically analyzed with the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software.

For the statistical analysis, the Wilcoxon signed-rank test as a non-parametric statistical hypothesis analysis for related samples was used to compare the mentioned data sets. This statistical test was used because it is the alternative instead of the student t-test when the sample size is less than 30.

To explore students’ perceptions of the effectiveness of the intervention in relation to reading comprehension, quantitative and qualitative data were obtained. The quantitative data was collected through the use of a reading questionnaire, a survey, and a perception questionnaire based on a five-point Likert scale. The items on the questionnaires and surveys were grouped into different categories to compare the answers through the use of the nonparametric Mann-Whitney U statistical test, which is normally used when the number of cases does not exceed 30 participants. Both focus group sessions were audiotaped and transcribed by the researcher. The results of the qualitative data obtained from the first focus group, conducted after the first WebQuest on December 12th, 2016, and the second focus group, conducted after the second WebQuest on January 16th, 2017 were also matched with the questionnaires and survey results in order to determine students’ perceptions of the effectiveness of the intervention in relation to reading comprehension. Some students’ statements were translated from Spanish into English and used in the results chapter to underpin the quantitative results (they were cited through the indication of the line in the original transcripts at the appendix section).

The following chapter details the results of qualitative and quantitative instruments in detail with the purpose of triangulating the data obtained.
Chapter V

Results

5.1 Data Analysis and Interpretation

The objectives of this research were to determine whether the use of two teacher-designed WebQuests enhance reading competence of EFL A2 level students, to explore students’ perceptions about the effectiveness of the intervention in relation to reading comprehension, and to examine the teacher's perceptions about the students’ attitude toward the use of WebQuests in the EFL classroom. In order to reach these objectives an embedded mixed method design, which included quantitative as well as qualitative research instruments, were used.

The reading comprehension pre-test and post-test results were statistically analyzed using the non-parametric Wilcoxon signed-rank test. The comparison of the six categories through the Mann-Whitney U statistical test for the reading questionnaire at the beginning of the intervention, the survey conducted after the completion of the first WebQuest and the perception questionnaire which was taken at the culmination of the intervention were analyzed and interpreted.

Furthermore, the data obtained from the two focus groups, one after each WebQuest, were matched with the questionnaires and survey results in order to determine students’ perceptions about the effectiveness of the intervention in relation to reading comprehension. Finally, the teacher journal entries were analyzed to examine the teacher's perceptions about the students’ attitude towards the use of WebQuests in the EFL classroom.

5.1.1 Reading Comprehension Pre-Test and Post-Test Results

Based on the research objective, to determine whether the use of two teacher-designed WebQuests enhance reading competence of A2 level EFL students, a pre-test was
administered on September 29th, 2016 as a reading diagnostic test and the same test as post-test was administered on January 5th, 2017 after the final exam. Each test consisted of 3 readings at an A2 level and two readings at a B1 level. Finally, a Wilcoxon signed-rank test was used, as a non-parametric statistical hypothesis analysis, to evaluate the data.

The reading comprehension (CEFR) pre-test and post-test of the A2 readings showed an increase in the mean score as well as the standard deviation. The analysis of the nonparametric Wilcoxon signed-rank test for related samples indicated that the difference was not significant $p > .278 \ r = .236$ (see table 1 and figure 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test</th>
<th>Score Pre-Test A2 - Score Post-Test A2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-1.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>0.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>0.236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2 Mean and Standard Deviation of Pre-Test and Post-Test A2
In comparison, the B1 reading comprehension (CEFR) pre-test and post-test showed that the average was maintained, but the standard deviation was reduced. This result indicated that the students as a whole, were closer to the average value after the intervention. Although the Wilcoxon Signed-Ranks test findings stated that the result was not significant $p > .791, r = .058$ (see table 1 and figure 2). This means, that students did improve, although not significantly.

\[\text{Table 2 Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test Results of the Pre-Test and Post-Test B1}\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test</th>
<th>Score Pre-Test B1 - Score Post-Test B1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-0.264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>0.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>0.058</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\text{Figure 3 Mean and Standard Deviation of Pre-Test and Post-Test B1}\]

In order to calculate the reading comprehension pre-test and post-test grades, each reading level was divided as follows: the A2 reading test scores were 15 points, while the B1
reading scores, were 20 points, for an overall score of 35 points. This score was then reduced to a grade over five points, allowing for a comparison with the reading score obtained from the midterm and final exam from the ULI (see figure 4).

The averages of the pre-reading test, midterm exam and final exam were compared in order to correlate the effect the two WebQuests application had on students. The results of the pre-reading test (M = 3.10, SD = 0.75) were used as a diagnostic test and compared with the midterm exam (M = 3.71, SD = 1.03). This comparison showed significant progress $Z (21) = 2.055, p < .041, r = .448$. In addition, the pre-reading test/diagnostic test was compared to the final exam results (M = 3.90, SD = 0.29) and also indicated significant progress $Z (21) = 3.127, p < .003, r = .682$. It is relevant to mention that the comparison of the midterm exam with the final exam, was not significant $Z (21) = 0.871, p > .383, r = .190$.

The evidence of significant progress between the initial pre-reading/diagnostic test and the midterm exam indicated that the strength of the intervention was through the application of the first WebQuest. When the averages of the final and midterm exam were compared, progress was maintained, but they were no longer significant (see figure 5).
5.1.2 Questionnaires and Survey Results

The paper-based reading questionnaire that was taken during class time had a different number of participants from the online survey and the online perception questionnaire, which were not completed during class hours. In each of the questionnaires and the survey, the responses that were collected were anonymous and the participants were randomly grouped.

Through the categorization of the questions of the paper-based reading questionnaire, the online survey and the online perception questionnaire, a comparison of the different categories was possible through the use of the non-parametric Mann-Whitney U statistical test according to table 3.

Table 3 Categories of the Reading Questionnaire, Survey and Perception Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Abbr.</th>
<th>Reading C. Questionnaire Questions</th>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>Perception Questionnaire Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective Reactions</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Strategies</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>13-19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Improvement</td>
<td>CWQ</td>
<td>6-12</td>
<td>1;9</td>
<td>1;4;9;10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties in using WebQuest</td>
<td>DWQ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6;10</td>
<td>3;6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of WebQuest use</td>
<td>EWQ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2;4;5;7</td>
<td>2;5;7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Importance of WebQuest</td>
<td>IWQ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3;8</td>
<td>8;11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Following this, question 20 and 21 from the reading comprehension questionnaire and the open questions from the previously mentioned tests were analyzed.

The reading questionnaire contained 21 closed questions and one open ended question. The closed questions 1-19 were divided into three categories: affective reactions, reading strategies, and difficulties in using WebQuests. Regarding the affective reaction category (questions 1-5), a frequency analysis of the answers is demonstrated in figure 6.

Figure 6 indicates that more than half of the students responded at the intermediate point, sometimes, which indicates little motivation.

The results of the reading strategy category (questions 13-19) can be seen in figure 7.
Figure 7 Reading Strategies Category

As expected by the researcher, students were able to use some reading strategies that they had already learned in the classroom, indicated in the ULI syllabus. According to the answers, it seems that some basic strategies were known and practiced.

Table 4 indicates which categories were compared in the questionnaire or survey and the corresponding probability value (p-value).

Table 4 Mann-Whitney U Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>CWQ</th>
<th>DWQ</th>
<th>EWQ</th>
<th>IWQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Questionnaire - Survey</td>
<td>.007*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Questionnaire - Perception Questionnaire</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey - Perception Questionnaire</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.522</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The perception dimension of cognitive improvement (CWQ) showed an increment from the initial reading questionnaire with the mean value (M = 3.59) to the survey value (M = 4.15) after the first WebQuest, which resulted to be significant p <.008. Furthermore, there was an increment between the initial reading questionnaire with the mean value (M = 3.59) and the perception questionnaire (M = 4.39) at the end of the intervention, which also resulted to be significant p <.001. However, the value of the perception questionnaire when compared with the value of the survey after the first WebQuest implementation was not significant p > .755.

The results of the difficulty category can be seen in the figure 9.
The WebQuest difficulties category (DWQ) showed an increment from the initial mean value (M = 1.95) to the value of the perception questionnaire (M = 2.03), but it did not result in significance p > .812.

The ease of WebQuest use category can be seen in the figure 10.

![Figure 10 Ease of WebQuest use Category](image)

The ease of WebQuest use category (EWQ) indicated a slight increase from the initial average value (M = 4.23) to the value of the perception questionnaire (M = 4.31), which turned out not to be significant p > .110.

The perception of the importance of the WebQuest category can be seen in the figure 11.

![Figure 11 The Importance of WebQuest Category](image)
The perception of the importance of the WebQuest (IWQ) was only evaluated in the survey after the first WebQuest and the final perception questionnaire. There was evidence of an increase in the perception of importance from $M = 3.95$ to $M = 4.34$ which was not significant $p > .521$.

**Questions which were analyzed separately**

The question 20 and 21 from the reading questionnaire and the open questions were analyzed separately: first, the reading questionnaire, second, the survey and at the end, the perception questionnaire.

For the question 20 (Do you read texts or articles outside of the English class in English?) a frequency analysis of the answers is demonstrated in figure 12.

![Figure 12: Students' Answers of Question 20](image)

Based on the results of figure 12, question 20, the group of participants presented diverse influence of the English language through the different subjects of their university studies. The distribution was heterogeneous because there were 8 students who answered that they read *frequently* in English and on the other hand, 7 students answered that they *occasionally* read in English.
The students’ answers of question 21 (Do you read English texts on your own initiative, for example topics of your interest?) can be seen in the figure 13.

![Bar chart showing students' answers of question 21](chart.png)

*Figure 13 Students’ Answers of Question 21*

Figure 13 showed that the behavior of the group followed a normal trend with a portion of students who frequently or always (7 students) read on their own initiative and the other portion of the group who did so occasionally or never (8 students).

The topics of the answers of question 22 (If you answered yes to the previous question 21, please indicate which topics you read in English) can be seen in table 5.5.

*Table 5 Topics of the Answers of Question 22*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Topics</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Topics</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Interest</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free time distraction</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of table 5.5, demonstrated the main reading topics students mentioned. A marked tendency could be seen among academic and research topics according to the students’ subject of study.

The answers to the survey, open question 11 can be seen in table 6.

*Table 6 Students’ Responses of Question 11 of the Survey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you have any suggestions to improve the WebQuest?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• I think that the hyperlinks should be used with more understandable terminology. It was difficult for me to understand certain words that are handled within a technical language in the branch of the research topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It is a more didactic way to learn, and the way it was developed was very interesting. Perhaps the use of more graphics would facilitate understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I recommend putting more topics of interest for students, such as PókemonGO. That one I liked! :D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It would be better to incorporate topics of interest for each student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Everything was very good!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The answers of the survey in table 6, were separated in three categories: self-interest, vocabulary problems, and positive comments, which reflected the criteria of the students who participated in the study. The absence of suggestions from the majority of students (15 of a total of 20) indicated their agreement with the applied tool.

Comparing the results with the first focus group, similar opinions arise. It was possible to categorize this collected information in: self-interest, student A: “I did not like the topic that I had, I think there were other interesting topics ...” (see Appendix Q, 12/12/2016, Line 3, translation); positive comments, “In other words, the steps we carried out seemed to me correct, the order of the topics was not abrupt …, smooth, it seemed to me that there were correct examples, the bibliography first, we were doing a shorter work …, then the other” (Appendix Q, 12/12/2016, Line 24, translation).
The students’ responses of question 12 (Which WebQuest did you find more interesting and why?) of the perception questionnaire can be seen in table 7.

Table 7 Students’ Responses of Question 12 of the Perception Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WebQuest 1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WebQuest 2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the information in table 7, it can be seen that WebQuest 2, which had a topic of general interest, was preferred by the participants (12). In contrast to WebQuest 1, where the topic was related to a technical area, presented a lower frequency of acceptance (3).

Comparing with the data of the second focus group, it was possible to get more information as to why the students preferred WebQuest 2:

- Student G: “It was easier for me because we already did the first WebQuest” (Appendix R, 01/16/2017, Line 4, translation).
- Student H: “For me, the second one was a little more entertaining because I liked the role-play at the end, it seemed to me quite practical and suitable to learn to express myself in English” (Appendix R, 01/16/2017, Line 11, translation).
- Student G: “For me also, the second one was more interesting, for the topic of the Nobel prize that was something that we talked a little bit more” (Appendix R, 01/16/2017, Line 20, translation).

5.1.3 Teacher’s Journal

The teacher’s journal included information recorded by her during the research
process in order to document students’ behavior in every class in the observation form. To analyze the qualitative data obtained from the journal, the teacher’s comments were categorized into two topics: students’ participation and task performance to examine students’ attitude towards the use of WebQuests in the EFL classroom.

When the first WebQuest task was introduced, through its different steps and sub-steps, students seemed interested in accomplishing the new demand, but they were also skeptical about the use of the new learning tool.

According to the students’ participation, it could be observed that at the beginning they had problems to work effectively in groups, due to different reasons such as some students were used to working with only their friends and some students were not satisfied with their topic at the beginning. It could be observed that one group tried to divide the three readings between group members in an attempt to optimize their work, but through the CSR Learning Log students were obligated to interchange understandings and misunderstandings about each text. After repeated instruction of how to work together, the teacher perceived that the majority of the students were engaged in the reading process of their chosen invention as well as checking the provided vocabulary lists and using online dictionaries. Apart from the difficulty of some students to attend classes regularly and the vocabulary complexity of some authentic online texts, it was possible to observe how students participated actively through permanent exchange of information as well as vocabulary knowledge within the group work.

Regarding task performance, the teacher perceived a high motivation from students to work with the provided web-based material. Students were not only engaged but also very creative during the design process of their multimedia poster. During the poster presentation, students seemed positively surprised about their own outcomes as well as the other groups outcomes.

When the second WebQuest was introduced, students seemed interested and
motivated to accomplish the new task. According to the students’ participation, some students seemed more interested in their chosen Nobel Peace Prize laureate after each reading, although one group had problems with the necessary historical background for better understanding. The group work seemed effective because the students worked in harmony and collaboratively.

Regarding task performance, the teacher perceived that despite the time limitations, the students were motivated to record their mock interview. It could be observed that the students used the second WebQuest tool with more ease and took more advantage of it.

The data obtained from the various qualitative and quantitative research instruments were analyzed in this chapter and will be further discussed in detail in the following chapter.
Chapter VI

Discussion

The focus of this chapter is to discuss the significance of the obtained quantitative and qualitative results of the current study and how these findings can be compared and linked to the existing literature in this field. Limitations will be discussed and analyzed in relationship to those of previous studies. Results will be discussed according to the research objectives.

The quantitative results from the first specific research objective, which was to determine the reading competence of the participants before and after the application of two WebQuests, was obtained through the administration of the reading comprehension (CEFR) pre-test and post-test at the beginning and at the end of the intervention. These results, shown in Figure 2, compare the A2 reading comprehension pre-test and post-test scores and indicate a slight increase in the mean score as well as in the standard deviation; regardless of the nonparametric Wilcoxon test that did not demonstrate statistical significant improvement. The obtained results share similarities with Barros and Carvalho’s (2007) findings, which demonstrated a higher standard deviation in the experimental group in the reading skill through the WebQuest intervention.

Figure 3, compares the B1 reading comprehension pre-test and post-test results and shows that the average remains the same, but the standard deviation is reduced. This result indicates that the students had different reading comprehension proficiency levels when they started the intervention process. However, the values were closer to the average after the intervention. In other words, the group can be described as more uniform and more balanced in their reading comprehension proficiency level after the intervention.

On the other hand, these findings are in contradiction with the previous results reported by Kocoglu (2010); Tuan (2011) Alshumaimeri & Almasri (2012); Al-Shamisi
In order to obtain a more accurate picture of the WebQuest intervention and its effect on the reading comprehension performance, the researcher additionally took the midterm exam and the final exam reading score into account. The reading comprehension pre-test was used as a diagnostic test to be able to compare with the midterm exam and the final exam reading score. The results were remarkable, especially when comparing the average reading scores of the group; significant differences between the reading pre-test and the midterm reading exam, and the reading pre-test and the final reading exam were found. This can be confirmed with the qualitative data from the second focus group with the following comment made by student G: “Really, in the final exam, I did not have difficulties in the reading part, I understood it very quickly and instantly, yes” (see Appendix R, 01/16/2017, Line 59, translation).

However, when comparing the averages of the midterm reading score and the final reading score, after the second WebQuest, no significant differences were found. Following these findings, it can be interpreted that the first WebQuest intervention had a higher effect on the students’ reading skill. Even though the students kept improving, through the second WebQuest, there was more intervention effect after WebQuest one (see Figure 5). These values correlate favorably with Barros and Carvalho (2007); Makrogjorgou and Antoniou (2016); Portilla and Camacho (2017). and support the idea that the use of a WebQuest can cause an improvement in the EFL language skills.

The second specific research objective was to explore students’ perceptions about the effectiveness of the intervention in relation to reading comprehension; some quantitative and qualitative data were gathered through various methods, including: the reading questionnaire administered at the beginning of the intervention, a survey after the first WebQuest
application, a perception questionnaire administered at the end of the intervention, and two focus groups with a subset of students. In other words, students’ responses were analyzed through the application of these instruments based on six emergent categories: affective reactions, reading strategies, cognitive improvement, difficulties in using WebQuests, ease of WebQuest use, and the importance of WebQuests.

The first two categories, affective reactions and reading strategies, were based on the data collected from the reading questionnaire administered at the beginning of the intervention. The data indicated that students were not highly motivated to read in English, but they were aware of the necessity to improve their reading skill (see Figure 6). With the data of the reading strategies, the researcher was able to determine the previous students’ experience with reading texts in and outside of the EFL classroom, and their affection with the target language (see Figure 7).

The third category, cognitive improvement, addressed the students’ perceptions about the effectiveness of the intervention in relation to their reading comprehension at three different stages of the intervention: at the beginning (reading questionnaire), during (survey), and at the end (perception questionnaire) (see Figure 8). The obtained results from all these data collection instruments was significant. This means that the students perceived an enhancement in their reading skill which concurred with the findings by Barros and Carvalho (2007), Tuan (2011), and Al-Shamisi (2016), who, unlike this study, administered a final questionnaire to get information about the students’ attitude.

The fourth category, which dealt with difficulties that arose from using WebQuests, concentrated on time limitations in relation to task accomplishment, difficulties in group work, and reoccurring technical difficulties. When comparing the survey responses with the perception questionnaire, a slight increase was observed with the implementation of the second WebQuest, which resulted in no significant difference (see Figure 9).
The fifth category, ease of WebQuest use, focused on WebQuest design, effective support by the teacher, adequate network communication within the classroom, and based on the answers of the survey and perception questionnaire. Although the results are not being significant, a slight increase from the initial survey average value to the value of the perception questionnaire was observed (see Figure 10).

The sixth category, the importance of WebQuests, was created to see the students’ attitude in relation to the provided authentic texts and additional links to support the learning process by the WebQuest model application. This was in contrast to the traditional reading material used at the ULI. This category also asked students if they could imagine participating in EFL classrooms that used WebQuests in the future. This category was only evaluated after the first WebQuest application with the survey and in the final perception questionnaire. The results indicated an increase, which was not significant. To discuss the importance of the WebQuest, the qualitative data gained throughout the intervention must also be included. The supplementary qualitative data obtained from the second focus group and the teacher’s journal indicated, in contrast, a considerable positive attitude to the intervention, as can be seen in the following conversation:

**Researcher:** Did you like that the texts used were authentic and not typical ones from English textbooks?

**Student G:** For me yes, because in the English credit course 2 and also in other English courses that I have had, it is true that the texts and the readings given in the book were very basic and one got used to it. On the other hand, the WebQuests were more real, with much more content from real life, than the books that are more basic, for schools and that. (see Appendix R, 01/16/2017, Line 42, translation)

These qualitative results are in complete agreement with the findings by Barros and Carvalho (2007), and Tuan (2011).
In order to obtain the results for the third specific research objective, which was to examine the teacher's perceptions about the students’ attitude towards the use of WebQuests in the EFL classroom, a teacher's journal was used and analyzed in relation to the perceptions of the two guided focus groups. The seventeen entries in the teacher’s journal were categorized into two topics: students’ participation and task performance, in order to examine students’ attitude towards the use of WebQuests in the EFL classroom.

Based on the journal, the researcher was impressed with the students' engagement in the two WebQuest tasks and about the students’ results and creativity, which can be seen in their multimedia posters, poster presentations, paragraphs, podcast scripts, podcasts, essays and recurring conversations between the students and between students and teacher (Appendix L, Appendix H). Despite the fact that, at the beginning of the intervention, some students did not totally agree with the group formation and tried to divide the three provided texts among group members, making it individual work; later, the students’ collaboration was effective, which was demonstrated in constant group conversations in the target and native language about the reading content and design decisions in class. The difficulty to mediate the different preferences students had about how to read online texts, and whether this should be done individually or as a group, is consistent with previous results by Kiili (2013).

On the other hand, in reviewing literature and the researcher’s experience during the quantitative and qualitative data collection, some internal and external factors for possible limitations were recognized. It is plausible that a number of limitations could have probably affected students’ reading comprehension performance results.

First, the time constraints as well as course objectives limited the teacher/researcher in the number of WebQuests created. Only two WebQuests could be used during the intervention time, which Alshumaimeri and Almasri (2012) also mentioned in their research. Additionally, the author of the current research completely agrees with Portilla and Camacho,
that the design process of a WebQuest is a very time consuming and a complex process that involves careful planning.

Second, the reading post-test was not conducted at the best moment as it was administered after the final exam in January 2017, when the students indicated low motivation, most likely due to the course ending. This low motivation could be seen additionally by the fact that some students did not answer all multiple-choice questions on the test, which was not the case in the pre-test.

Third, it should be mentioned that the students’ attendance was irregular and some students seemed to be overworked due to their university schedule during the intervention. Additionally, the English class schedule from 2 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. was tiresome.

Fourth, statistical limitations arose because the sample size consisted of only 21 students. This condition prevented the possibility to execute parametric statistical tests, which require a minimum of 30 participants, and made it impossible to generalize the obtained results.

Fifth, on the basis of administrative difficulties, it is impossible for teachers at the ULI to get two groups with the same characteristics such as number of students, gender, age, and schedule. So, this study is in contrast to the research by Kocoglu (2010); Alshumaimeri & Almasri (2012); Al-Shamisi (2016), who used a control group with the same characteristics in their research in order to compare the test results to get clear evidence of the positive effect of the WebQuest intervention.

Sixth, the application of the CSR reading strategy and the corresponding (CSR) Learning Log in this research was an additional activity and their possible influence on the reading comprehension performance was not considered when analyzing the data due to the research design.
To sum up, although both the quantitative and qualitative instruments used in this research study have some limitations, it is important to mention that they can lead to some very significant considerations, which are, the application of the WebQuest tool in the context of EFL classes would be very useful for students to help them improve their reading skill as well as their English proficiency.
Chapter VII

Conclusions and Recommendations

This chapter summarizes the conclusions and recommendations for further research into the use of WebQuest based on the results, findings, and limitations of the current study.

The evidence from this study highlights the positive effect of the WebQuest application on the reading comprehension performance of EFL students in the Ecuadorian context. Even though the statistical analysis showed that the students’ reading comprehension performance was not significant, their perceptions about their reading comprehension level after the WebQuest application showed they were motivated and satisfied with it. The findings reveal that students had a positive attitude toward the WebQuest tool and that they perceived an enhancement of their reading comprehension performance through the intervention. As stated by Alshumaimeri and Almasri (2012), the WebQuest model implies a special challenge for students and teacher. For teachers, during the design process and through the new way of teaching. In contrast, for the students it is a demanding activity due to the use of authentic material that needs more effort to get a thorough understanding of the text due to new vocabulary and different text genres. The WebQuest itself as a new tool in the EFL acquisition and through its challenging task, demands a diverse use of linguistic skills (Barros & Carvalho, 2007). Besides, reading online requires additional skills such as handling hyperlinks, images and publicity in the text. However, WebQuest gives teacher the possibility to engage students not only with authentic material, but also with a preparation for their professional lives through its task design that involves the handling of technological tools (Tuan, 2011).

It is important to mention some recommendations for possible future studies in order
to foster the use of WebQuest to enhance students’ reading comprehension performance in EFL classrooms in Ecuador.

First, the results in this study suggest that in order to determine the effect of the intervention a longer period of time with more than two WebQuests were designed by a group of researchers with a larger sample size would be beneficial to gain a deeper understanding of this effect.

Second, the class time should be used better; for instance, students should read the online articles prior to coming to class as suggested by Ikpeze and Boyd (2007). Thus, students could acquire a brief understanding of the digital material and could take more advantage through group work and discussions in the classroom.

Third, further work needs to be done to get more insights into the area of online reading and the use of online reading strategies in different EFL contexts (Makrogiorgou & Antoniou, 2016). This research has raised questions on the use of the CSR reading strategy, in need for further investigation such as the influence of reading strategies on online reading performance.

Fourth, further research could use digital literacy to foster students’ critical thinking in higher level EFL courses, by creating debate and discussion situations where they can express their opinions based on arguments and general knowledge similar to the research by Puthikanon (2009).

Fifth, based on the researcher's experience during the intervention to work in groups efficiently is not something automatic, EFL teachers in the Ecuadorian context should be trained on how to include cooperative learning strategies in their classes in order to develop efficient group work.

Sixth, this study focused on enhancing the reading comprehension performance of EFL students based on the WebQuest model. It did not combine this model with other Web
components to create, for instance, an additional interchange with native speakers. Future studies should further explore the high potential of WebQuest for the EFL acquisition.

To conclude, despite the fact that there are limitations in this study, the researcher is in agreement with Ayfer and Neufeld (2006) and Andrade Álvarez (2015) that the WebQuest tool would enrich the teaching of English as Foreign Languages at the University of Cuenca on the basis of the mentioned advantages in the theoretical framework and the positive acceptance from students’ side. It would be an effective way to include technology in the EFL syllabus design to improve the twenty-first-century skills of our students as stated by Cramer (2007) and give them in this way new opportunities to develop autonomous learning so they can become independent language users to face the challenges of this competitive world.
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Appendix A: University Language Institute Permission

Cuenca, 29 de abril del 2016
Officio No. 001-29-04-2016-UIL

Lcda. Sonja Stadelhofer
Docente del Instituto.
Ciudad

De mi consideración:

Con un cordial saludo y por medio del presente me permito comunicar que el Consejo Académico del Instituto Universitario de Lenguas, en su sesión de fecha 29 de abril del 2016, conoció la petición presentada por usted en la cual solicita, se le autorice aplicar la propuesta de investigación de diseño de tesis “The use of WebQuest to enhance the Reading skill of EFL students at the University of Cuenca Institute of languages” como estudiante de la Maestría en Lingüística Aplicada en un segundo Curso del Programa de Inglés de Créditos durante el ciclo académico Septiembre-Febrero 2016-2017

Al respecto el Consejo Académico tomando en consideración que actividades académicas como las anotadas, coadyuvan en la formación de nuestros docentes resolvió: Acoger favorablemente la solicitud presentada por la Lcda. Sonja Stadelhofer y autorizar la propuesta de investigación de su diseño de tesis en un Segundo Curso de Inglés de Créditos durante el ciclo académico Septiembre-Febrero 2016-2017

Particular que comunico para los fines legales pertinentes.

Atentamente:

Ab. Diana Carolina Cunalata Vázquez
SECRETARIA DEL CONSEJO

Sonja Stadelhofer de Martínez 107
Oficio No. UC-IUL-2018-0003-O
Cuenca, 26 de enero de 2018

Sonja Melanie Stadelhofer Pont
Docente De La Universidad De Cuenca
Presente.

De mi consideración:

Con un cordial saludo me permito poner en su conocimiento que en sesión de 15 de enero de 2018, el Consejo Académico del Instituto Universitario de Lenguas, conoció la comunicación enviada por la Led. Sonja Stadelhofer de Martínez, por medio de la cual solicita se revise la resolución adoptada por el Consejo Académico toda vez que al momento de la aprobación para la aplicación de la tesis de investigación titulada “The use of WebQuest to enhance the reading skill of EFL students at the University of Cuenca Institute of Languages” se asignó el segundo nivel de los cursos de Inglés por créditos, sin embargo la aplicación se ha venido realizando en el tercer nivel de los cursos de inglés, curso asignado dentro del distributivo aprobado para el ciclo septiembre16-febrero17.

Al respecto los miembros del Consejo Académico en uso de sus atribuciones resuelven corregir la resolución adoptada por el Consejo Académico en la sesión de 29 de abril de 2016, y señalar que el curso autorizado para la aplicación de su tesis de investigación titulada “The use of WebQuest to enhance the reading skill of EFL students at the University of Cuenca Institute of Languages” como posgradista de la maestría en Lingüística Aplicada a la enseñanza del Inglés como Lengua Extranjera, es el tercer nivel del curso de inglés por créditos, curso que fue asignado a través distributivo aprobado para el ciclo lectivo septiembre16-febrero17.

Particular que comunico para los fines legales pertinentes.

Con sentimientos de distinguida consideración.

Atentamente,
Oficio No. UC-IUL-2018-0003-O

Cuenca, 26 de enero de 2018

Dra. Tania Graciela Iglesias Vasquez
SECRETARIO ABOGADO
CARTA COMPROMISO CON FINES DE MEJORAMIENTO ACADÉMICO

Señor / Señorita estudiante: Como requisito para la obtención de mi título de Master en la Maestría en Lingüística aplicada a la enseñanza del inglés como lengua extranjera, tengo bajo mi responsabilidad la aplicación del proyecto “The use of WebQuest to enhance the reading skill of EFL students at the University of Cuenca Institute of languages” en calidad de profesora del Instituto Universitario de Lenguas de la Universidad de Cuenca. Mi propósito con este proyecto es investigar la implementación de dos WebQuests para mejorar la lectura comprensiva en la clase de inglés.

Para el efecto, solicito a usted muy respetuosamente su colaboración para proceder a la aplicación de dos WebQuests en esta clase de inglés. Usted únicamente deberá asistir regularmente a ella. Este estudio no afectará su rendimiento académico en lo absoluto. Además la información obtenida es totalmente confidencial, es decir, será llevada de manera anónima. Finalmente, los resultados conseguidos serán divulgados en términos generales, sin mencionar nombres de ningún individuo, curso o institución educativa.

Muchas gracias por su colaboración

Sonja Stadelhofer de Martínez
PROFESORA DEL NIVEL I-3 CRÉDITOS

Yo .................................................. estoy de acuerdo en ser parte de este proyecto.

Firma:  Fecha:

Sonja Stadelhofer de Martínez
# Appendix C: UIL Third Level Syllabus

## SÍLABO

**INSTITUTO UNIVERSITARIO DE LENGUAS**

**Periodo Académico:** septiembre 2016 – febrero 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOMBRE DE LA ASIGNATURA</th>
<th>Código</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inglés</td>
<td>7343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Denominación oficial de la asignatura: Inglés III Créditos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CARRERA</th>
<th>INSTITUTO UNIVERSITARIO DE LENGUAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INSTITUTO UNIVERSITARIO DE LENGUAS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CICLO O SEMESTRE</th>
<th>TERCERO (CRÉDITOS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EJE DE FORMACIÓN</th>
<th>Básico Obligatorio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CRÉDITOS SEMESTRALES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEÓRICAS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRÁCTICAS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEÓRICO-PRÁCTICAS</td>
<td>6 créditos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6 créditos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MODALIDAD:

- **PRESENCIAL** ✔
- **A DISTANCIA**
- **SEMIPRESENCIAL**
UNIVERSIDAD DE CUENCA

PROFESOR(ES) RESPONSABLE(S):

DESCRIPCIÓN DE LA ASIGNATURA:
El nivel 3 de los cursos de créditos se enfoca en un desarrollo equilibrado de las cuatro destrezas básicas: leer, escuchar, hablar y escribir. A través de una variedad de actividades y tareas comunicativas se plantea como llevar a los estudiantes adquirir un nivel B1.1 del Marco Común Europeo de Referencia para Lenguas. La característica de este curso no sólo destaca la práctica del idioma a través de diferentes recursos tecnológicos y físicos, sino también el desarrollo de estrategias de aprendizaje que son la base de un aprendizaje continuo y autónomo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRE-REQUISITOS</th>
<th>CO-REQUISITOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asignatura</td>
<td>Código</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inglés I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inglés II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asignatura</th>
<th>Código</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No aplica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OBJETIVO(S) DE LA ASIGNATURA:
El estudiante será capaz de entender los puntos principales de una conversación habitual y clara sobre asuntos cotidianos que se dan generalmente en el trabajo, escuela, hogar; puede defenderse en la mayoría de situaciones en conversaciones que surgen cuando por ejemplo viaja a un área donde se habla el lenguaje; puede producir textos simples y relacionados sobre tópicos que le son familiares o de interés general; puede describir experiencias y eventos, sueños, esperanzas, metas y ambiciones y brevemente puede dar razones y explicaciones en opiniones y planes.

RESULTADOS O LOGROS DE APRENDIZAJE, INDICADORES DE APRENDIZAJE, CONTENIDO DE LA ASIGNATURA Y SITUACIONES DE EVALUACIÓN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULTADOS O LOGROS DE APRENDIZAJE</th>
<th>INDICADORES DE APRENDIZAJE</th>
<th>ESTRATEGIAS DE APRENDIZAJE</th>
<th>SITUACIONES DE EVALUACION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El estudiante puede:</td>
<td>El estudiante:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISTENING</td>
<td>• Identifica y comunica</td>
<td>• Listening for the main</td>
<td>Trabajo en clase y deberes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprender</td>
<td>ideas principales e</td>
<td>idea</td>
<td>Trabajos y tareas en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>información</td>
<td>información concreta</td>
<td>Predicting</td>
<td>línea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general y</td>
<td>presentes en diferentes</td>
<td>Drawing</td>
<td>Pruebas orales y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>específica en</td>
<td>medios de</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comunicación.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **temas de interés personal así como también en temas de conocimiento y cultura general en diferentes situaciones comunicativas.** | **inferences** | escritas  
Examen Interciclo  
Examen Final  

| **READING**  
Comprender textos transaccionales más extensos y complejos en el ámbito personal, social, profesional y académico. | **Reconoce ideas principales e información concreta a cerca de los textos leídos.**  
**Infiere y comunica ideas principales y secundarias de textos escritos** | **Skimming**  
**Scanning**  
**Guessing meaning from context**  
**Finding the main idea**  
**Making inferences** | Trabajo en clase y deberes  
Trabajos y tareas en línea  
Pruebas orales y escritas  
Examen Interciclo  
Examen Final  

| **SPOKEN INTERACTION**  
Interactuar y opinar de manera espontánea sobre temas del ámbito personal, social, profesional y académico. | **Reacciona a la interacción con su interlocutor utilizando vocabulario y frases acordes al nivel.**  
**Se comunica utilizando estructuras gramaticales acordes al nivel.**  
**Se comunica con fluidez acorde al nivel.**  
**Pronuncia con claridad acorde al nivel.**  
**Utiliza entonación de acuerdo al contexto requerido.** | Trabajo en clase y deberes  
Trabajos y tareas en línea  
Pruebas (diálogos en pares, grupos y con el profesor, role plays)  
Examen Interciclo  
Examen Final o Proyectos  

| **SPOKEN PRODUCTION**  
Describir, narrar, justificar y explicar temas del ámbito personal, social, profesional y académico. | **Describe o relata los temas con una organización y secuencia coherentes.**  
**Argumenta coherentemente sobre temas acordes a su nivel.**  
**Pronuncia con claridad.**  
**Se comunica utilizando estructuras gramaticales acordes a su nivel.**  
**Se comunica con fluidez.**  
**Utiliza entonación de acuerdo al contexto requerido.**  
**Utiliza vocabulario y** | Trabajo en clase y deberes  
Trabajos y tareas en línea  
Pruebas (diálogos en pares, grupos y con el profesor, role plays, exposiciones orales)  
Examen Interciclo  
Examen Final o Proyectos  

---
| **WRITING** | Trabajo en clase y deberes  
Trabajos y tareas en línea  
Pruebas  
Examen Interciclo  
Examen Final  
Folder de escritura que contenga textos interrelacionados de carácter narrativo, descriptivo, explicativo y argumentativo sobre temas cotidianos y de interés personal, temas de conocimiento y cultura general. |
| --- | --- |
| Escribir textos narrativos, descriptivos, y argumentativos sobre temas del ámbito personal, social, profesional y académico. | • Utiliza signos de puntuación acorde al nivel (period, comma, semicolon – run-on sentence, quotation marks – in-text citation)  
• Presenta un orden lógico (organización) y secuencial de las ideas dentro de la composición.  
• Usa conectores de secuencia, contraste, adición, transición, argumentación (Connectors: Sequence, Contrast: but, however. Addition: and, besides, also, moreover. Exemplification: for, example, such as, like. Argumentative: First of all, I think, Not only that, but I also think that, Not only are they, they are also, They are not..., nor are they, There are various/several/many reasons for this.)  
• Mantiene consistencia en el uso de estructuras gramaticales. |
| **CONTENTS** | **Grammatical** |
| **Lexical** | • Future tenses: will vs going to vs present progressive vs simple present vs modals (might, may, can)  
• Perfect tenses: Present, past, progressive.  
• Conditional tenses: Zero, First, and Second  
• Modals: might, may, could, should, ought to, must, would. |
| • Technology  
• Interpersonal relationships: family structures, relations between generations, relations at work  
• Education  
• Business, services, and shopping | preferences  
• Social problems in your community  
• Dreams, hopes, goals, ambitions, wishes, decisions  
• Passive Voice: Present and Past |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SESSIONS</th>
<th>CONTENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1st. Week</strong></td>
<td>Teacher-students introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sep. 12-16</strong></td>
<td>Course introduction (Syllabus, class policy review, course expectations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal information/details (yourself and others)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future tenses I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2nd. Week</strong></td>
<td>Future tenses II: will vs going to vs present progressive vs simple present vs modals (might, may, can)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sep. 19-23</strong></td>
<td>SS’ Profiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diagnostic test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3rd. Week</strong></td>
<td>Future tenses III: will vs going to vs present progressive vs simple present vs modals (might, may, can)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sep. 26-30</strong></td>
<td>Perfect tenses I: Present, past, progressive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4th. Week</strong></td>
<td>Perfect tenses II: Present, past, progressive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oct. 3-7</strong></td>
<td>Perfect tenses III: Present, past, progressive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conditional tenses: Zero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5th. Week</strong></td>
<td>Mid-term exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oct. 10-14</strong></td>
<td>Nov. 3 &amp; 4 Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8th. Week</strong></td>
<td>Conditional tenses: First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oct. 17-21</strong></td>
<td>Conditional tenses: Second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9th. Week</strong></td>
<td>Modals I: might, may, could, should, ought to, must, would.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nov. 7-11</strong></td>
<td>Modals II: might, may, could, should, ought to, must, would.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10th. Week</strong></td>
<td>Modals III: might, may, could, should, ought to, must, would.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nov. 14-18</strong></td>
<td>Passive Voice I: Present and Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11th. Week</strong></td>
<td>Passive Voice II: Present and Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nov. 21-25</strong></td>
<td>Passive Voice III: Present and Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12th. Week</strong></td>
<td>Final exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Nov. 28- Dec. 2</td>
<td>Exam Results Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13th. Week</strong></td>
<td>Make up Test 12-13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NÚMERO DE SESIONES, ESTRATEGIAS DE APRENDIZAJE Y RECURSOS O MEDIOS PARA EL APRENDIZAJE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NÚMERO DE SESIONES</th>
<th>ACTIVIDADES</th>
<th>RECURSOS O MEDIOS PARA EL APRENDIZAJE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El curso se desarrolla en 132</td>
<td>Discusiones</td>
<td>Material preparado por el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORAS DIVIDIDAS EN 4/3 SESIONES DE 2 O 1 Y 30 HORAS DIARIAS DURANTE 16 SEMANAS, TANTO ENTRE TRABAJO EN CLASE Y AUTÓNOMO.</td>
<td>DRAMATIZACIONES</td>
<td>DOCENTE, HOJAS DE TRABAJO, AULA, PIZARRA, CDs, REPRODUCTOR DE CDs, LABORATORIO DE CÓMPUTO, PROYECTOR, SALA DE VIDEO, TELEVISOR, REPRODUCTOR DE DVDs, VÍDEOS, PLATAFORMA VIRTUAL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LECTURAS Y ACTIVIDADES DE COMPRENSIÓN DE TEXTOS</td>
<td>ESCuchar MATERIAL DE AUDIO Y REALIZAR ACTIVIDADES DE COMPRENSIÓN DE ESTOS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJERCICIOS DE VOCABULARIO</td>
<td>PRESENTACIONES ORALES</td>
<td>EJERCICIOS GRAMATICALES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIALOGOS EN PARES Y EN GRUPOS</td>
<td>JUEGOS Y COMPETENCIAS EN PARES O GRUPOS</td>
<td>EJERCICIOS DE PRONUNCIACIÓN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVIDADES ONLINE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CRITERIOS PARA LA ACREDITACIÓN DE LA ASIGNATURA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exámenes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escucha</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lectura</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habla</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escritura</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gram. y Voc.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TEXTOS Y OTRAS REFERENCIAS REQUERIDAS PARA EL APRENDIZAJE DE LA ASIGNATURA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textos principales de consulta.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Autor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliografía detallada por el docente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autor(es)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ximena Orellana M.
DIRECTORA INSTITUTO UNIVERSITARIO LENGUAS

Guillermo Pacheco Salazar
COORDINADOR INGLÉS CRÉDITOS

Cuenca, septiembre, 2016
You may have asked yourself: "What is the most important invention for humanity?" To answer this question, we have to first think about the meaning of the word 'invention.' If we consult the Merriam-Webster dictionary, it defines invention as something useful that was created through imagination or of ingenious thinking and experiment. Now, if we reflect on what is useful for people of the 21st century, maybe things like the World Wide Web, the telephone, among others. But, who and which historical and industrial processes stand behind these kinds of inventions?

**TASK**

The Museo Pumapango in Cuenca wants to organize an exhibition with the title "The most useful inventions worldwide." In this exhibition, they will present inventions from all over the world, which are still important in our daily life.

The organizer of the exhibition asked the University of Cuenca for help to find three of the most important British inventions.

Our English course has to decide, which three inventions should be part of the museum catalog.

**PROCESS**

Now that we have gone through an introduction, it is time for us to start thinking and shaping our ideas to come up with a nice and solid outcome.

You have to design a poster in a group of three students with one of the eight suggested inventions. **STEP 1:** You have to find different arguments to defend your choice and a good way to promote it.

To be able to accomplish it, it is important to have in mind the following 5 steps to successfully work.

*Note: For further information click on each "Step".*

**STEP 1**

Make up groups of three people. Then choose one invention from the chart below. Every invention can be chosen only once.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Invention</th>
<th>URL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Car Can</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.canufacturers.org">Can Manufacturers Institute</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.bbc.co.uk">BBC Story how the tin can really was!</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.industrial.co.uk">Industrial: The tin can revolution: The humble invention that changed the way we live</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electric Vacuum Cleaner</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.vacuumcleanerhistory.com">Vacuum cleaner history</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Encyclopedia (Hunt-Geol-Booth)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Museum of Power, Hatfield Road, Langford]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telephone</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.telephone.com">Telephone</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UNIVERSIDAD DE CUENCA
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1. Encyclopedia Britannica
2. History channel Website
3. Telephone Museum
4. Electric Telegraph
5. History channel Website ( Morse code & the telegraph)
6. Encyclopedia Britannica
7. Computer Networking and Telecommunications Research (The birth of electrical communication – 1837)
8. Television:
9. BBC (The story of BBC Television)
10. Museum of Communication (Timeline)
11. The Radio & Television Museum (operates in Bowie, Maryland)
12. Photography:
13. Encyclopedia Britannica
14. BBC (History – William Henry Fox Talbot)
15. The Met - Museum
16. World Wide Web:
17. History channel Website (The Invention of the Internet)
18. Encyclopedia Britannica (Sir Tim Berners-Lee)
19. World Wide Web Foundation
20. Light Bulb:
21. Encyclopedia Britannica (Sir Joseph Wilson Swan)
22. Live Science
23. Edison Tech Center

**STEP 2**

Check you have selected information from the previous websites, click on “open task sheet 1” down below the document to complete it as a group.

**STEP 3**

Now, distribute the different roles within your group, as explained below. Every student will carry out his/her individual work.

**Student A:**
The writer will search for information to write the text that should be on the poster. He/she should use techniques like paraphrasing and editing. Do not forget to quote sources.

**Student B:**
The Graphic designer will be in charge of the layout and will search for adequate photos or images to design the presentation. He/she will also create either a memorable motto or slogans to promote the chosen invention.

**Student C:**
The Speaker will find a good way to present the results of the group work to the audience. Remember that an advertising slogan, depending on its content, should be presented in a serious, funny, mysterious or ceremonial way (useful phrases and vocabulary)

**STEP 4**

Every group will come together again and design a multi-media poster, for example, with the open source tool g2psitter (g2psitter Tutorial). You can also use other alternatives to design your poster. Everything depends on the creativity of your group. Please take into consideration the answers of your IND SHEET 1 (Step 2). The poster should contain a text part, and at least three images and either a motto or a self-created advertising recording.

**STEP 5**

**Voting Time**

Present your poster as a group. Afterwards, we will vote on the posters. You, as a class, will be the committee in charge of deciding on the three inventions that should be part of the museum catalog.

To make our final decision, we will use the following criteria:
**EVALUATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Non-linear compilation and collaboration in the group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Task sheets not complete. Less than 5 questions are answered. Collaboration in the group was limited.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Developing</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Non-linear compilation. Some problems in the task sheets are not relevant. Notes may be repetitive, or test may be already captured from source.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Qualified</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Task sheets complete. Some problems with the presentation of answers. Collaboration in the group was partially effective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exemplary</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Task sheets complete. Some problems with the presentation of answers. Collaboration in the group was very effective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context representation</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Some of the information context is not clear.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Material is not presented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design representation</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Images do not relate to the basic idea.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Several important images do not have a context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Images are not related to the basic idea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Several important images have a context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presentation of the idea</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The language is not clearly understandable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The language is clear and understandable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The language is clear and understandable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The language is clear and understandable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONCLUSION**

Now that we have learned some new and very interesting facts, during the preparation process of your poster, it is reinforcement time.

Watch the video "Crazy Inventions That Never Made It" and check the meaning of the expression "Quitaflaqueo." With a partner, choose one of the crazy inventions and write a descriptive paragraph (180-200 words). Your composition should encompass an introductory sentence, the body, and a concluding sentence. Add a short discussion about why your chosen invention cannot be patented.
# Appendix E: Lesson Plan (WebQuest Technology)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Plan</th>
<th>Teacher: Sonja Stadelhofer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject:</strong></td>
<td>English Credit Course I-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td>September 11, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution:</strong></td>
<td>Language Institute University Cuenca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students will engage in:</strong></td>
<td>☑ independent activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☑ cooperative learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☑ peer tutoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☑ visuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☑ simulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time</strong></td>
<td><strong>Procedures Followed:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 Minutes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Class Starter:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10 Minutes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Review of Previously Learned Material/ Lesson Connections:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10 Minutes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Statement of Objectives:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10 Minutes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Literature--New material:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Guided Practice:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Independent Practice:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20 Minutes</strong></td>
<td><strong>New Material:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Guided Practice:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Independent Practice:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Materials/Text References</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25 Minutes</strong></td>
<td><strong>New Material:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Guided Practice:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Independent Practice:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Materials/Text References</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10 Minutes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lesson Review/Reteach:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Present Closure</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standards/Objective Met:**
- The use of WebQuest to enhance the reading skill of the students.

**Time**
- **5 Minutes**
  - **Class Starter:** - Introduction of the WebQuest “Technology”
  - **Materials/Text References:** - Computer, Projector

- **10 Minutes**
  - **Review of Previously Learned Material/ Lesson Connections:** - Talk about technology and inventions in general.
  - **Materials/Text References:** - WebQuest “Technology” (Introduction), Brainstorming

- **10 Minutes**
  - **Statement of Objectives:** - Presentation and explanation of the WebQuest “Technology”
  - **Materials/Text References:** - WebQuest “Technology” (Introduction, Task)

- **10 Minutes**
  - **Literature--New material:** - Three online-texts according to the chosen invention
  - **Guided Practice:** - Introduction of the CSR- Reading Log
  - **Independent Practice:** - Reading of the WebQuest Process
  - **Materials/Text References:** - WebQuest “Technology” (Introduction, Task)

- **25 Minutes**
  - **New Material:** - The first online text
  - **Guided Practice:** - Teacher explains the task
  - **Independent Practice:** - Reading
  - **Materials/Text References:** - WebQuest “Technology” (Introduction, Task)

- **20 Minutes**
  - **New Material:** - CSR- Reading Log
  - **Guided Practice:** - Group work
  - **Independent Practice:** - Complete the CSR-Reading Log of the first online-text in group work
  - **Materials/Text References:** - WebQuest “Technology” (Substep 1)

- **10 Minutes**
  - **Lesson Review/Reteach:** - The teacher checked the CSR-Reading Logs and asked understanding questions

**Teacher Notes:**

This lesson plan format was taken from “LessonPlans4Teachers.com”
CSR Learning Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before reading</th>
<th>During reading</th>
<th>After reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge</strong>: What do you know about the topic?</td>
<td><strong>Clunks</strong>: Make a list.</td>
<td><strong>Questions and discussion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prediction</strong>: What will you learn?</td>
<td><strong>The gist</strong>: Write the gist for each section.</td>
<td><strong>Review</strong>: What did you learn?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 1:</td>
<td>Paragraph 2:</td>
<td>Paragraph 3:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Promoting reading comprehension, content learning, and English acquisition through collaborative strategic reading (CSR), by Klingner and Vaughn (1999, p. 745).
Appendix G: Task Sheet 1

Name: 
Date: 

TASK SHEET 1

1) Who was the inventor and when was it invented?
_________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________

2) What influence, necessity or event led to this invention?
_________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________

3) Which is the historical development of this invention?
_________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________

4) How has it changed our everyday life?
_________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________

5) Which significance and importance this invention still has in our daily life?
_________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________
Appendix H: Poster (WebQuest Technology)

**WORLD WIDE WEB**

**WHILE EXISTS CONNECTION, THE WORLD WILL BE YOURS**

**WORLD WIDE WEB**

**What is it?**

It started in Switzerland with a computer programmer named Tim Berners-Lee, who said that 1989 was the year when World Wide Web was born as we know it today. In 1983, he created a program that allowed information to be exchanged among several computers so that people could easily access information that anyone on the internet could retrieve.

**History:**

In 1980, Siemens-Lee joined CERN laboratories as a consulting engineer where he developed a program that could share information in files that contained hypertext links named “links.” In 1989, he designed a laboratory computer network that allowed hypertext communication with other laboratories. Finally, he wrote in 1991 the software for the first web server and browser. The World Wide Web was introduced in 1991. A web of information that anyone could use to reveal something more than just files from one computer to another.

**What is the difference:**

World Wide Web or simple Web is a way of accessing information over the medium of the Internet. It’s a portion of a big world of codes disseminated over the cyber environment. Internet is a massive network of networks, becoming both a networking infrastructure. The two terms are not synonymous and should not be confused.

**Impact on our life and importance:**

We use the World Wide Web every day and at every time in our daily life. The World Wide Web has changed our lives. All the time we have access to every kind of information. It changes our education methodology and our way to learn. This invention allows us to do a set of things that in the past we didn’t have idea how to do it.

All the information we need are on those lines waiting for someone who searches that. But wait! As a place that anyone around the world can put any information, we have to be careful for the ideas we visit. We don’t know how dangerous any those sites. It depends on the official personality of the users. That’s why we need to be educated in the way we search the information. As everything it depends on the personality only.
Learning-sheet
The most useful British inventions

TOPIC: _______________________

STUDENT/S: ______________________

Please answer the question 1 to 3 with the content information of the presentation. Question 4 and 5 you have to discuss in your group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Who was the inventor and when was it invented?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Which is the historical development of this invention?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Which significance and importance this invention still has in our daily life?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Are the presentation, content, and the design creative and convincing?</td>
<td>Comment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. You think, that this invention has to be part of the museum catalog?</td>
<td>Explain why, or why not?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

Great People, great achievements

Every day if we open the “international” section of the daily newspaper, we can find articles about the injustices of human rights such as unfair treatment against a minority group of people. Social issues as: discrimination, racism, sexual exploitation, among others, have drawn attention and sorrow from the reader, but only a few people really try to combat and change these situations.

The Nobel Peace Prize demonstrates the greatest honor to people who fight against injustice in their social system. Every year on the 10th of December the Nobel Peace Award Ceremony in Stockholm or Oslo takes place. This is done in memory of the anniversary of Nobel’s death. Alfred Nobel was a Swedish inventor and businessman. In his will in 1895, he said that his assets would have to be used to start a foundation to award a Nobel Prize every year to the person who attained the best achievements for humankind in the prior year in one of six categories: Physics, Chemistry, Literature, Peace, Economic Science, Physiology or Medicine.

Task

You work as a trainee in the editorial department at the radio station My life - My radio. For this year’s Nobel Prize award week you get to record a short podcast in which the audience has the possibility to meet and learn more about one of the most popular preceding Nobel Peace Prize laureates.

Carry out an imaginary interview with one of the respective Nobel Peace Prize laureates. One of you has to take over the role of the journalist and the other person has to represent the Nobel Peace Prize laureate. It is important to state that if you manage to handle a good interview, you might be granted yourself a permanent position at the radio, which is actually your main goal to be achieved.

Process

To carry out your interview/podcast, make sure you go through the following recommendations:

- Make groups of two students.
- Choose one of the five presented Nobel Peace Prize laureates you want to role play.
- Define who will get the role of the interviewer and the interviewee.
- Set up an introduction, 8 questions and responses, and final words of the laureate. It is important to proof read your questions before you record your podcast. More information about how to write an audio script you will find in the hyperlink.
WebQuest Great People

STEP 1 - Preparation

First, read the information about the laureates, his/her life, his/her achievement. Have in mind that you need to use Collaborative strategic reading (CSR) to be able to get key points during your reading. It will help you come up with a solid and clear set of ideas for a good interview. Please share your information with the teacher through a Google Document. Write on your document title the name of your chosen Nobel Prize Laureates and the names of the two group members.

CSR Learning Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Points</th>
<th>During reading</th>
<th>After reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resources:
The following Web sites will provide you with insights regarding the laureates.

1. Aung San Suu Kyi
   Vocabulary
   - Encylopedia Britannica: https://www.britannica.com/biography/Aung-San-Suu-Kyi
   - Aung San Suu Kyi- Nobel Lecture (nobelprize.org):
   - Chairman of The Norwegian Nobel Committee Thorbjorn Jagland’s speech at Aung San Suu Kyi’s Nobel Lecture (Oslo, June 16, 2012):

2. Elie Wiesel
   Vocabulary
   - The New York Times: Elie Wiesel, Auschwitz Survivor and Nobel Peace Prize Winner, Dies at 87
   - Elie Wiesel- Nobel Lecture

3. The 14th Dalai Lama
   Vocabulary
   - BBC: The Dalai Lama: http://www.bbc.co.uk/religion/religions/buddhism/people/dalailama_1.shtml
   - Encyclopedia Britannica: Dalai Lama XIV
     https://www.britannica.com/biography/Dalai-Lama-XIV
   - Dalai Lama- Nobel Lecture

4. Martin Luther King Jr.
   Vocabulary
   - History: Martin Luther King Jr. Article http://www.history.com/topics/black-history/martin-luther-king-jr
   - Martin Luther King Jr. - Nobel Lecture

5. Malala Yousafzai
   Vocabulary 1
   Vocabulary 2
   - BBC: Diary of a Pakistani schoolgirl: http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/8934402.stm

WebQuest Great People

STEP 2 - Preparation

Now, distribute the different roles within your group, as explained below.

Group with two people:

Student A:
The interviewer will conduct the interview with the laureate in a common way. Therefore it is important to prepare interesting questions and ask them in a natural way.

Student B:
The interviewee has to answer the questions and to think in the final words to complete the podcast.
Each group will come together again and record their podcast, for example, with the open source tool Audacity or PostSnap. You can also use other alternatives to record your podcast, such as your cellphone. Everything depends on the creativity of your group.

Do take into consideration the notes of your web research to get your introductory part, the 8 questions and the closing part with the final words of the Nobel Prize Laureate.

* Your podcast should last 3 minutes minimum, 5 minutes maximum.

**EVALUATION**

Your podcast will be evaluated under the following criteria. Your score will be determined by the success of your group, as well as your individual contributions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Qualified</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coherence and Structure Introduction</td>
<td>The student does not organize ideas logically nor has a clear range of connections, making it difficult to follow. He/she includes a few unnecessary sentences.</td>
<td>Presentation of information is disorganized, not logical or sequential and content is not related to the topic. He/she includes a few sentences that are not related to the topic.</td>
<td>Information is presented in a logical and organized sequence. He/she includes all necessary sentences.</td>
<td>Information is presented in a very logical and organized sequence. He/she includes all necessary sentences.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions</td>
<td>Speech is very short and repetitive, making it hard to understand.</td>
<td>Speech is repetitious and difficult to follow.</td>
<td>Speech is fluent and understandable.</td>
<td>Speech is well articulated and conveys the intended meaning.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intonation</td>
<td>Speech is very clear and articulate. List of vocabulary is varied and the meaning of the sentences is clear.</td>
<td>Speech is clear and articulate. List of vocabulary is varied and the meaning of the sentences is clear.</td>
<td>Speech is well pronounced and vocabulary is varied.</td>
<td>Speech is well pronounced and vocabulary is varied and well articulated.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task achievement</td>
<td>The task is not adequately addressed. No clear position presented.</td>
<td>The task is adequately addressed. A clear position presented.</td>
<td>The task is well presented and supported by evidence.</td>
<td>The task is very well presented and supported by evidence.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originality</td>
<td>The investigation, the context of the questions and the four worlds of the Nobel Prize laureate are not very creative.</td>
<td>The investigation, the context of the questions and the four worlds of the Nobel Prize laureate are not very creative.</td>
<td>The investigation, the context of the questions and the four worlds of the Nobel Prize laureate are not very creative.</td>
<td>The investigation, the context of the questions and the four worlds of the Nobel Prize laureate are not very creative.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONCLUSION**

Now that we have learned some new and very interesting facts about the Nobel Peace Prize laureates during the preparation process of your podcast, it is reinforcement time. With your partner write a four-paragraph essay (220-250 words) to explain why your chosen Nobel Peace Prize laureate was awarded this great honor. Your composition should contain an introduction paragraph, two body paragraphs and the conclusion paragraph.
## Lesson Plan

**Subject:** English Credit Course I-3  
**Date:** December 19, 2016  
**Teacher:** Sonja Stadelhofer  
**Institution:** Language Institute University Cuenca

### Students will engage in:
- independent activities
- cooperative learning
- peer tutoring
- visuals
- simulations

### Materials/Text References:
- Computer
- Projector
- WebQuest “Great People”

### Standards/Objective Met:
- The use of WebQuest to enhance the reading skill of the students.

### Time | Procedures Followed: | Materials/Text References
--- | --- | ---
5 Minutes | **Class Starter:**  
- Brainstorming about the reading process. | - WebQuest “Great People”

10 Minutes | **Review of Previously Learned Material/ Lesson Connections:**  
- Review of the shared CSR-Reading Logs  
- Introduction of the substep 2 | - WebQuest “Great People”

5 Minutes | **Statement of Objectives:**  
- To finish the reading part of the WebQuest and to begin to accomplish the task |

35 Minutes | **New Material:**  
- The students had to finish to read the third online text  
**Guided Practice:**  
- Group work  
- Teacher-Student Interaction: digital and face to face  
**Independent Practice:**  
- Reading | - WebQuest “Great People”

25 Minutes | **New Material:**  
- Substep 2  
- Hyperlinks for additional material  
**Guided Practice:**  
- Introduction of the different roles of every group member, and an explanation on what they had to do.  
**Independent Practice:**  
- Every group member has to check his or her hyperlinks. | - WebQuest “Great People” (Substep 2)

10 Minutes | **Lesson Review/Reteach:**  
- The teacher checked the CSR-Reading Logs and asked understanding questions. |

### Present Closure

### Homework Given:
- Every group had to finish its third CSR-Log.

### Teacher Notes:

This lesson plan format was taken from “LessonPlans4Teachers.com”
Appendix L: Podcast Script

W: Interviewer
Z: Martin Luther King Jr.

Interviewer: Hello everybody, Tonight we have a special guest. He is one of the most important defensors of human rights. Please welcome Martin Luther King Jr.

(applause)

Martin: Good night everybody it’s a pleasure for me to be here.
I want to take this opportunity to share with you my ideals and part of my life. I think that it is very important because through spaces like this we can make people aware about what is the situation of Negro people throughout all the world and specially in this country.

Interviewer: It is a pleasure that you be here with us tonight. Let's start with the interview. I know that you have been fighting for the African american rights. 1. What was your motivation for do this?

Martin: Well, throughout all my life I have been able to evidence the abuse and injustice against my community. I am proud to be part of Negro people. I was tired to see all white people mistreating us, and destroying our families. I couldn’t stay silent. I have to raise my voice and make Negro people know that they are not alone.

Interviewer: So, with that you are telling us that you are giving a cry of hope to African American people. You are motivating them to go to the streets to claim for their rights. But, 2. Do you imagined that all this protests can generate violence and insecurity all over the world?

Martin: No at all. I will always be in favor to pacific protests. The violence generates more violence. When you light up the flame of anger nothing in this world can stop it. This clamor is aimed at achieving peace and equality.

Interviewer: 3. So, can you tell us about your family? Did they influence to your philosophy and your struggle?

Martin: Well, my father was a pastor and my mother was a schoolteacher, they raised me as a righteous person and they taught me what is compassion and selfless love. But my true influence comes from Dr. Benjamin Mays, he was an theologian and outspoken advocate for racial equality, for his impact in my life I decided to become a Baptist minister.

Interviewer: In Washington you gave a speech year that shocked and changed the thinking of many people. 4. Was it very difficult for you to speak in front of thousands of people?

Martin: Not at all, during my all life I gave a lot of speeches, also I think that you cannot be nervous when you are telling the truth. In fact, I improvised that speech, I did not practice it, I only said what was in my mind and felt my heart.
Interviewer: Oh I can’t believe that you improvised the whole speech! It was brilliant. I think that it was exactly the way that led you to get the Peace Nobel Prize in 1964. Talking about this great award. 5. What was your reaction when you received it?

Martin: Wow… It was one of the best moments in my life! I could not believe it, because the Nobel Peace Prize is one of the best awards that a person that is fighting for justice and equality can receive. So for me it was a true honor.

Interviewer: 6. How did the Nobel Peace Prize change your life? 7. Do you think that it was the end of your fight against injustice toward your community?

Martin: I don't think so, because that was only the first step to make this fight known worldwide, and also it helped us to carry out more forceful and perennial activities.

Interviewer: We can now speak in the context of our country. Here in Ecuador exist a lot of discrimination against Negro people. They are often associated with delinquency and addiction. Society in general deters them and denies them decent development opportunities and sources of work. 8. What do you think that is a good alternative to fight against this?

Martin: Discrimination is shameful in the majority of all the countries in the world. I think that the best alternative to fight against discrimination in all its scale is education, because an educated person know what is the respect for everybody. They are tolerant and free from prejudice. Here in Ecuador it is necessary to teach from the beginning how to live together with all persons no matter the color of their skin. It is necessary to remember that we are all God’s children with the same rights and needs.

Interviewer: Well. Martin, I think that we have reached the end of the interview. Thank you for joining us tonight. Good bye, and good luck.

Final words:
Martin: Thank you for giving me the opportunity to express myself in this interview. It was amazing. I would like to say goodbye, and telling you that it is necessary to fight for justice and peace, no matter how difficult it could be.

Good night everybody.

(applause)
Este cuestionario fue diseñado con fines de investigación. La información recabada no será usada con otros fines.

Instrucciones: Por favor responda cada pregunta y elija la opción que usted considera correcta. Por favor responda de manera objetiva y honesta. No hay respuestas correctas o falsas.

Fecha: ____________________
Edad: ________________
Sexo: ☐ Femenino  ☐ Masculino

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Siempre</th>
<th>Frecuentemente</th>
<th>A veces</th>
<th>Rara vez</th>
<th>Nunca</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Me parece difícil leer textos en inglés.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Cuando es posible evito leer en inglés.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Me siento incómodo cuando no estoy seguro si entendí lo que leí en inglés.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Me siento incómodo cuando no conozco todas las palabras en inglés.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Siento cansancio cuando tengo que leer textos largos en inglés.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Creo que leer es importante para el estudio de inglés.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Creo que leer textos en inglés ayuda a mejorar el vocabulario.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Leo páginas web en inglés.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Consulto el diccionario para buscar palabras desconocidas que se presentan en un texto en inglés.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Entiendo el significado de nuevo vocabulario en el contexto.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Cuando leo en inglés yo analizo las estructuras de las oraciones.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Reconozco la idea principal de un párrafo a través de las palabras claves.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Comprendo la idea principal de los textos en inglés.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Tanto el título como también los subtítulos me ayudan a reconocer la idea principal de un párrafo en inglés.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Siempre</td>
<td>Frecuentemente</td>
<td>A veces</td>
<td>Rara vez</td>
<td>Nunca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Las imágenes, tablas o figuras en un texto en inglés me ayudan a entender la idea principal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>La lectura rápida del primero y último párrafo me permiten entender la información esencial de un texto en inglés.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Intento interpretar la intención del escritor mientras yo leo en inglés.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Establezco la diferencia entre la información más importante y la información secundaria en un texto en inglés.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Estoy familiarizado con las técnicas de lectura de textos: skimming, scanning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>En otras materias, que NO sea el inglés ¿Lee usted textos o artículos en inglés?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>¿Lee usted textos en inglés por iniciativa propia, por ejemplo, temas de su interés?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. En caso de haber respondido afirmativamente a la pregunta anterior (21), indique qué temas lee en inglés.

_______________________________________________________________

Gracias por su ayuda y cooperación
Gatesbridge’s new Merriwether Mall is opening this September. With an area of 320,000 square metres, the Merriweather Mall will be the biggest mall in the south west. It’s located close to the motorway, has its own bus station and 2000 car parking spaces, so it is convenient for everyone.

The mall has five areas, all under cover. The largest, Main Street, is a shopping area on three floors. Here, you’ll find all the major chain stores and department stores. You can buy fashion items and all the famous brand names. There is also a large chemist.

Situated on two levels, the market square is where you can find traditional market stalls. On the lower floor, there are food stalls, including a butcher’s, baker’s, a fishmonger’s, greengrocer’s and delicatessen. On the upper floor, you will find stalls selling hardware and haberdashery.

Bohemia is at the rear of the mall. Here, you’ll find quirky, independent shops selling everything from second hand music and books to clothes and handicrafts. The Palisade is more upmarket. Here you will find fashion boutiques, jewellers, antiques and furniture. There are also two banks and a post office located along The Palisade.

The Showground is the entertainment centre of the mall. On the ground floor, there is a food court where you’ll find cuisine from around the world, including Chinese, Japanese, Thai and Italian food. There is a large arena where events will take place through the year. There is also an eight-screen cinema, a night club and a bowling alley.

And if that is not enough, we are offering you a voucher which will give you £10 off any purchase over £40 that you make in the Merriwether Mall between 10th and 16th September. You can’t afford to miss it!
1. Where is the best place in the mall to buy an expensive necklace? Select
   a) Main Street  d) The Palisade
   b) Market Square e) The Showground
   c) Bohemia

2. Where is the best place in the mall to buy some bacon? Select
   a) Main Street  d) The Palisade
   b) Market Square e) The Showground
   c) Bohemia

3. buy a used CD? Select
   a) Main Street  d) The Palisade
   b) Market Square e) The Showground
   c) Bohemia

4. have a meal? Select
   a) Main Street  d) The Palisade
   b) Market Square e) The Showground
   c) Bohemia

5. buy some shampoo? Select
   a) Main Street  d) The Palisade
   b) Market Square e) The Showground
   c) Bohemia

2. Read the email and answer the questions. (Accommodation)

To: Ellie Crest
Subject: Surfing Holiday

Hi Ellie,
I’m so pleased you can come surfing in August! Paul, Rose and Kevin are coming too, so there will be five of us. We’ve decided to return to New Sands, because the surf board hire is so cheap there.

I’m starting to think about accommodation. We won’t camp again after last year! I hated staying in a tent in all that rain!
Kevin wants to hire a caravan. There are some nice ones with 3 bedrooms, showers and cooking facilities. The problem is, none of the caravan parks take short bookings in the summer. The minimum stay is a week. It’s a shame because there are several nice parks near the beach.

There’s a youth hostel in New Sands. It’s the cheapest option after camping, and there’s a big kitchen and dining room where we can cook. The problem is, accommodation is in dormitories and I don’t really want to sleep with strangers.

There are a few guest houses in New Sands. Some have triple rooms, so we’d only need to book two rooms. They’re not expensive, but we wouldn’t be able to cook there. We’d have to eat out at restaurants, or eat sandwiches for every meal! We’ll have to book soon if we choose that option, because many guest houses are already full. The hotels in New Sands are far too expensive, even though I’d love to stay at the Sunrise Pavilion with its rooftop pool!

The final option is to rent a cottage. Few cottages offer mid-week breaks in summer, but I found one. It has three bedrooms - a double, a single and a twin, so two of us would have to share a bed! There’s a big kitchen diner with a microwave, washing machine and dishwasher. The living room has a TV and DVD player. There’s just one bathroom, but there’s a separate WC. There’s a nice garden too. The problem is, it’s 5 miles from the beach, so we’d have to hire a car, because there aren’t any buses.

Let me know which option you prefer.

Cheers Natalie
1. Last year the friends stayed in a…
   a) caravan
   b) tent
   c) youth hostel

2. Last year the friends had problems with…
   a) the weather.
   b) the transport.
   c) their surf boards.

3. The problem with the caravan park is that…
   a) caravans are only available for full weeks.
   b) there are not enough beds for everyone.
   c) all the caravans are fully booked.

4. Natalie doesn’t want to stay in the youth hostel because…
   a) it is too expensive.
   b) she doesn’t want to share with people she doesn’t know.
   c) it does not have any self-catering facilities.

5. Natalie chose this cottage because…
   a) it is cheaper than the other cottages.
   b) everyone can sleep in a different room.
   c) it allows people to stay for less than a week.

3. Read the text and answer the questions. (Education)

Sixteen - What now?

You’re 16 and finally you can leave school! By now, you’re probably sick of teachers, desks, tests and exams. But don’t just run for the exit. You need to think carefully about what to do next.

If you want a professional career, you will need to go to university and get a degree. To do that, you need to stay at high school for another two years. But you needn’t stay at the same place. There are several options in the district of Northacre.

St. Leopold’s School has the best pass rate of all the high schools in the district. It offers a wide range of subjects in the humanities and sciences. St Leopold’s is, of course, a private school, so may be too expensive for you. But don’t worry, there are several other options if you want to follow the academic route. Knowle Grammar School is a state school, so there are no fees, and it has excellent tuition and facilities. It is a boys’ school from the ages of 11-16, but from 16-18 it is co-educational. But it is selective, so you’ll have to pass an exam to get in. If you’re interested in going into Business, check out Wyle River Academy. This school specialises in subjects like Business Studies, Management and Economics. If you prefer the arts, look at the courses on offer at Northacre College. Here you can study woodwork, art, textiles and much more.

Northacre College also offers a wide range of vocational qualifications. You can do a 1-year certificate or a 2-year diploma in subjects like electrics, plumbing, roofing and hairdressing. If you’d prefer to work outdoors, look at Milldown College, where there are courses in Farm Mechanics, Land Management, Animal Management and much more.

A final option is to get an apprenticeship with a local or national company. You will get on-the-job training, gain certificates or diplomas and start earning straight away. But be warned - places are limited! Find out more at the Jobs Fair on 26th May at Northacre College.
1. The aim of the article is to…
    a) advise young people about how to get to university.
    b) tell young people about the options available.
    c) advise young people to stay in education.

2. You can only attend Knowle Grammar School if you…
    a) pass an exam.
    b) are a boy.
    d) can afford the tuition fees.

3. Anna wants to work with horses. Where is the best place for her to study?
    a) Wyle River Academy
    b) Northacre College
    c) Milldown College

4. Kevin wants to be a fashion designer. Where is the best place for him to study?
    a) Wyle River Academy
    b) Northacre College
    c) Milldown College

5. What is the problem with apprenticeships?
    a) There are few available.
    b) They are expensive.
    c) They don’t give you any qualifications.
4. **Read 4 reviews for a hotel.**

**The Coach Hotel**  
Rating: ★★★☆☆ 164 reviews

**Patsy190** writes:  
6 of us stayed here for the weekend. The first thing we noticed on entering our room was how small it was. Our rooms were clean, but the bed cover was stained. The furniture was really outdated, especially the bathroom, which had an old pink suite and linoleum on the floor. The ‘shower’ was a hose that you fit onto the taps. The sink was in the bedroom, right next to the television sockets which seems pretty unsafe to me. We had dinner there, and it was well-cooked, but we were still hungry afterwards because the servings were so tiny. The drinks prices were extortionate - £5 for a small glass of wine. My friend ordered a brandy and coke, but the waitress brought him whisky and coke. When we complained, she just walked off! Not impressed. I would like to say it was cheap and cheerful but at £120 a night, it was neither - overpriced and depressing more like.

**MellowBunny** writes:  
Just returned from a 3 day break here, and thought that the Coach Hotel was very good value for money. I had requested a quiet room and this was noted at reception. I got a great room - large, comfortable and clean, with a seating area overlooking the racecourse. The only disappointing thing was that there were no tea/coffee facilities in the room - not even a kettle. The furniture and decor were not particularly up-to-date, but that’s what you would expect from an old hotel. There was a wide selection of well-cooked food on offer. At breakfast I had poached eggs, and they were done to perfection. In the evening, I had a delicious three-course meal, and I wasn’t kept waiting for ages between courses, which is definitely a plus when you’re dining alone. I found the staff friendly and always willing to help.

**TomWheeler** writes:  
The hotel’s is just 200 metres walk away from the racecourse, so it’s really convenient. There’s plenty of space to park. The bed was comfortable with clean cotton sheets. Good power shower. I would agree with some of the less favourable reviews on the site too, though. The room definitely needed some attention – it smelt musty and the furniture was old, cheap and battered. The bin hadn’t been emptied from previous guests, and there was other rubbish on the floor. The fan in the bathroom was very loud, and the plumbing made strange noises in the night. The walls were thin too. Breakfast was okay, but there wasn’t much of it.

**JadeUnicorn** writes:  
Don’t be fooled by the pictures online. What you see is definitely NOT what you get! First, it’s not close to the city centre – it’s at least a 35-minute walk. Furniture was old and dated, although the bed was comfortable. Tiny bathroom, with an absurdly loud extractor fan. No lock on the bathroom door and no toiletries, not even soap. There were cobwebs all over the hotel. The dining room is dark and uninviting, with no windows except one tiny one. The food simply was the type that gives Britain a bad name. Instant coffee and cheap sausages. Service was poor, with staff clearing the table while we were still eating.
Which reviewer says the following? Choose ‘two reviewers’ when two reviewers agree, and ‘all reviewers’ if all reviewers agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The hotel was too expensive. Select</th>
<th>The location was bad. Select</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>a) Patsy190</td>
<td>a) Patsy190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) MellowBunny</td>
<td>d) JadeUnicorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Tom Wheeler</td>
<td>e) Two reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f) All reviewers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The decor was old-fashioned. Select</th>
<th>The shower was inadequate. Select</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>a) Patsy190</td>
<td>a) Patsy190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) MellowBunny</td>
<td>d) JadeUnicorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Tom Wheeler</td>
<td>e) Two reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f) All reviewers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The service was poor. Select</th>
<th>The food was bad quality. Select</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>a) Patsy190</td>
<td>a) Patsy190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) MellowBunny</td>
<td>d) JadeUnicorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Tom Wheeler</td>
<td>e) Two reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f) All reviewers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The bed clothes were dirty. Select</th>
<th>The food portions were small. Select</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>a) Patsy190</td>
<td>a) Patsy190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) MellowBunny</td>
<td>d) JadeUnicorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Tom Wheeler</td>
<td>e) Two reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f) All reviewers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The room was big. Select</th>
<th>The room wasn't quiet. Select</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>a) Patsy190</td>
<td>a) Patsy190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) MellowBunny</td>
<td>d) JadeUnicorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Tom Wheeler</td>
<td>e) Two reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f) All reviewers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Choose the best title for each paragraph (Free time)

a) Why it's so hard
b) Make a difference
c) Get creative
d) Guard your time
e) Do what you want
f) Change your Life
g) Set a date
h) Meet likeminded people
i) Plan ahead
j) Establish your goals
Make the Most of your Free Time

1. ______
Studies say that people nowadays have more free time than ever before. Then why doesn’t it feel that way? These days, our free time is usually spent watching television, using computers or communicating on our phones. Images and information are constantly flashing into our brains, so it’s no wonder we don’t feel as if we have really switched off. To really wind down and help us regain our energy levels, it is important to use our free time wisely.

2. ______
Think about what you want to achieve in your free time. Do you want to get fit, get creative or simply relax? Don’t worry about what you ought to be doing, just think about what will make you feel more content.

3. ______
Plan when you are going to enjoy your free time, and treat it in the same way as anything else on your calendar. If something else more important comes along, you can choose whether or not to postpone it, but never cancel it!

4. ______
Make sure you have everything you need to enjoy your free time in advance. If you’re looking forward to a nice long bath, buy in bath oil and candles. If you want to get out in the countryside, get your boots and map ready, and don’t forget to check the weather forecast.

5. ______
Don’t let anything else encroach on your free time. Ignore the washing up and the vacuuming. Don’t check your inbox for messages and turn off your mobile phone. Otherwise, the lines between free time and everyday live will begin to blur, and you won’t feel refreshed.

6. ______
In many free time activities, we take the role of consumer. When we watch TV, play video games or read, we are only passively involved. Take on the role of producer for a change. Build a model, write a blog or make an animation film. You will use a different part of your brains and will feel more energised as a result.

7. ______
But don’t go overboard. Many people worry too much about their free time activities. They want to do things that will impress their friends, look good on their résumés or help them get a better job. But free time isn’t about that. It is about doing an activity for enjoyment’s sake, so don’t let outside pressures influence your choice.

8. ______
Take the opportunity to expand your social circle. Everyone has different interests, so don’t expect your mates to be into the same things you are. Give them a break for a while, join a club and get to know people with the same interests as you. You can never have too many friends!

9. ______
You’ll really know you’re using your time wisely if what you’re doing helps other people. So find out what’s going on in the community and lend a hand. Visit the elderly or help out in a children’s club. If socialising’s not your thing, why not volunteer for a wildlife organisation?

10. ______
Once you’re relaxed and energised, you can think about what you’d like to improve in your life. Want to get fit? Learn a skill? Improve your job prospects? There are plenty of groups, clubs and classes you can join that will set you on a completely new life path. So what are you waiting for? Get out there and enjoy yourself!

Thank you very much
Por favor, dedique cinco minutos de su tiempo para completar esta encuesta que ha sido diseñada con fines de investigación. Por favor responda de manera objetiva y honesta.

1. **Sexo**
   *Mark only one oval.*
   - [ ] Femenino
   - [ ] Masculino

2. **Carrera**

3. **Aprender con la WebQuest fue beneficioso e interesante.**
   *Mark only one oval.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totalmente de acuerdo

Totalmente en desacuerdo

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1q1qF2yWMycz_DtyglO2VRIiMKC3m9sQS9VFF_df_MOo-w/printform
4. La WebQuest fue bien diseñada.*
*Mark only one oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totalmente de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totalmente en desacuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. La WebQuest contiene mucha información y enlaces útiles.*
*Mark only one oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totalmente de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totalmente en desacuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Recibí toda la información necesaria de manera efectiva sobre las tareas de la WebQuest antes de comenzar.*
*Mark only one oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totalmente de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totalmente en desacuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. La profesora guió de manera efectiva el desarrollo de las tareas propuestas en la WebQuest.*
*Mark only one oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totalmente de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totalmente en desacuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. El tiempo asignado para completar la tarea de la WebQuest fue suficiente.*
*Mark only one oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totalmente de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totalmente en desacuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Para mi fue posible realizar las tareas diseñados en la WebQuest de manera satisfactoria.*
*Mark only one oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totalmente de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totalmente en desacuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. 8. Yo prefiero aprender con lecturas disponibles en la red, que con lecturas tradicionales de los libros de enseñanza de inglés. *
Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5
Totalmente de acuerdo □ □ □ □ □ Totalmente en desacuerdo

11. 9. La tarea de la WebQuest contribuyó a mejorar mi competencia de comprensión de lectura en el lenguaje de inglés. *
Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5
Totalmente de acuerdo □ □ □ □ □ Totalmente en desacuerdo

12. 10. Para mí fue útil trabajar junto con las personas de mi grupo durante la finalización de las tareas de la WebQuest. *
Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5
Totalmente de acuerdo □ □ □ □ □ Totalmente en desacuerdo

13. ¿Tienes alguna sugerencia para mejorar esta WebQuest?


Gracias por su colaboración!
Appendix P: Perception Questionnaire

Encuesta de percepción de la implementación de dos WebQuests para mejorar la lectura comprensiva en la clase de inglés.

Por favor, dedique cinco minutos de su tiempo para completar esta encuesta que ha sido diseñada con fines de investigación de manera objetiva y honesta. Gracias por su ayuda y cooperación.

Introducción

1. Sexo
   
   *Mark only one oval.*
   
   ☐ Femenino
   ☐ Masculino

2. ¿Cuál es su carrera universitaria?

Encuesta

Por favor indique el grado de cada afirmación con la siguiente marcación: (1) totalmente en desacuerdo, (2) en desacuerdo, (3) indiferente, (4) de acuerdo y (5) totalmente de acuerdo.

3. 1. Mi competencia de lectura en Inglés ha mejorado por el uso del WebQuests.
   *Mark only one oval.*

   1  2  3  4  5

   totalmente en desacuerdo ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ totalmente de acuerdo

4. 2. No he estado acostumbrado a utilizar herramientas tecnológicas para aprender idiomas.
   *Mark only one oval.*

   1  2  3  4  5

   totalmente en desacuerdo ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ totalmente de acuerdo
5. 3. Frecuentemente me encontré con dificultades técnicas en el uso del WebQuests.  
Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

totamente en desacuerdo 0 0 0 0 0 totalmente de acuerdo

6. 4. El uso de la Lectura Estratégica Colaborativa (CSR) fue útil para el entendimiento de las lecturas del WebQuests.  
Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

totamente en desacuerdo 0 0 0 0 0 totalmente de acuerdo

7. 5. Los apuntes de la Estratégica Colaborativa (CSR) fueron útiles para resolver los trabajos del WebQuests.  
Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

totamente en desacuerdo 0 0 0 0 0 totalmente de acuerdo

8. 6. La interacción con los compañeros del grupo fue productiva.  
Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

totamente en desacuerdo 0 0 0 0 0 totalmente de acuerdo

9. 7. La comunicación con la instructora a través de redes sociales y en forma personal me facilitó el proceso con las Webquests.  
Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

totamente en desacuerdo 0 0 0 0 0 totalmente de acuerdo

10. 8. El material de las dos WebQuests es más actualizado que el de una clase tradicional de comprensión de lectura.  
Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

totamente en desacuerdo 0 0 0 0 0 totalmente de acuerdo

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1DeFJ5rH8P7aA4YumZ6Ttw2yPexMgU6RC35meArV8LZzss/printform
11. Los materiales presentados por las WebQuests fueron apropiados para mejorar mi conocimiento de Inglés.

Mark only one oval.

1  2  3  4  5

totalmente en desacuerdo  O O O O O totalmente de acuerdo

12. Mi vocabulario se ha ampliado en la producción tanto escrita como oral.

Mark only one oval.

1  2  3  4  5

totalmente en desacuerdo  O O O O O totalmente de acuerdo

13. Me gustaría participar en otro curso de inglés que incluya herramientas tecnológicas como por ejemplo la WebQuest.

Mark only one oval.

1  2  3  4  5

totalmente en desacuerdo  O O O O O totalmente de acuerdo

Por favor responda la siguiente pregunta.

14. ¿Cual de las WebQuests ofertadas le pareció más interesante y por qué?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Investigadora: Ok, mi pregunta es: ¿qué les gusto del WebQuest y qué no les gustó? si recuerdan algo.

Estudiante A: A mí no me gustó el tema que me tocó, yo pienso que habían otros temas más interesantes, a mi particularmente el internet, o sea tiene algo atractivo pero mmmm.

Investigadora: Pero, ¿te gustaron los otros temas o tampoco?

Estudiante A: ¿Cuáles eran los otros temas? ¿Era de la luz, del teléfono?

Estudiante A: Había uno que quería yo.

Estudiante B: Fotografía

Estudiante A: ¿De cine no era el otro?

Estudiante B: No, no era ese

Estudiante A: La televisión

Investigadora: Ok, ¿otros comentarios?

Estudiante B: Comparto lo que dice X que los temas deberían ser más actuales, había uno de redes sociales si no me equivoco y era algo que estábamos viendo, pero son temas que a la larga ya es como monótono, entonces si sería interesante por ejemplo: nuevas tecnologías, nuevas aportaciones, cosas así.

Investigadora: ¿Y qué les gustó, por ejemplo?

Estudiante A: ¿Qué me gustó?

Estudiante B: El proceso

Estudiante A: Eso

Investigadora: Ya

Estudiante B: Y la conclusión. Por ejemplo, fue interesante que tuviéramos un proceso con un guía, o sea personalmente en inglés no me guíó muy bien, entonces necesito que esté algo especificado, fue como que tienes que hacer esto, esto, esto y al final vas a llegar a esto, o que se desarrolló en un flyer o un video o una presentación. Entonces la forma ordenada en la que se desarrolló.

Investigadora: Ya, ¿otros comentarios?

Estudiante C: O sea, los pasos que llevó a cabo a mí me parecía que el tema de ordenamiento, o sea no era brusco sino suave, suave, me parecía que eran ejemplos correctos, la bibliografía primero, vamos haciendo un trabajo más corto de tal biografía, después la otra.

Investigadora: ¿Les gustaron los readings, que eran páginas en verdad auténticas?

Estudiante C: Sí

Investigadora: Sí

Estudiante A: Porque contaban historias cortas y se entendía.
Estudiante B: Información completa

Estudiante A: Exacto, información completa

Estudiante B: Más que todo, uno se guiaba con eso que tipo de información debía ir, porque si nos dejaba temas sueltos, entonces podíamos haber buscado cualquier tipo de información y a veces no es confiable, entonces era como que ya sabíamos.

Investigadora: Y, ¿tienen una idea de cómo puedo mejorar un WebQuest la próxima vez? Una idea, era temas más actuales pero ¿tal vez una idea cómo puedo mejorar?

Estudiante D: La parte final donde nos informaron de proyectos o inventos que en su momento sirvieron, pero que a la larga no daban soluciones o realmente no eran suficientes.

Investigadora: ¿Y tienen una idea de cómo puedo mejorar un WebQuest la próxima vez? Una idea, era temas más actuales pero ¿tal vez una idea cómo puedo mejorar?

Estudiante E: La parte final donde nos informaron de proyectos o inventos que en su momento sirvieron, pero que a la larga no daban soluciones o realmente no eran suficientes.

Investigadora: ¿Tú dices al final eso ver de otra manera con un video?

Estudiante E: Claro. Pienso que esa es la manera correcta enseñar, como decía un compañero de mi curso que “uno tiene que aprender así hablando no tanto leyendo”, claro es indispensable pero en realidad el mismo hecho que usted hable y hable, enseña a tener fluidez y eso.

Investigadora: Ok. ¿Y que están esperando, mañana vamos comenzar otro WebQuest? ¿Están esperando algo? ¿Con qué idea van mañana a la clase?

Estudiante A: Más afinidad. Es que por ejemplo eso tampoco me simpatizó, bueno hablo por mi experiencia, hacer en grupos que usted nos puso.

Investigadora: Mmmm

Estudiante A: Yo por ejemplo, yo con la X casi que no conversaba y con el Y un poquito, no he conversado mucho con ellos, entonces era como que vos haz esto, yo hago esto y vos haz esto y nada más. Pero en cambio si es que hubiésemos hecho entre confianza, entre todos aportábamos, nos divertíamos y no era estrictamente formal sino más ameno.

Estudiante B: Creo que para comenzar con el primer WebQuest si debería ser por afinidad y el segundo ya puede ser sorteo, porque incluso a estas alturas ya nos conocemos porque hay chicos que realmente no nos hemos visto, estamos en la misma facultad pero no sabemos que estaban aquí. Entonces si fue como que muy tajante aquello como que ustedes hacen con tal persona, y yo me quedé con las personas que eran de otra facultad, que si no era por el mail no podía comunicarme con ellos no sabía nada.

Investigadora: ¿Algún comentario más o es todo?

Estudiante A: Creo que eso es todo

Investigadora: ¿Pero ustedes sí tienen la idea de que aprendieron algo con esta metodología? ¿Sí? Ahora es el momento de la verdad.

Estudiante A: Si

Estudiante B: Si

Investigadora: Bueno muchas gracias eso fue todo.
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Investigadora: ¿Quería saber si les gustó el segundo WebQuest? ¿Les gustó más que el primero, les fue más familiar? ¿Se pueden imaginar tal vez en el futuro otra vez haciendo un WebQuest, si piensan en la clase de inglés, en el contexto de inglés?

Estudiante G: Sí se me hizo más fácil porque ya hicimos el primer WebQuest. El primero sí fue un poco complicado al comienzo saber encontrar las ideas y los temas, incluso nos demoramos más la primera vez.

Investigadora: Mmmm

Estudiante G: El segundo WebQuest como ya sabíamos cómo estaba organizado y era lo mismo, se nos hizo más fácil y ya sabíamos lo que teníamos que hacer.

Investigadora: Mmmm, ya

Estudiante H: Para mí, el segundo fue un poco más entretenido por el juego de roles que hubo al final, me pareció bastante práctico y justamente para aprender a expresarse en inglés.

Investigadora: ¿Te gustó el podcast?

Estudiante H: Sí

Investigadora: Y ¿el tema en general les gustó más que el primero o los dos temas estaban interesantes o no muy interesantes para ustedes?

Estudiante H: El segundo fue un poco más interesante.

Investigadora: De tu gusto digamos, de tu interés.

Estudiante H: Sí

Estudiante G: Para mí también si fue más interesante este segundo podcast, por la temática del Premio Nobel, entonces era algo que se habla un poco más. Yo personalmente no conocía mucho sobre este tema y pudimos ver sobre varios personajes que han ganado, entonces en esta parte sí fue más entretenido que el primero.

Investigadora: Ok, y ¿se pueden imaginar trabajando con cosas así como el WebQuest en inglés? ¿Les pareció bien en la clase de inglés?

Estudiante H: Sí, en la clase de inglés podemos conocer acerca de otros temas, porque hay bastante aprendizaje, entonces creo que si se trata de una buena metodología

Investigadora: ¿Cómo les pareció la estrategia de leer que usábamos, fue al comienzo más difícil de buscar lo que estaba mencionando X?

Estudiante H: Al comienzo sí porque había muchos links, palabras que no conocíamos y la forma que había en las páginas era un dialecto, una forma de escribir un poco más compleja del vocabulario que ya sabíamos. Pero, después en el segundo WebQuest, ya sabía que iban haber palabras raras, pero entonces leía el texto de manera rápida y las pocas que me faltaron las entendí solo por el concepto o iba directamente al diccionario, pero la primera vez me estanqué en las primeras palabras que no entendía. En cambio ahora como ya sabía que iban haber muchas, entonces leí de corrido, entendí la idea general y luego las partes que me faltaron completé con el diccionario.
Investigadora: Mmmm

Estudiante H: Para mi estuvo igual los dos, porque los dos WebQuest tuvieron su grado de dificultad, pero ninguna cosa de otro mundo de cualquiera de los dos, entonces fueron similares para mí.

Investigadora: ¿Y les pareció bien que los textos eran auténticos y no los típicos del libro de inglés?

Estudiante G: Para mí sí porque en inglés número dos y otros cursos de inglés que he tenido, es verdad que los textos, las lecturas y todo lo que nos da el libro es muy básico y uno se acostumbra. En cambio los WebQuest eran más reales, con mucho más contenido y más de la vida real, porque que los libros de inglés son más para básico, escuelas y eso.

Investigadora: ¿Les ayudó el ejercicio a trabajar con el diccionario WordReference, recuerdan esta clase?

Estudiante H: Sí

Investigadora: ¿Si les ayudó?

Estudiante H: Sí, porque antes uno no tenía la costumbre de buscar una palabra y saber el significado de la palabra, sino un entendimiento más general de acuerdo a la idea.

Investigadora: ¿Y piensan que sí mejoraron su estrategia de leer en inglés?

Estudiante H: En el futuro

Estudiante G: Sí

Investigadora: ¿Por ejemplo ahora en el examen, fue muy difícil leer el texto?

Estudiante H: No para nada

Estudiante G: Sí realmente, en mi examen no hubo complicación en la lectura, se entendió muy rápido y al instante sí.

Investigadora: Eso es todo, muchas gracias.
The preparation stage:

*Number of Participants:* 24 students  
*Date:* Third week 26-29 September 2016  
*Location:* classroom in the Faculty of architecture  

*Activities:*
- Consent Form in Spanish.  
- Pilot of the reading questionnaire.  
- Questionnaire in Spanish.  
- Pilot reading Pre-Test.  
- Reading Pre-Test.  
- Introduction of the lexical topic from the syllabus “Technology”.

*Observation:* Only three students were not from the faculty of architecture and in different majors.

*Date:* Fourth week 03-06 October 2016  
*Location:* Computer Lab in the Faculty of philosophy  

*Materials required:* 25 computers with Internet connection, a multimedia projector and the “Technology” WebQuest.  

*Preparation activity:*
- The Scenario “Social Network Implications” helped the students become familiarized with the use of Google Drive. The students had to prepare a presentation with Google Slide in groups about the possible implications of Facebook. The students could share their Google Slide with their fellow students, and the teacher. With this option it was possible to work together in groups on different computers at the same time, and see the changes and activity of every student or fellow student in the group presentations.

*Observations/ Comments:*
- I was surprised that only two students already had experience working with Google Drive options such as document sharing.  
- This activity was successful because all students were involved and actively participating in the task.  
- The final presentation was good but it was interesting to see that the students mentioned mainly advantages of the “Social Network Implications”.

*Date:* 10th of October 2016  

*Preparation activity:*
- Introduction of the reading strategy Collaborative Strategic Reading CSR with a Power Point presentation and a practical reading exercise.

*Observations/ Comments:*
- The groups worked together but they had some problems with the different steps of CSR for example: Get the gist and Wrap Up.

The implementation stage:

*Class one:*
*Date:* 11th of October 2016  
*Location:* Computer Lab in the Faculty of philosophy  

*Materials required:* 25 computers with Internet connection, a multimedia projector and the “Technology” WebQuest.
Attendance: Two students missed this class.

Activities:

- The teacher shared the WebQuest and Google Doc (Google Drive) with the students, introduced the “Technology” WebQuest and clarified the general idea of the task, which the students should accomplish through a process of different steps.
- The teacher presented the eight British inventions and assigned three students to each invention.
- The evaluation rubric of the WebQuest was revised.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8 Groups</th>
<th>Group members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electric Telegraph</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tin Can</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacuum Cleaner</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Wide Web</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Bulb</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The teacher shared the CSR PowerPoint presentation with the students in order for them to use the different steps during their reading process of the provided authentic material from the Internet.
- The teacher indicated that every group had to read their material together and share their annotation of the CSR Learning Log (3 readings) through Google Doc.
- The next step was to check the provided vocabulary hyperlink for their topic.
- Every group had to begin to read their first website together and to fill out their first CSR Learning Log.

Homework:

- Every group had to finish their first reading and share their first CSR Learning Log (Google Doc) with the teacher.

Approximate autonomous learning time: 1 hour

Observations/Comments:

- I had problems with the Google Site WebQuest- writing format (it was not easy to change the format or to copy a text from word to the Google Site).
- I had to show the whole class, how to put the correct form the name of the created Google Doc document (Topic of the group, group members, first or second document).
- Some groups seemed stressed at the beginning because they had to read three websites and they tried to divide the work between the group members (but that was not the idea). I had to talk to the students and explain that everybody had to read the three texts.

Class two:

Date: 12th of October 2016

Location: Computer Lab in the Faculty of philosophy

Materials required: 25 computers with Internet connection, a multimedia projector and the “Technology” WebQuest.

Attendance: One student missed this class

Activities:
• Every group had to read their second website together and to finish their CSR Learning Log.
• Some groups did not finish their first website.

**Homework:**
• Every group had to finish their first and second reading and to create the corresponding document.

Approximate autonomous learning time: 1 hour

**Observations/Comments:**
• Students had problems with the CSR reading process.
• Some groups had problems working together because they did not know each other very well.
• For them it was difficult to imagine to work together only through Google Drive, outside of the classroom.
• One or two students did not like their topic.

**Class three:**

**Date:** 13th of October 2016  
**Location:** Computer Lab in the Faculty of philosophy  
**Materials required:** 22 computers with Internet connection, a multimedia projector and the “Technology” WebQuest.  
**Attendance:** Nine students missed the class.

**Activities:**
• Every group had to read their third website together and finish their CSR Learning Log.
• Some groups were still reading their second website.

**Homework:**
• Every group had to finish their third reading and the corresponding document to finish the Task Sheet due 14th October.

Approximate autonomous learning time: 1 hour

**Observations/Comments:**
• Today it wasn't possible for every group to finish the task sheet.
• The teacher got 12 docs on Google Drive.
• The teacher put some comments on the docs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Document: CSR</th>
<th>Document: Task Sheet 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Wide Web</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tin Can</td>
<td>1;2</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Bulb</td>
<td>1;2; at the beginning of 3</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>1;2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacuum Cleaner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>1;2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Telegraph</td>
<td>1;2</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• I was stressed because this day a lot of students did not come to class.
• It was evident that some students did not have experiences with the use of dictionaries. I had to introduce the online dictionary “wordreference” to them to deter the use of Google Translator.
Normal class:
Date: 17 -20 October 2016 in the regular classroom
Attendance: Only seven students came to class, because the other 17 students had a workshop from their Faculty.

- Sixteen students, missed classes for one week, and presented the justification from the Faculty of Architecture, ONU Hábitat III, which took place in Quito from October 17th to 20th (the official Email to inform the English-teacher was received on 22nd of October 2016).

Materials required:
- E-virtual with the part of self-study and worksheets for the activities in class.
- One worksheet was about the use of dictionaries

Date: 21st of October 2016
- Shared material with the teacher:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Document: CSR</th>
<th>Document: Task Sheet 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Telegraph</td>
<td>1;2</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Bulb</td>
<td>1;2;3</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>1;2;3</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>1;2;3</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tin Can</td>
<td>1;2;3</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacuum Cleaner</td>
<td>1;2;3</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Wide Web</td>
<td>1;2;3</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class four:
Date: 24th of October 2016
Location: Computer Lab in the Faculty of philosophy
Materials required: 22 computers with Internet connection, a multimedia projector and the “Technology” WebQuest.
Attendance: Two students missed class
Activities:
- Some groups had to finish their Task Sheet.
- At Step 3 of the WebQuest the teacher explained the different roles of every student, and what they had to do.
- The teacher presented the video "How inventions change history (for better and for worse) Kenneth C. Davis."

Homework:
- Every student had to prepare their part for Tuesday, 25th October.
- The students had to finish the worksheet of the video.
Approximate autonomous learning time: 1 hour

Class five:
Date: 25th of October 2016
Location: Computer Lab in the Faculty of philosophy
Materials required: 22 computers with Internet connection, a multimedia projector and the “Technology” WebQuest.
Attendance: One student missed class
Activities:
- The students had to begin with Step 4 of the WebQuest.
- The students had to design a multi-media poster (group work).

Homework:
- Every group continued with the development of their poster.

Approximate autonomous learning time: 1 hour

Observations:
- Some groups had problems because not every student finished their task as previously arranged.

Class six:
Date: 26th of October 2016
Location: Computer Lab in the Faculty of philosophy
Materials required: 22 computers with Internet connection, a multimedia projector and the “Technology” WebQuest.
Attendance: Nobody missed class
Activities:
- The students designed their multi-media poster and prepared the corresponding presentation together.

Homework:
- To finish the group presentation of the multi-media poster.

Approximate autonomous learning time: 1 hour

Class seven:
Date: 27th of October 2016
Location: Regular classroom
Materials required: a multimedia projector
Attendance: Nobody missed class
Activities:
- The first presentations
- Every group had to fill out a “Learning sheet” to give anonymous feedback to their classmates’ work. These comments were sent to every group after their presentation.

Class eight:
Date: 31st of October 2016
Location: Regular classroom
Materials required: a multimedia projector
Attendance: Four students missed class
Activities:
- Presentations

Class nine:
Date: 1st of November 2016
Location: Regular classroom
Materials required: a multimedia projector
Attendance: Six students missed class
Activities:
- The last presentation
- Vote for the three best inventions “Voting sheet”
The teacher introduced the conclusion step of the WebQuest where the students had to reinforce their acquired knowledge. The students had to watch the video “Crazy Inventions That Never Made It”, and prepare an essay in pairs(??), about one crazy invention.

**Homework:**
- The students had to finish their essay.

Approximate autonomous learning time: 1 hour

**Observation:**
- The students were very proud of their poster, final product.

**Class ten:**

*Date: 8th of November 2016*
- Two students dropped out/ withdrew from the course. Finally, the research had 21 participants.

Finally, the researcher had the following documents:
- Individual work: Worksheet “How inventions change history (for better and for worse).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Telegraph</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Bulb</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tin Can</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacuum Cleaner</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Wide Web</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observation/ Comments:**
- With some writing, I had problems with plagiarism from internet sites.

**Focus group:**
- With the researcher and 5 students.

**Survey** (after the WebQuest “Technology”)
- Only 18 from 21 students answered

**WebQuest “Great People”**

**The preparation stage:**

*Participants: 21 students*

**Activity:**
- *Introduction in the lexical topic Interpersonal Relationships and Personal Interests*
**Homework:**

- On the E-virtual there was an audio recording (MAHATMA GANDHI) and a worksheet.
  - I prepared a class to talk about referencing and plagiarism. On the e-virtual I provided four exercises to improve their paraphrasing.

**Observation/ Comments:**

- I was surprised that the students did not know a lot about the topic “Nobel Peace Prize.”
- It seems that they liked the idea of creating their own audio recording (podcast).

**The implementation stage:**

**Class one:**

**Date:** 13th of December 2016

**Location:** Computer Lab in the Faculty of philosophy

**Materials required:** 21 computers with Internet connection, a multimedia projector and the “Great People” WebQuest.

**Attendance:** Five students missed this class

**Activities:**

- The teacher shared the WebQuest and the corresponding Google Doc documents with the students.
- The teacher introduced the “Great People” WebQuest and clarified the general idea of the task, which the students accomplished through a process of three steps.
- The teacher presented five Nobel Peace Prize laureates.
- The students divided themselves up into 10 groups of two or three people.
- The students revised the provided vocabulary doc for their topic.

**Groups:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The 14th Dalai Lama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Elie Wiesel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Malala Yousafzai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Malala Yousafzai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The 14th Dalai Lama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Martin Luther King Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Elie Wiesel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Malala Yousafzai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The 14th Dalai Lama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Malala Yousafzai</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The teacher shared the CSR Learning Log document again.
- Every group had to share their created CSR Learning Log of every reading with the teacher.
- Every group had to begin to read their first website together.

**Observation/ Comments:**
● The students seemed happy with their chosen peer partner and topic.

Homework:
● Every group had to share their first CSR Learning Log with the teacher.

Class two:
Date: 14th of December 2016
Location: Computer Lab in the Faculty of philosophy
Materials required: 21 computers with Internet connection, a multimedia projector and the “Great People” WebQuest.
Attendance: Five students missed this class
Activities:
● Every group had to finish their first website and finish their CSR Learning Log and to begin with the second website.
Homework:
● Every group had to finish their first two CSR Learning Logs.

Observations/ Comments:
● The groups that chose Elie Wiesel had some problems with the historical background (WWII) of this Nobel Peace Prize laureate.
● The groups worked almost autonomously and seemed familiarized with the WebQuest process.

Class three:
Date: 15th of December 2016
Location: Computer Lab in the Faculty of philosophy
Materials required: 21 computers with Internet connection, a multimedia projector and the “Great People” WebQuest.
Attendance: Six students missed the class.
Activities:
● Every group had to read their second website.
Homework:
● Every group had to finish their second reading and the corresponding document.

Class four:
Date: 19th of December 2016
Location: Computer Lab in the Faculty of philosophy
Materials required: 21 computers with Internet connection, a multimedia projector and the “Great People” WebQuest.
Attendance: Three students missed class
Activities:
● The students had to read their third website.
● The teacher explained the different roles of every student in step 2 of the WebQuest, and what they had to do.
Observation/ Comments:
● Some groups had to finish their second reading.
● One group finished the reading part and began with the step 2 of the WebQuest.
● A lot of students tried to talk with me in English, if they had a problem.
The students talked or discussed things in Spanish about the content of the text/articles.
They sometimes had problems to fill out the CSR Learning Log and asked me for help.
I had two groups, which had problems with the time and attendance, because they had to finish projects for their main subject.
One group searched for additional information on Wikipedia about the person in Spanish to get a better understanding.

**Homework:**
- Every group had to finish their third CSR Learning Log.
- The students had to begin with step 2 of the WebQuest

**Class five:**

*Date:* 22th of December 2016  
*Location:* Computer Lab in the Faculty of philosophy  
*Materials required:* 21 computers with Internet connection, a multimedia projector and the “Great People” WebQuest.  
*Attendance:* Nobody missed class  

*Activities:*
- The teacher introduced step 3 of the WebQuest.  
- The students had to write an audio script and think about the recording of their podcast.  
- The teacher explained the evaluation.  
- The teacher checked the CSR Learning Logs.  
- The teacher added comments on the first received drafts of audio scripts.

*Homework:*
- First they had to finish the audio script due 28.12.2016  
- Secondly, after the correction of the audio script, they had to record their podcast.  
- The podcast they had to send was due on January 3rd 2017

*Observations of the homework:*
- One group did not send the third CSR Learning Log on time.  
- One group sent the audio script, but it was a copy of an interview with Elie Wiesel from the Internet.  
- Another group did not send the audio script first and sent both audio script and the podcast at the same time.  
- Some groups used musical background.

*Christmas Holidays till 1st of January*

**Class six:**

*Date:* 2nd/3rd of January 2017  
*Location:* Regular classroom  
*Materials required:* A multimedia projector  
*Attendance:* Three students missed class  

*Activities:*
- The teacher introduced the conclusion step.
Every group had to begin to write an essay and each of these groups had to explain why their chosen Nobel Peace Prize laureate was awarded this great honor.

**Homework:**
- The groups had to finish their essay due 4th of January 2017

**Class seven:**

**Date:** 4th and 5th of January 2017

**Activity:**
- Post-Test Reading

Finally, the researcher had the following documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The 14th Dalai Lama</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elie Wiesel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malala Yousafzai</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malala Yousafzai</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 14th Dalai Lama</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Luther King Jr.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elie Wiesel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malala Yousafzai</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 14th Dalai Lama</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malala Yousafzai</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reading Comprehension Post-Test**
- Low motivation (the end of the course and exam season)
- After the correction of the test I was surprised because many students forgot to answer questions or omitted answers, and got lower points.

**Focus group**
16th January 2017
- The researcher and two students.

**Perception Questionnaire**
- Only 16 out of 21 students replied.