



# UNIVERSIDAD DE CUENCA

Facultad de Filosofía, Letras y Ciencias de la Educación  
Maestría en Lingüística Aplicada a la Enseñanza del Inglés  
como Lengua Extranjera

## **Using Cooperative Learning Strategies to Develop Rural Primary Students' English Oral Performance**

Trabajo de titulación previo a la obtención  
del título de Master of Linguistics Applied  
to Teaching English as a Foreign  
Language.

Modalidad: Artículo Científico

**Autora:**

Lilian Catalina Nievecela Guamanrrigra

**CI:** 0105618490

**Correo electrónico:** liliannieve91@hotmail.com

**Tutor:**

Diego Patricio Ortega Auquilla, MSc, PhD(c)

**CI:** 0105289821

**Cuenca, Ecuador**

26-junio-2020



## Resumen:

Este estudio de investigación cuasi-experimental a pequeña escala tuvo como objetivo investigar la efectividad de las estrategias de aprendizaje cooperativo (AC) en el logro de alcanzar el nivel A1 de desempeño oral de los estudiantes según el Marco Común Europeo de Referencia para las lenguas. Los participantes del estudio fueron veinticuatro alumnos de séptimo grado de una pequeña escuela primaria rural ubicada en la parte sur de la ciudad de Cuenca. Los datos del estudio cuantitativo se obtuvieron mediante un enfoque de método mixto. La parte cuantitativa se basó en un estudio estadístico descriptivo. Su información se recopiló a través de una prueba oral aplicada antes y después del tratamiento. Los resultados se procesaron y analizaron a través del programa SPSS versión 25. Además, para establecer la similitud entre los puntajes con el puntaje mínimo (7) requerido para alcanzar el nivel A1, se consideró la prueba estadística T-Student para una muestra. Por lo demás, la parte cualitativa se basó en un estudio de investigación fenomenológica. Sus datos se recolectaron a través de observaciones directas en el aula y una discusión de grupo focal. Los resultados indicaron que: en primer lugar, los participantes alcanzaron su nivel A1 de desempeño oral en los criterios de evaluación de comprensión, interacción, fluidez, pronunciación. En segundo lugar, los estudiantes demostraron actitudes positivas hacia las estrategias del AC. En tercer lugar, los estudiantes a través de las estrategias de AC se mostraron más motivados y menos reacios durante la participación oral. A la luz de los hallazgos, las estrategias de AC deberían adoptarse en la enseñanza del inglés a nivel escolar primario; ya que, ayuda a mejorar en los alumnos la habilidad de hablar en inglés.

**Palabras clave:** Aprendizaje Cooperativo. Habilidades de hablar en inglés. Actitudes. Percepciones.



**Abstract:**

This small-scale quasi-experimental research study aimed to investigate the effectiveness of cooperative learning (CL) strategies in the achievement of students' oral performance at the A1 Common European Framework of Reference for languages level. The study participants were twenty-four seventh graders from a small rural primary school located on the southern part of Cuenca city. The data of the study were gathered through a mixed method approach. The quantitative part was based on a descriptive statistic study. It was collected through the students' speaking pre and post- test. The results were processed and analyzed through SPSS version 25. In addition, to establish the similarity between the scores with the minimum score (7) required to reach the A1 level, the statistical T-Student test for one sample was considered. In addition, the qualitative part was based on a phenomenological research study. It was gathered through direct classroom observations and a focus group discussion. Findings indicated that: firstly, the study participants reached their A1 oral performance level in the evaluation criteria of comprehension, interaction, fluency, pronunciation. Secondly, students had positive attitudes toward CL strategies. Thirdly, students through CL strategies were more motivated and less reluctant during oral participation. In light of the findings, CL should be adopted in primary English learning as it helps improve learners' English speaking skill.

**Key words:** Cooperative learning. English speaking skills. Attitudes. Perceptions.



## Table of Contents

Resumen.....	2
Abstract.....	3
Cláusula de licencia y autozación para publicación.....	5
Cláusula de propiedad Intelectual.....	6
I. Introduction .....	8
1.1 <i>The relationship between CL and the development of the speaking skill.</i> .....	9
1.2 <i>The relationship between CL strategies and the development of the school students' English speaking skill.</i> .....	10
II. Research Problem.....	12
III. Methodology .....	13
3.1 <i>Participants</i> .....	13
3.2 <i>Data Collection Instruments</i> .....	14
3.3 <i>Data Collection Procedure</i> .....	15
IV. Data Analysis .....	15
V. Results .....	16
5.1 <i>The speaking tests</i> .....	16
5.1.1 <i>Pre- test</i> .....	16
5.1.2 <i>Post test</i> .....	18
5.1.3 <i>Comparison: Pre and post intervention.</i> .....	19
5.1.4 <i>A1 achievement level</i> .....	20
5.2 <i>Direct Classroom Observations</i> .....	21
5.2.1 <i>Group Formation (GF)</i> .....	21
5.2.2 <i>Cooperative work attitudes (CWA)</i> .....	22
5.2.3 <i>Oral participation (OP)</i> .....	23



5.3	The focus group discussion .....	23
5.3.1	<i>Group Formation (GF)</i> .....	24
5.3.2	<i>Cooperative work perceptions (CWP)</i> .....	25
5.3.3	<i>Oral participation (OP)</i> .....	26
VI.	Discussion.....	28
VII.	Conclusions .....	30
VIII.	References.....	31
	Appendices.....	35



## Cláusula de Licencia y Autorización para Publicación en el Repositorio Institucional

### Cláusula de licencia y autorización para publicación en el Repositorio Institucional

---

Lilian Catalina Nievecela Guamanrrigra, en calidad de autor/a y titular de los derechos morales y patrimoniales del trabajo de titulación "Using Cooperative Learning Strategies to Develop Rural Primary Student' English Oral Performance", de conformidad con el Art. 114 del CÓDIGO ORGÁNICO DE LA ECONOMÍA SOCIAL DE LOS CONOCIMIENTOS, CREATIVIDAD E INNOVACIÓN reconozco a favor de la Universidad de Cuenca una licencia gratuita, intransferible y no exclusiva para el uso no comercial de la obra, con fines estrictamente académicos.

Asimismo, autorizo a la Universidad de Cuenca para que realice la publicación de este trabajo de titulación en el repositorio institucional, de conformidad a lo dispuesto en el Art. 144 de la Ley Orgánica de Educación Superior.

Cuenca, 26 de junio de 2020.

Lilian Catalina Nievecela Guamanrrigra

C.I: 0105618490



## Cláusula de Propiedad Intelectual

### Cláusula de Propiedad Intelectual

---

Lilian Catalina Nievecela Guamanrrigra, autor/a del trabajo de titulación "Using Cooperative Learning Strategies to Develop Rural Primary Student' English Oral Performance", certifico que todas las ideas, opiniones y contenidos expuestos en la presente investigación son de exclusiva responsabilidad de su autor/a.

Cuenca, 26 de junio de 2020.

Lilian Catalina Nievecela Guamanrrigra

C.I: 0105618490



## I. Introduction

Teaching and learning English as a foreign language (EFL) has been broadly discussed for years by theorists and researchers. Every year, standardized tests and recognized international organizations, such as Education First English Proficiency Index (EF EPI) and British Council have reported the English language proficiency of different countries. Regarding the Ecuadorian context, the EF EPI (2018) results pointed out a low English performance level. Additionally, Malik, Esaki-Smith, Lee and Ngan (2015) indicated an intermediate average score for reading and listening and a fair average score for speaking and writing. These results demonstrated that Ecuadorian English proficiency level, especially speaking skill is under the average score.

Authors like Puma (2015), asserted that this situation is especially seen in rural education schools where baccalaureate students' EFL level does not meet the objectives proposed by the Ecuadorian Ministry of Education (MINEDUC), which is the B1 level. As Calderón (2015) indicated, this is because rural areas present a lack of materials, economic resources, and a poor application of active teaching methodologies.

Because of these circumstances, the MINEDUC has implemented some measures to improve the English language teaching-learning process of the country along the time (Ortega & Aucchuallpa, 2017). They initiated in 1992 with the compulsory English language teaching in secondary education (British Council, 2015). Likewise, in 2012 the Strengthening English Language Teaching (Fortalecimiento de la Enseñanza del Inglés) project promoted by the MINEDUC in 2012 came into force. In this project, the New National Curriculum Guidelines 2012 were established. After that, in 2016, the Curriculum





of English as foreign language was elaborated by the MINEDUC, and it mainly focused on helping third year baccalaureate students to reach the B1 level by the end of high school education. At that time, the teaching of EFL at the primary school level became mandatory, which was previously optional (MINEDUC, 2016).

Although the above-mentioned actions were carried out, the low English proficiency level still remained. Therefore, Naranjo and Naranjo (2017) stated that effective pedagogical practices related to communicative approach such as cooperative learning (CL) may support the process of English language learning. In that way, EFL learners may reach the required level set by the national standards within the new curriculum. Alike, Villafuerte et al. (2018) emphasized that group learning activities directed by the CL approach can be viewed as teaching and learning strategies that may positively support the acquisition process of the English language in the Ecuadorian educational context.

### *1.1 The relationship between CL and the development of the speaking skill.*

Researches in different countries have demonstrated that CL is effective to develop students' English skills, mainly speaking. Authors such as Nasser (2014), conducted a study on the effectiveness of CL strategies with undergraduates' English language learners. The study results showed a remarkable development in their speaking skills as well as a promotion of positive attitudes towards learning the English language. Moreover, Ahmed and Bedri (2017) carried out an investigation about the role of CL in enhancing EFL second year university students' oral communication skills. The results demonstrated that the students developed their English-speaking skills. Also, they showed an increase



in regard with their motivation when using the language orally due to their mutual help and support.

As Devia and García (2017) indicated, being able to successfully communicate ideas orally is a fundamental skill in language learning. Through this, students share their ideas, feelings, and thoughts regarding their personal, educational, and social life (Kaniadewi, Sundayana & Purnawrman, 2017). Therefore, whatever the target language is, learners need to develop this skill to express themselves in a foreign language. However, it can represent a huge challenge especially for beginners. Thereby, Devia and García (2017) suggested that cooperative learning is a supportive strategy to help students to develop this skill. It involves processes of psychological health where participants control their fear, stress, and anxiety they feel when speaking in English (Priyantín, 2016). Yet, in cooperation, students feel secure and sure to participate orally in class. Cooperation means working in a way that every person participate by helping to each other in order to achieve common goals (Johnson & Johnson, 2017). Even though, the key feature of CL is not the group configuration, but the way students and teachers work together, taking into account these five basic elements: positive interdependence, face to face interaction, individual accountability, social skills, and group processing (Johnson, Johnson & Holubec, 2013). Therefore, the aforementioned authors have recommended CL strategies as important sources that can be adapted in EFL classrooms to develop students' speaking skills.

### *1.2 The relationship between CL strategies and the development of the school students' English speaking skill.*



Rot-Vrhovec (2015) agreed to apply CL strategies with pupils of all ages. CL strategies, such as jigsaw, think-pair-share, numbered head and three step interview (just to mention a few), affect pupils' interest in learning English language and their attitude towards the subject (Kandasamy & Habil, 2018). As a result, students improve their pronunciation, fluency, and accuracy, which are essential components in speaking skills. Also, CL strategies help school students to interact more with their peers due to the fact that all of them are accountable in a group work learning activity. It should be pointed out that this kind of interaction promotes active oral participation among language learners (Lucena & San Jose, 2016).

Therefore, considering the previous information, the present research study investigated the effectiveness of CL strategies in facilitating 24 seventh graders achieve A1 oral performance at a rural elementary school outside Cuenca city. The study explored the development of the English speaking skill through the use of lessons based on cooperative learning strategies. This research used cooperative learning group as the independent variable and the development of the speaking skill as the dependent variable. The former variable was measured by comparing the results of the study participants' speaking skills obtained in the pre- test with the results in the post test. Moreover, this study investigated seventh grade students' attitudes and perceptions towards the implementation of selected CL strategies into English language instruction in relation with motivation to speak.

A more detailed description of the research problem, the methodology, the results, the discussion, and the conclusions are described in the below sections.



## II. Research Problem

It has been observed that there is a need to improve the current speaking skill level among seventh graders. The students have possessed a low development of this skill since the 2017-2018 school year, which was the first time they were familiar with English language learning. As Puma (2015) reported, public education, especially rural institutions, do not have enough English teachers and consequently these schools do not offer this subject. Additionally, Calderón (2015) commented that the lack of material and economic resources are also reasons for rural students' poor oral performance level.

The existing English language low proficiency level can be evidenced in the research carried out by Ortega and Auccauallpa (2017). The authors carried out a quantitative exploratory study where the results described low English language competencies. The participants were 142 students studying the last year of General Unified Baccalaureate during the 2016 -2017 school year. They belonged to eight rural public institutions located in Azogues, a city from Cañar province. In general, the study showed that the participants' English language proficiency level was very limited, especially in the oral linguistic competence. Five of the eight educational institutions had an oral performance average percentage between 20.4% and 45.70% over 100%.

In 2016, the MINEDUC established the agreement Nro. MINEDUC-ME-2016-00020-A, in which the teaching of EFL had to be compulsory at primary schools. Therefore, at the end of the school year, seventh graders are expected to achieve an A1 level (beginner level). It means that by the end of this school year, they will be able to produce slow, hesitant, and planned dialogues; bearing in mind that oral communication still depends



on repetition, rephrasing, and repair (MINEDUC, 2014). With these notions in mind, it is crucial to create a CL environment for the study participants from this specific school context in order to help them to reach their A1 English speaking level.

### **III. Methodology**

The present quasi-experimental research study aimed to investigate whether CL strategies are effective to help seventh graders to reach their A1 English speaking level. The study employed a mixed method approach: quantitative and qualitative. On one side, the quantitative phase intended to evaluate the effectiveness of a group of CL strategies in reaching seventh graders A1 English speaking skill. It was based on a descriptive statistic study. By means of this type of study, the researcher could specify properties and important characteristics of an analyzed phenomenon by describing the positive or negative inclination of the numerical results of a group from a statistical point of view (Hernández, Fernández & Baptista, 2014). On the other side, the qualitative phase was aimed to find out the students' attitudes and perceptions towards CL strategies in relation with their motivation to speak. It was based on a phenomenological research study. The main purpose of this type of design is to explore, to describe, and to understand the participants' experiences regarding a phenomenon throughout describing the common elements of such identified experiences (Hernández, Fernández & Baptista, 2014).

#### *3.1 Participants*

The participants in this study were 24 seventh graders from a rural elementary school located in Cumbe, a small parish from Cuenca. They were 14 males and 10



females, ranging from 11 to 12 years old ( $M = 11.38$ ,  $SD = 0.50$ ). All of them were homogeneous with regard to ethnicity, native language, exposure to English, and educational and cultural background. All the participants were exposed to regular English instruction, three hours per week, according to the Ecuadorian EFL Curriculum for subnivel medio (MINEDUC, 2016).

### *3.2 Data Collection Instruments*

The study mainly used three research instruments. The first one was an oral test, used as a pre and post-test to measure students' A1 English oral performance. It was adapted from Villalba (2014) and Euro Exam International A1 (2017). The test contained tasks, such as an interview, a presentation, and a picture description. A scoring rubric taken from Villalba (2014) was included to evaluate the speaking test. It provided a measure of quality of performance on the basis of the following criteria: comprehension, interaction, pronunciation, accuracy, and fluency on a five-rating scale ranging from 9 to 10 meaning "excellent", 7 - 8 "very good", 5 - 6 "good", 3 - 4 "fair", 1 - 2 "poor". In addition, to show validity and feasibility, the test was piloted to 12 students similar to the research study participants. This process allowed the researcher to carry out improvements in the rubric before it was used with the actual participants during the treatment phase of the study. It also helped to mark off the time and the best kind of grouping configuration needed to complete the test.

The second instrument was a template in which the information from direct classroom observations was registered. The observations were intended to find out the students' attitudes towards the implementation of the CL strategies in relation with their



motivation to speak. In this instrument, note taking techniques were employed. The third instrument was a set of questions used for a focus group discussion, which was aimed at finding out the students' perceptions towards the implemented lessons based on the CL strategies and the impact of the lessons on their motivation. The questions were asked in Spanish being this, the students' mother tongue. Consequently, it was easier for them to express their views and opinions. Also, the set of questions were piloted with a group of students alike to the actual participants of the study. For instance, this process allowed the researcher to establish the wait time required for the questions during the actual focus group and to make adjustments to the structure of the posed questions and the extension of the instrument.

### *3.3 Data Collection Procedure*

The quantitative data were collected through the students' scores obtained from a speaking test that was conducted twice in this study. Firstly, the pre-test was applied to know about the students' actual speaking proficiency level. Then the same instrument was utilized as the post-test; this test was conducted to know whether the students' speaking skill reached the A1 level or not after the application of the CL strategies.

On the other hand, the qualitative data was gathered through the classroom observation notes. Finally, the focus group discussion was videotaped and then transcribed on a computer.

## **IV. Data Analysis**



The data from the speaking test were analyzed by means of central tendency measures (mean) and dispersion (minimum, maximum and standard deviation). In addition, in order to establish the similarity between the scores with the minimum score (7) required to reach the A1 level, the statistical T-Student test for one sample was carried out. The decisions were made with a significance of 5% ( $p < .05$ ). The statistical program SPSS 25 and Excel 2016 for the creation of tables and graphs were used as part of this study. Meanwhile, the data gathered through direct classroom observation notes and the focus group discussion were analyzed through these three steps for qualitative data analysis recommended by Gay et al. (2012): reading/memoing; describing the participants, describing the setting and the phenomenon studied, and classifying research data.

## V. Results

### 5.1 *The speaking tests*

#### 5.1.1 *Pre- test*

Before the intervention, the students general score in each task ranged from 1 to 3.6. It indicated poor levels of oral expression. None of them achieved the A1 required learning level established by the MINEDUC, “fair” according to the evaluation rubric. The interview was the task within the test with the best performance ( $M = 1.68$ ,  $SD = 0.67$ ), followed by the presentation ( $M = 1.57$ ,  $SD = 0.60$ ), and finally the picture description ( $M = 1.52$ ,  $SD = 0.60$ ).

Considering the five evaluation criteria of each task, it was found out that the maximum score obtained by the students was 5 points. These corresponded to the





evaluation criterion of *comprehension*, revealed as the best performance in all the tasks from the test. The criteria with the lowest scores were: *accuracy* in the interview (M = 1.46, SD = 0.59) and picture description (M = 1.29, SD = 0.46); and *interaction* in the presentation (M = 1.33, SD = 0.48). The details can be seen in table 1.

Table 1. Pre-test results.

		Std			
		Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Deviation
	Comprehension	1	4	2.25	0.99
Interview (M=1.68; DE=0.67)	Interaction	1	3	1.50	0.66
	Accuracy	1	3	1.46	0.59
	Fluency	1	5	1.63	0.88
	Pronunciation	1	3	1.54	0.59
	Comprehension	1	3	2.00	0.83
Presentation (M=1.57; DE=0.60)	Interaction	1	2	1.33	0.48
	Accuracy	1	2	1.42	0.50
	Fluency	1	4	1.54	0.72
	Pronunciation	1	4	1.54	0.72
Picture description (M=1.52; SD=0.60)	Comprehension	1	3	1.88	0.80
	Accuracy	1	2	1.29	0.46
	Fluency	1	4	1.46	0.72
	Pronunciation	1	4	1.46	0.72



### 5.1.2 Post test

After the intervention, it was evidenced maximum scores of 10 in comprehension and fluency in each of the evaluation criteria. The *picture description* was the task with the best performance (M = 6.86, SD = 2.34), followed by the presentation (M = 6.73, Std Deviation = 2.25) and finally the interview (M = 6.16, Std Deviation = 2.52). Broadly, all the tasks of the test are very close to achieve the A1 required learning level as mandated by MINEDUC (2016).

*Comprehension*, was the evaluation criterion with the best performance in all the tasks of the test and the weakest criterion was *accuracy*, the details can be seen in table 2.

Table 2. Post test results.

			Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation
	Comprehension	1	10	7.29	3.21	
Interview	Interaction	1	9	6.71	2.77	
(M=6.16; SD=2.52)	Accuracy	1	8	4.21	1.98	
	Fluency	1	10	6.71	3.16	
	Pronunciation	1	9	5.88	2.44	
Presentation	Comprehension	1	10	7.75	2.85	
(M=6.73; SD=2.25)	Interaction	1	9	7.13	1.87	
	Accuracy	1	8	5.04	2.18	



	fluency	1	10	7.08	2.80
	Pronunciation	1	9	6.63	2.37
Picture	Comprehension	1	10	8.21	2.81
description	Accuracy	1	8	5.00	2.00
(M=6.86; SD=2.34)	Fluency	1	10	7.75	2.74
	Pronunciation	1	9	6.50	2.40


### 5.1.3 Comparison: Pre and post intervention.

The average total score of the students before the intervention was 1.58 / 10 (Std Deviation = 0.60), while after the intervention, it was 6.59 / 10 (Std Deviation = 1.92) revealing an increase of 5.01 in general. Each evaluation criterion was calculated as an average of each of the tasks in the test. In figure 1, it can be seen that prior to the intervention, the oral performance of the students was "poor" according to the evaluation rubric. They were ranged between 1.39 and 2.04. However, after the intervention (figure 2), it can be seen significant increase in all the different criteria: 5.71 points in comprehension, revealing the best results; 5.49 points in interaction; 3.36 in accuracy, revealing the weakest increase; 5.64 in fluency; and 4.82 in pronunciation.

It can also be observed that, in the evaluation criteria with regard to comprehension and fluency, the final results confirmed that the required score was reached (score > 7); while, in interaction, accuracy, and pronunciation the students were close to achieve the required learning of the target language (scores between 4.01 and 6.99).



Table 3. Pre and Post intervention results



5.1.4 A1 achievement level.

To determine if the students reached the A1 level oral performance, the results of each criterion and the final score were compared with the value seven through the T-Student test for a sample. According to the MINEDUC (2016), seven is the score that indicates students' achievement of their English learnings.

Table 4 shows that in the pretest, the students did not reach the A1 level since none of the evaluation criteria approached to seven ( $p < .05$ ). Nevertheless, after the intervention the students revealed scores close to 7 ( $p > .05$ ), which implies that the A1 level was reached in the total score of the speaking test. Also, the scores reached the required level in all their evaluation criteria, except in accuracy ( $p < .05$ ).

Table 4. Students results A1 level (Test value =7)

Evaluation Criteria	Pre test	p	Post test	p
---------------------	----------	---	-----------	---



	Std			Std		
	Mean	Deviation		Mean	Deviation	
Comprehension	2.04	0.83	0.000**	7.75	2.29	0.122
Interaction	1.42	0.52	0.000**	6.92	2.12	0.849
Accuracy	1.39	0.47	0.000**	4.75	1.72	0.000**
Fluency	1.54	0.75	0.000**	7.18	2.31	0.705
Pronunciation	1.51	0.65	0.000**	6.33	1.80	0.082
Total	1.58	0.6	0.000**	6.58	1.91	0.300

*Note: \* Significant Difference ( $p < .05$ )*

## 5.2 Direct Classroom Observations

The participants were observed during 32 sessions of 40 minutes and each time significant field notes were registered in the instrument. The direct classroom observation notes were registered on an observation template. When the data on the templates were examined, the following categories emerged over the course of data analysis: group formation (GF); cooperative work attitudes (CWA) consisting of positive interdependence (PI), face to face interaction (FFI), individual accountability (IA), and social skills (SS); as well as oral participation (OP).

### 5.2.1 Group Formation (GF)

During group work, it was observed that many students liked to work in groups; some in pairs, and a few individually. Students in the first sessions demonstrated negative attitudes when they were asked to group or pair with different students. However, after



some sessions, many participants showed more acceptance to work with different group members. There were few students who preferred to work in pairs and very little individually, until the end of the sessions.

### 5.2.2 Cooperative work attitudes (CWA)

In addition, it was observed that at the beginning of the sessions, there were students who did not understand the importance of being engaged during group work. They let some students only to do the task. However, after some sessions the students were active participants in the teaching- learning process (PI). For instance, the numbered- head CL strategy allowed students to be very engaged during the English language instruction. A number was called up randomly to share the answers and everybody needed to pay attention and be ready to provide them. Also, they were responsible in their assigned roles (IA) as well as during whole group work development. For example, when the students participated in the jigsaw strategy each one of them were assigned with a role such as the leader, the time keeper, the recorder, and the reporter. All of them were engaged in their roles and were responsible for each one of their tasks. Some students did not understand what the task was about or how to carry it out. Therefore, there were students who assisted and supported among one other (FFI). It was evident during the application of the Three Steps Interview CL strategy that the students helped among one another in their pronunciation, grammar mistakes, and vocabulary. Additionally, during group tasks, students exchanged opinions, ideas, and information within the group (SS). The think-pair-share CL strategy was the one where SS was promoted. The students expressed their ideas to their group mates and they listened carefully to one another. In



general, it could be perceived that students through CL strategies showed positive attitudes toward English language learning. They showed four of the five CL basic elements: positive interdependence, individual accountability, face to face interaction, and social skills.

### 5.2.3 *Oral participation (OP).*

While the study participants performed the cooperative tasks and oral activities, it was observed that they demonstrated an active oral participation during the planned learning activities. Most of the time, students used vocabulary words from the beginning of the sessions despite their lack of pronunciation. In addition, while working in groups, most students were less reluctant to use the language orally. There were students who helped their group members or even members of other groups by correcting the pronunciation or by assisting them to provide the answers. It could be seen that there were participants who were role models regarding pronunciation for their classmates. Finally, while working in groups students not only used the vocabulary words and sentences from the lessons, but also common classroom phrases like “help me, please”, “work in groups”, “thank you”, “good morning”, etc.

### 5.3 The focus group discussion

The focus group discussion, which can be seen in Appendix 6, on the other side, was analyzed through: group formation (GF), cooperative work perceptions (CWP), and oral participation (OP). Three group of seven students were made up considering the following characteristics: the first group consisted of students who got high scores in the post test and were active participants during the implementation of the cooperative group



activities. The second group was comprised of students who got low scores in the post test but were active participants during the cooperative group activities. Finally, the third group had students who got low scores in the post test and were not active participants during the cooperative group activities.

### 5.3.1 Group Formation (GF)

The first category emerged out of data analysis was group formation. The researcher, implemented some group configuration techniques where it was seen that students showed acceptance to join in groups, some in pairs, and a few individually. This can be supported by the following focus group discussion transcript extracts presented in table 5.

Table 5. Group Formation

Question (Coding) No.	Focus (Coding) No.	Participant (Coding) No.	Focus group discussion extracts
Q10	G1	S5	<i>en grupo porque cambiamos las opiniones.</i>
		S6	<i>(in groups because you exchange opinions. en partners o individual porque o sino unos hacen y otros no. (in partners or individually because you do the tasks and other do not.)</i>





### 5.3.2 Cooperative work perceptions (CWP)

During the lessons that comprised the treatment phase of the present study some CL strategies were implemented, such as Jigsaw and Three Step Interviews. In the former strategy each member in the group was assigned with roles. The students demonstrated good acceptance before them. Additionally, when working in groups, participants commented to have good leadership skills because they could create an environment of trust and respect when interchanging opinions and ideas. Furthermore, students perceived that their participation and engagement in the activities improved. Finally, during group work, the study participants made meaningful contributions, which allowed the task to be better accomplished. It showed that students demonstrated PI during the lessons by helping to one another. All this can be supported by the following extracts of focus group discussion transcript in table 6.

Table 6. Cooperative Work Perceptions.

Cooperative Learning Elements	Question (Coding) No.	Focus Group (Coding) No.	Participant (Coding) No.	Focus group discussion extracts
FFI	Q17	G1	S6	<i>porque nos ayudamos, porque si fuera individual, tendríamos que hablar nosotros solos como monólogo. (because we help each other, because if it were individually,</i>



---

				we would talk to ourselves as monologue.)
SS	Q15	G1	S6	<i>opiniones, ideas, juegos, noticias, lo que sea para compartir entre compañeros.</i> (opinions, ideas, games, news, whatever we can share with our partners.)
IR	Q13	G2	S1	<i>sí, porque ellos dan opiniones y nosotros tenemos que escribir...así todos realizamos la tarea.</i> (yes, because they share opinions and we have to write ... so we all do the task.)
PI	Q16	G3	S1	<i>que tenemos que ser más responsables con el grupo.</i> (that we have to be more responsible with the group.)

---

### 5.3.3 Oral participation (OP).

It was notorious during the implemented lessons that students were supported by their classmates and became more active speakers. They used short, modeled conversations, common classroom phrases, and easy vocabulary words. Likewise,



students helped one another, especially in the way words and short phrases were pronounced. It can be evidenced from the transcript extracts below in table 7.

Table 7. Oral Participation

Question (Coding) No.	Focus Group (Coding) No.	Participant (Coding) No.	Focus group discussion extracts
Q17	G1	S1	<i>motivados, porque ... investigamos, tenemos más ideas...ósea cuando decimos alguna palabra nos corrigen... para poder hacer mucho mejor. (yes, because... we investigate, we have more ideas ...when we say a word, they correct us ...)</i>
Q19	G1	S6	<i>me siento seguro compartiendo las palabras. Por ejemplo, unos dicen “Good morning” otros “How are you?” y hay decimos ¿Por qué dices how are you? ¿Qué significa?... (...I feel secure sharing the words. For example, someone says “Good morning” others “How are you?” and then we say Why do you say how are you? What it means?... )</i>



The above-mentioned results show that CL strategies provided positive outcomes to seventh graders. They increased their motivation to learn English and mainly to develop their speaking skill. Also, students developed their social skills which allowed them to promote their positive attitudes while working in groups.

## **VI. Discussion**

The findings of this study revealed positive outcomes in regard with the development of the seventh graders' speaking performance after the implementation of some CL strategies as well as their motivation to use English language orally.

Firstly, concerning the effectiveness of CL strategies in reaching seventh graders' A1 speaking skill level, they worked well during the teaching instructions. The findings from the pre and post- test demonstrated that students improved their speaking skills. They reached their A1 level in terms of comprehension, interaction, pronunciation, and fluency. These findings are consistent with the study findings of Devia and García (2017) that showed speaking improvement. In this sense, their results evidenced how students were positively influenced by these strategies to improve their vocabulary, pronunciation, grammar, and fluency. Similarly, it is in line with the findings of Nasser (2014) which showed a remarkable development in the students' speaking skills after the introduction of CL techniques. The findings of this study provide confirmatory evidence in support of the results generated in the study by Ahmed and Bredi (2017) as well as Lucena and San Jose (2016). These authors asserted that the implementation of CL in the language learning process can develop students' speaking skills.



Additionally, with regard to investigate the students' attitudes towards the CL strategies in relation with their motivation to speak, significant differences were found between the students' attitudes. The study participants had a more positive attitude towards their speaking skill. Firstly, the students were helpful among each other, and it demonstrated promoted interaction. This is in line with the findings of Johnson and Johnson (2017) who stated that through CL students provided mutual help and assistance over the course of second language instruction. Secondly, the participants' challenges to work in groups, encouraged their patience, creativity, organization, and task design. These results supported the findings of Devia and García (2017) where the results demonstrated that all the study groups improved together by exchanging ideas, supporting one another and working in an organized way. Thirdly, it can be proved that CL strategies promote positive attitudes in students when using the target language verbally. It can be evidenced in the studies carried out by Nasser (2014) and Ahmed and Bedri (2017) where the results showed an increase concerning students' positive attitudes in relation to their motivation to use the language during oral communication.

Finally, in order to find out the students' perceptions towards the implementation of CL strategies in relation with their motivation to speak, the findings showed that through CL strategies students increased their motivation. The study results indicated that students were active participants while learning the target language because of their mutual help. This is similar to the findings showed of Ahmed and Bredi (2017) and Priyantín (2016) where an increase in students' interest and enthusiasm towards learning English was yielded. Also, those learners who are reluctant and fearful speakers are able to overcome these feelings.



## VII. Conclusions

On the basis of the above evidence provided by this quasi experimental research study, it can be concluded the following: firstly, there is no doubt that CL strategies are beneficial to improve students' speaking skills. Through them, students could practice their oral performance. Giving as result, improvement in their EFL comprehension, interaction, fluency, and pronunciation. Because of that, teachers, especially those teaching English speaking skills at schools need to be aware of the benefits and importance of these strategies.

In addition, through CL strategies, students' demonstrated positive attitudes toward English speaking learning. They developed good leadership skills by creating an environment of responsibility, respect, trustfulness, and communication. Similarly, they knew that their contribution during the group work was essential to accomplish the assigned tasks. Moreover, during group work, learners enjoyed sharing their ideas, opinions, and feelings. It can be concluded that CL had positive effects on the formation of students' attitudes towards motivation for spoken communication in the classroom.

Finally, the study participants perceived CL strategies as helpful speaking participation resources. These strategies helped them to increase their security and participation while performing oral tasks. Therefore, their motivation increased, too. It was possible because they received their peers' mutual help and support. All in all, it is reasonable to state that learners perceived CL strategies as an important language learning tool to development their motivation to speak in English.



## VIII. References

Ahmed, S. A., & Bedri, A. M. (2017). The role of cooperative learning in enhancing EFL learners students' oral communication skills. *International Journal of English Language, Literature and Translation Studies (IJELR)*,4 (1), 33-40.

Calderón, A. (2015). Situación de la educación rural en ecuador. Informe de asistencia técnica grupos diálogo rural – impactos a gran escala. Quito: FIDA. 58 pp.

Devia, M.S. & García, A. S. (2017). Oral skills development through the use of language learning strategies, podcasting and collaborative work. *Gist Education and Learning Research Journal*, 14, 32-40.

EF EPI. (2018). *EF English proficiency index* (8<sup>th</sup> ed.),. *EF education first Ltd.*,2-50.

Retrieved from: [www.ef.com/epi](http://www.ef.com/epi).

Euro Exam International A1. (2017). Speaking Procedure, Script and Material. *Practice test web set*. Retrieved from:

[http://www.euroexam.net/sites/international/files/private/practicetests/euro\\_a1/71\\_A1\\_WEB\\_MAT\\_Speaking.pdf](http://www.euroexam.net/sites/international/files/private/practicetests/euro_a1/71_A1_WEB_MAT_Speaking.pdf).

Hernández, R., Fernández, C. & Baptista, P. (2014). *Metodología de la Investigación* (6th ed.). México D.F.: mcgraw-hill / interamericana editores, s.a. de c.v.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R., & Holubec, E. (2013). *Cooperation in the classroom* (9th



ed.). Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2017). Cooperative Learning. *Innovación educación: I*

*congreso internacional*, 1-11. Gobierno de Aragón. Retrieved from:

[\\_https://2017.congresoinnovacion.educa.aragon.es/documents/48/](https://2017.congresoinnovacion.educa.aragon.es/documents/48/)

David\_Johnson.pdf

Kandasamy, Ch. & Habil. H. (2018). Exploring cooperative learning method to enhance

speaking skills among school students. *LSP International Journal*, 5 (2), 1-16.

<https://doi.org/10.11113/lspi.v5n2.59>

Kaniadewi, S., Sundayana, W., & Purnawrman, P. (2017). Improving students' speaking

ability in reporting procedural text by using videos. *LSP International Journal*, 5 (2),

1-16. <https://doi.org/10.11113/lspi.v5n2.59>

Lucena, R., E. & San Jose, A. (2016, March). Cooperative Learning in Enhancing the

Speaking Skills of Students: A Phenomenological Approach. *International Journal*

*of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research*, 3 (2), 67-71.

Malik, Z., Esaki-Smith, A., Lee, T., & Ngan, B. (2015). English in Ecuador: An examination

of policy, perceptions, and influencing factors. England: British Council.

MINEDUC. (2012). *National English as foreign language curriculum guidelines*.





*currículos completos*. Quito-Ecuador. Retrieved from: [educacion.gob.ec](http://educacion.gob.ec)

MINEDUC. (2014). *Ecuadorian in-service English teacher standards: the English language learning standards*. Quito-Ecuador. Retrieved from: [educacion.gob.ec](http://educacion.gob.ec)

MINEDUC. (2016). Acuerdo nro. MINEDUC-ME-2016-00020-A. Quito, Ecuador, 1-7.

Naranjo, X. & Naranjo, M. (2017). Effective pedagogical practices to develop communicative competences in large EFL classrooms. *Revista Publicando*, 12(1), 269- 283.

Nasser, O. M. (2014). Effectiveness of Cooperative Learning in enhancing speaking Skills and Attitudes towards Learning English. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 6 (4), 27-45. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v6i4.6114>

Ortega, D., & Auccahuallpa, R. (2017). La educación ecuatoriana en inglés: Nivel de dominio y competencias lingüísticas de los estudiantes rurales. *Revista Scientific*, 2(6), 52-73. <https://doi.org/10.29394/scientific.issn.2542-2987.2017.2.6.3.52-73>

Priyantín, T. (2016). *Students' attitudes towards cooperative learning in enhancing their motivation to speak*. In: The 61 TEFLIN international conference, 2014, Universitas Sebelas Maret .

Puma, E. G. (2015). El Idioma Inglés como Aporte al Desarrollo de las



Comunidades Urbano Marginales o Rurales. *Revista Vínculos*, 1(1), 48 - 49.

Rot-Vrhovec, A. (2015). Forms of cooperative learning in language teaching in

Slovenian language classes at the primary school level. *CEPS Journal*, 5(3), 129-

15. Retrieved from:

[https://www.pedocs.de/volltexte/2015/11409/pdf/cepsj\\_2015\\_3\\_RotVrhovec\\_Forms\\_of\\_cooperative\\_learning.pdf](https://www.pedocs.de/volltexte/2015/11409/pdf/cepsj_2015_3_RotVrhovec_Forms_of_cooperative_learning.pdf)

Villafuerte, J. S., Rojas, M. A., Hormaza, S. L., & Soledispa, L. A. (2018). Learning styles

and motivations for practicing English as a foreign language: a case study of role-

play in two Ecuadorian universities. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*

*Journal*, 8 (6), 555- 563. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0806.01>

Villalba, J. (2014). Classroom Assessment Suggestions. Proyecto de

Fortalecimiento de Inglés. Quito – Ecuador. Retrieved from: [educacion.gob.ec](http://educacion.gob.ec).



## Appendix 1: Consent Form

### Consentimiento de Participación - Estudio de Investigación

#### UNIVERSIDAD DE CUENCA, Cuenca, Ecuador

**Título del estudio:** *Los efectos de las estrategias cooperativas en el desarrollo del idioma inglés como Lengua Extranjera en el rendimiento oral aplicados en una escuela primaria de la zona rural.*

#### Investigador:

*Lilian C. Nievecela, Investigadora Principal – UNIVERSIDAD DE CUENCA.*

#### Introducción

- Se solicita de la manera más comedida autorizar a su represento/a ser parte del trabajo de investigación educativo sobre los efectos de las estrategias cooperativas en el desarrollo del idioma inglés como Lengua Extranjera en el rendimiento oral aplicados en esta institución educativa. El trabajo de investigación fue aprobado por la Coordinación de Investigación de la universidad de Cuenca y el mismo cuenta con el respaldo de la directora de la institución educativa.
- Su representado/a fue seleccionado/a como un/a participante potencial para este estudio por ser actualmente estudiante de inglés del séptimo año de educación básica en esta institución educativa.
- Solicito leer este documento cuidadosamente antes que autorice a su representado/a ser parte de este proyecto de investigación.

#### Propósito del Estudio

- Este proyecto pretende investigar los efectos de las estrategias cooperativas en el rendimiento oral de los estudiantes del séptimo año de educación básica, permitiéndoles alcanzar un nivel A1, siendo este el nivel establecido en el Lineamiento Curricular del idioma inglés requerido para los estudiantes que finalicen este año de básica.
- Finalmente, los resultados originales de esta investigación serán difundidos.

#### Descripción Básica de Procedimientos de Investigación

- Si usted está de acuerdo en autorizar que su representado/a participe en este estudio, su representado/a podría completar un test de inglés, ser observado en clases, y ser entrevistado. Se debe recalcar que solo una muestra (es decir solo un grupo de estudiantes) del total de la población de los estudiantes del séptimo año de la institución completarán el test de inglés y serán entrevistados. Los resultados de estas actividades ***no afectarán a sus calificaciones o promedio general*** como estudiantes.



### Riesgos (o Incomodidades) por Participar en la Investigación.

- La investigación no tiene ningún tipo de riesgos o no pretende causar ningún tipo de incomodidades entre los participantes. Este estudio no acarrea aspectos bioéticos para los participantes, quienes no serán vulnerados o puestos en riesgo en ninguna etapa de la investigación. Es decir, los participantes como los investigadores no serán objeto de ningún tipo de intervención que incluya procesos que puedan afectar su bienestar físico o psicológico.

### Derecho a Rechazar o Retirarse de la Investigación

- La decisión de participar en esta investigación es voluntaria. Usted puede oponerse a que su representado/a participe en este estudio en cualquier momento sin afectar su relación con los investigadores de este estudio o de la institución educativa. Finalmente, tiene derecho a solicitar a los investigadores que no utilicen la información obtenida a través del test de inglés, las observaciones áulicas y entrevistas en los medios de difusión de los resultados de investigación planificados.

### Consentimiento

- Su firma abajo indica que usted ha aceptado voluntariamente que su representado/a participe en la investigación y que ha leído y entendido la información proporcionada en este documento. Posteriormente, se le entregará una copia firmada y con fecha de este documento.

Nombre del o de la  
participante/ estudiante  
(por favor escriba aquí el  
nombre):

\_\_\_\_\_

\*Firma del o de la  
participante/ estudiante  
en caso que *sea mayor  
de edad*:

Fecha:

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\*Firma del o de la  
representante en caso  
que el participante/  
estudiante *sea menor de  
edad*:

Fecha:

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\*Firma del Director del  
Proyecto:

Fecha:

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**Appendix 2: Speaking Pre and Post-Test****SPEAKING TEST**

During the test there will be an interlocutor and four candidates (candidate A, candidate B, Candidate C, and candidate D).

This test will contain three tasks which are described below.

Task		Timing
<b>Interview</b>	The Interlocutor will ask each candidate two questions about everyday topics. (e.g. toy store, clothes, food , family members)	2 minutes
<b>Presentation</b>	Each candidate has a choice of on everyday topic (e.g. toy store, clothes, food family members). They prepare a fluent one-minute speech using very simple sentences about one of them in ten minutes before the exam, and present it in the exam room. The candidates may use printed (i.e. non electronic) dictionaries during the preparation.	1 minutes 1 minutes 1 minutes
<b>Picture Description</b>	Each candidate is given a picture with some differences. Students have to find 3 differences by forming simple sentences about the pictures. The students will have 10 seconds to find out the differences and then share the answers.	3 minutes

Adapted from Ministerio de Educación (2014) and Euro A1 Webset – Speaking (n.d.)

**Together with the welcome, setting up of tasks and closure, the speaking test will be no longer than 10 minutes.**

**Task 1: Interview****Two Questions to each candidate**

Choose one topic, and from the topic questions ask candidate A. Then choose a different topic for candidate B ,a different for candidate C, and a different topic for candidate D. Repeat the procedure.

**Toy Store**

1. Do you like to go to the toy store?
2. What you can buy at the toy store?

**Clothing ownership.**

1. What type of clothes do you like?
2. Name three clothes you are wearing today.

**Shopping for food**

1. What food items do you usually find in a supermarket?
2. What food items do you usually buy at the supermarket?

**Family members**

1. How do you spell \_\_\_\_\_ (a family member word)?
2. Who do you live with?

**Task 2: Presentation**



You will now give your presentations.

### ROUND 1

**Candidate A:** Which topic are you going to speak about?

Good. You have one minute. After one minute I will stop you. Please start now. Thank you.

### ROUND 2

**Candidate B:** Which topic are you going to speak about? Good. You have one minute. After

one minute I will stop you. Please start now. Thank you.

### ROUND 3

**Candidate C:** Which topic are you going to speak about? Good. You have one minute. After one minute I will stop you. Please start now. Thank you.

### ROUND 4

**Candidate D:** Which topic are you going to speak about?

Good. You have one minute. After one minute I will stop you. Please start now. Thank you.

### Presentation Topics

#### Presentation Topics: card 1

Choose one topic out of the two and prepare to speak about it for one minute. You may use your dictionary to help you make notes. Do **not** write full sentences.

**A: Your favorite toy.**

**B: Your favorite clothes**

#### Presentation Topics: card 2

Choose one topic out of the two and prepare to speak about it for one minute. You may use your dictionary to help you make notes. Do **not** write full sentences.

**A: Your favorite food.**

**B: Your family.**

### Task 3: Picture Description

In this part of the test you will speak to each other about the differences in pictures.

**Appendix 3: Evaluation Rubric****EVALUATION RUBRIC**

	<b>Poor 1-2</b>	<b>Fair 3-4</b>	<b>Good 5-6</b>	<b>Very good 7-8</b>	<b>Excellent 9-10</b>
Makes her/himself understood while responding most of the questions asked; listener rarely asks for repetition or clarification.	Unable to make her/himself understood while responding most of the questions, even when listener asks for repetition or clarification.	Unable to make her/himself understood while responding most of the questions; listener frequently asks for repetition and clarification.	Makes her/himself understood while responding at least half of the questions; listener sometimes asks for repetition or clarification.	Makes her/himself understood while responding most of the questions; listener seldom asks for repetition or clarification.	Makes her/himself understood while responding most of the questions; listener rarely asks for repetition or clarification.
Interaction ability to listen to and interact with a partner	Unable to listen attentively or respond appropriately while performing the task; fails to interact with a partner.	Unable to listen attentively or respond appropriately while performing most of the task; interacts poorly with a partner.	While performing at least half of the task, listens to another person and responds reasonably well; interacts adequately with a partner.	While performing most of the task, listens attentively to another person and responds appropriately; interacts well with a partner	While performing the task, listens attentively to another person and responds appropriately; interacts very well with a partner
Accuracy grammar, syntax, and general structures	Uncontrolled grammar and syntax, lacks knowledge of general structures.	Very frequent errors; difficulty in making meaning clear.	Frequent errors; meaning is not always clear.	Quite accurate; some errors, but meaning is clear.	Grammatical and lexical accuracy are high.
Fluency vocabulary, speed, naturalness, lack of hesitation	Unnatural and labored speech, extremely hesitant on even high-	Hesitant; very limited range of language available.	Quite hesitant; limited range of vocabulary	Some hesitation and sometimes has to search for words.	Speaks fluently without hesitation or searching for words.



	frequency vocabulary words and phrases.		and phrases.		
Pronunciation stress, rhythm, intonation patterns	Lots of errors; unclear articulation and intonation, which makes speech almost unintelligible.	Very frequent errors; often very difficult to understand.	Frequent errors; not always clear enough to understand.	Generally clear; reasonable control of stress and intonation.	Very clear; stress and intonation help to make meaning clear.

Adapted from Villalba (2014).





**Appendix 4: Scoring Rubric**

**SCORING SHEET**

Student's name: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**TASK 1: INTERVIEW**

<b>COMPONENTS</b>	<b>Poor 1-2</b>	<b>Fair 3-4</b>	<b>Good 5-6</b>	<b>Very Good 7-8</b>	<b>Excellent 9-10</b>
<b>Comprehension</b> (ability to understand questions and respond appropriately)					
<b>Interaction</b> (ability to listen to and interact with a partner)					
<b>Accuracy</b> (grammar, syntax, and general structures)					
<b>Fluency</b> (vocabulary, speed, naturalness, lack of hesitation)					
<b>Pronunciation</b> (stress, rhythm, intonation patterns)					
Total: ..... out of 50. Comments and suggestions: .....					

**TASK 2: PRESENTATION**

<b>COMPONENTS</b>	<b>Poor 1-2</b>	<b>Fair 3-4</b>	<b>Good 5-6</b>	<b>Very Good 7-8</b>	<b>Excellent 9-10</b>
<b>Comprehension</b> (ability to understand questions and respond appropriately)					
<b>Interaction</b> (ability to listen to and interact with a partner)					
<b>Accuracy</b> (grammar, syntax, and general structures)					
<b>Fluency</b> (vocabulary, speed, naturalness, lack of hesitation)					
<b>Pronunciation</b> (stress, rhythm, intonation patterns)					



Total: ..... out of 50. Comments and suggestions:  
.....

**TASK 3: PICTURE DESCRIPTION**

<b>COMPONENTS</b>	<b>Poor 1-2</b>	<b>Fair 3-4</b>	<b>Good 5-6</b>	<b>Very Good 7-8</b>	<b>Excellent 9-10</b>
<b>Comprehension</b> (ability to understand questions and respond appropriately)					
<b>Interaction</b> (ability to listen to and interact with a partner)					
<b>Accuracy</b> (grammar, syntax, and general structures)					
<b>Fluency</b> (vocabulary, speed, naturalness, lack of hesitation)					
<b>Pronunciation</b> (stress, rhythm, intonation patterns)					
Total: ..... out of 50. Comments and suggestions: ..... .					



(Adapted from Villalba, 2014)



### Appendix 5: Pre and Post-test Results

#### PRE-TEST RESULTS

Before the intervention almost all the students got poor scores in all the tasks which were the interview, the presentation, and the picture description.





### POST-TEST RESULTS

After the intervention almost all the students good fair, goo, and even excellent results.

