

Pedagogical Tasks in the Improvement of Oral Interaction

Pedagogical Tasks in the Improvement of Oral interaction

César Andrés Meneses Perdomo

Monografía presentada como requisito para optar por el título de Licenciado en Ed. Básica con
énfasis en español y Lenguas Extranjeras

Presented to Ronald Andrés Rojas López

Universidad Pedagógica Nacional de Colombia

Languages Department

October 2nd 2016

Note of acceptance:

Accepted date

Study Advisor's signature

President of the Evaluation committee's signature

Committee Member's signature

Committee Member's signature

DEDICATED TO:

My father for teaching me to never give up

My mother for her constant praying, love and succor

My little sister for being my support in my hardest moments

My brothers Fabian and Camilo for their company and life advises

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to thank first and foremost to my thesis assessor Ronald Rojas for his constant support and advices along this whole process.

I also want to thank to my teachers, most of you were to me an example to follow.

RESUMEN ANALÍTICO EN EDUCACIÓN (RAE)

1. Información General	
Tipo de documento	Trabajo de Grado
Acceso al documento	Universidad Pedagógica Nacional. Biblioteca Central
Título del documento	Pedagogical Tasks in the Improvement of Oral interaction – Tareas Pedagógicas en el Mejoramiento de la Interacción Oral
Autor(es)	Meneses Perdomo, César Andrés
Director	Rojas López, Ronald Andrés
Publicación	Bogotá. Universidad Pedagógica Nacional, 2016. 97 p.
Unidad Patrocinante	Universidad Pedagógica Nacional
Palabras Claves	TASK BASED LEARNING, ORAL INTERACTION, PEDAGOGICAL TASKS

2. Descripción
<p>El presente trabajo realizado en el Centro de Lenguas de la Universidad Pedagógica Nacional de Colombia describe un proyecto que hizo uso de la investigación acción para analizar el impacto de la aplicación de tareas pedagógicas en la interacción oral de estudiante a estudiante en un aula de inglés como lengua extranjera. La implementación buscaba dar cuenta de los cambios que pudiera generar la aplicación de este método sobre la producción oral de los estudiantes. Para ello se diseñaron tareas pedagógicas basadas en los libros de texto que los estudiantes usaron, y cuya finalidad radicaba en estimular la interacción en lengua extranjera entre los estudiantes. Los resultados arrojados por la implementación fueron analizados desde una perspectiva cualitativa a través de tres instrumentos de recolección. Los resultados fueron reportados y analizados en la última parte de éste documento.</p>

3. Fuentes
<p>A. Saint-Germain, Michelle. "PPA Research Methods 12th Session." Data Collection Strategies II: Qualitative Research. Long Beach: California State University, 1st January 2001.</p> <p>Altay, M. & Öztürk P. "Understanding and overcoming student anxieties in speaking lessons." Sofia University Foreign Language Teaching Journal, 19 (1) (2004): 23-28.</p> <p>Angelo, T.A. "A Teacher's Dozen: Fourteen General, Research-based Principles for Improving." AAHE Bulletin, 45(8) (1993).</p> <p>Austin, J. L. How to do things with words. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.</p> <p>Azar, A, Maragheh, R. "The Effect of Pedagogical Tasks in EFL Learners' Performance." The Modern journal of Applied Linguistics 4 (3) (2012): 119-128.</p> <p>Brown. Teaching by Principles. Longman, 2000.</p> <p>Brown, R. A. "Learning consequences of fear of negative evaluation and modesty for Japanese EFL students." The Language Teacher, 28 (1) (2004): 15-17.</p>

Burns, Anne. Collaborative action research for English language teachers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Burstall, C., et al. Primary French in the balance. Slough, England: NFER Publishing Company, 1974.

Calderón, E. "The Impact of Teaching Grammar Inductively Through Textbook Songs and The Task Based Language Teaching." Bogotá DC: Universidad Pedagógica Nacional de Colombia, 2015.

Carroll, D. W. Psychology of language. . California: Thomson Higher Education, 2008.

Castañeda, N and L Bedoya. "Developing English Language Communicative Competence by Doing Pedagogical and Real World Tasks." Bogotá DC: Universidad Pedagógica Nacional de Colombia, 2007.

Chandler, D & Munday, R. A Dictionary of Media and Communication. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Cook, V. "Using the first language in the classroom." Canadian Modern Language Review 57 (2001): 402-423.

Creswell, John. Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design. Thousand Oaks CA: SAGE Publications, Inc, 2013.

Crick, N. R., & Dodge, K. A. "A review and reformulation of social information-processing mechanisms in children's social adjustment." Psychological Bulletin 115 (1994): 74-101.

Denzin, N.K and Y.S. Lincoln. "Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research." Denzin, N.K and Y.S (Eds) Lincoln. The sage handbook of qualitative research. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage Publications Inc., 2005.

Dodge, KA. "A social information processing model of social competence in children." Perlmutter, M (ed). Minnesota Symposium in Child Psychology. Vol. 18. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1986. 77-125.

Edwards and Westgate. Investigating classroom talk (2nd ed.). Basingstoke: Falmer Press, 1994.

Ellis, R. Instructed second language acquisition: learning in the classroom. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd., 1990.

—. SLA research and language teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Erten, İ. H. «Student teacher's perception of peer response in writing courses at the tertiary level.» Işık University ELT conference 2000 proceedings: global problems, local solutions. Ed. M. Monty & T. Godfrey. İstanbul: Heinle and Heinle, 2000.

Europe, Council of. "Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: learning, teaching, assessment." Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Feltovich, P. J, et al. "Colaboration within and among minds: Mastering complexity, individuality and in groups." (Ed.), T. Koschmann. CSCL: Theory and practice of an emerging paradigm. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 1996. 25-44.

Fontaine, R. "Applying systems principles to models of social information." Aggression and Violent Behavior 11 (2006): 64 - 76.

Forero, Y. "Promoting Oral Interaction in Large Groups through Task-Based Learning." Profiles. Bogotá: Universidad Nacional de Colombia, 2005.

Forman, E. "The role of peer interaction in the social construction of mathematical knowledge." International Journal of Educational Research, 13 (1989): 55-70.

Gillies, R. M. "Teacher's and students' verbal behaviours during cooperative and small-group learning." British Journal of educational Psychology, 76 (2006): 271-287.

Greeno, J.G. "Learning in Activity." (ed.), R.K. Sawyer. Cambridge Handbook of the Learning Sciences. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006. 79-96.

Halliday and Hasan. Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective. Oxford: OUP, 1989.

Herazo, J. "Authentic Oral Interaction in the EFL Class: What it Means, What it Does Not." Profiles. Bogotá: Universidad Nacional de Colombia, 2009.

Jamshidnejad, A. "The construction of oral problems in an EFL context." Studies in Literature and Language 1(6) (2010): 8-22.

Järvenoja, H and S Jarvelä. "Emotion control in collaborative learning situations - Do students regulate emotions evoked from social challenges?" British Journal of Educational Psychology (79) (2009): 463-481.

Kondo, A. "Students' perception of group work in EFL class." Nara National College of Technology (2010): 65-73.

Krashen, S.D. Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition. Oxford: Pergamon, 1982.

Kumaravadivelu, B. "The name of the task and the task of naming: Methodological aspects of task-based pedagogy." Gass, G. Crookes and S. Tasks in a Pedagogical Context. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1993. 69-96.

Larsen-Freeman, D. "State of the art on input in second language acquisition." Input in second language acquisition (1985): 433-444.

Lenguas, Centro de. Lineamientos Pedagógicos y Metodológicos del Centro de Lenguas de la Universidad Pedagógica Nacional. Bogotá: Universidad Pedagógica Nacional de Colombia, 2014. Digital.

Lightbown, P. "What do we have here? Some observations on the influence of instruction on L2 learning." Foreign/Second language pedagogy research (1991): 97-212.

Liu, J. " L1 use in L2 vocabulary learning: facilitator or barrier?" International Education Studies, 1 (2) (2008): 66-70.

Long, M. H. "A role for instruction in second language acquisition: Task-based language training." Pienemann, K. Hyltenstam & M. Modelling and assessing second language acquisition. Clevedon Avon England: Multilingual Matters, 1985.

Long, M.H. Porter, P.A. «Group work, interlanguage talk and second language acquisition.» TESOL Quarterly 19 (2) (1985): 07-227.

Loos, Eugene E., et al. "What is interrogative mood?" Glossary of linguistic terms. SIL International, 28 12 2009.

Macaro, E. "Codeswitching in the L2 classroom: a communication and learning strategy." Non-native Language Teachers: Perceptions, Challenges and Contributions to the Profession (2005): 63-84.

Makitalo, et al. "Mechanisms of common ground in case-based web discussions in teacher education." The Internet and Higher Education (5) (2002): 247-265.

Nemat, A. & Nasiri, M. "The Effect of Using Task-Based Activities on Speaking Proficiency of EFL Learners." The Third Asian Conference on Education 2011 Official Proceedings. Osaka: JALT, 2011. 333-345.

NR, Crick and Dodge KA. "A review and reformulation of social-information processing mechanisms." Children's development. Psychological Bulletin 115 (1994): 74-101.

Nunan, D. "Action research in the language classroom." (eds), J. C. Richards and D. Nunan. Second language teacher education. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,

1990.

Nunan, D. Research methods in language learning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Paker, T & Karaağaç, O. "The use and functions of mother tongue in EFL classes." An International Conference on Teaching and Learning English as an Additional. Ed. GlobELT. Antalya, Turkey: GlobELT, 2015. 111 – 119.

Parga, F. "Cooperative Structures of Interaction in a Public School EFL Classroom in Bogotá." Colombian Journal of Applied Linguistics. Bogotá: Universidad Distrital Francisco José de Caldas, 2009.

Peña, M. Onatra, A. "Promoting Oral Production through the Task-Based Learning Approach: A Study in a Public Secondary School in Colombia." Profiles. Bogotá: Universidad Nacional de Colombia, 2009.

Pine, Gerald J. "Conducting Teacher Action Research." Pine, Gerald J. Teacher Action Research Building Knowledge Democracies. Boston: Sage Publications Inc., Boston College, 2009. 234-262.

Pütz, M and L Sicola. Cognitive Processing in Second Language Acquisition. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2010.

Richards, Jack. Communicative Language Teaching Today. United States of America: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Robinson, H. A. The Ethnography of Empowerment – The Transformative Power of Classroom Interaction. Newbury Park, U.S.A.: Sage Publications, 1994.

Rodriguez, Sergio. «Task-Based Learning Strategies and Autonomous Work: A Way to Develop Speaking Skills On Students.» Bogotá: Universidad Pedagógica Nacional de Colombia, 2013.

Sachs, T & Ho, B. ESL/EFL Cases. Contexts for Teacher Professional Discussions. Kowloon, Hong Kong: City University of Hong Kong Press, 2007.

Sánchez, S. "Communicative Tasks in A Group of Children at The International Language Institute at The UPTC." Enletawa Journal. Tunja: Universidad Pedagógica y Tecnológica de Colombia, 2012.

Schutt, R. Investigating the Social World The Process and Practice of Research 8th Edition. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage Publicatons Inc., 2015.

Skehan, P. A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Storch, N. "Comparing ESL learners' attention to grammar on three different classroom tasks." RELC Journal, 32 (2001): 104-124.

Sullivan, P. «Playfulness as Mediation Communicative Language Teaching in a Vietnamese Classroom.» Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning (2000).

Swain, M. "Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development." Gass, S. and Madden, C. Input in Second Language Acquisition. New York: Newbury House, 1985. 235-256.

Swain, M. "Communicative competence: some roles of comprehensible output in its development." (Eds.), S. Gass & C. Maddern. Input in second language acquisition. Cambridge, MA: Newberry House Publishers, 1985. 235-253.

Swain, M., Brooks, L., & Tocalli-Beller, A. "Peer-peer dialogue as means of second language learning." Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 22 (2002): 171–185.

Tang, H, J Chiou and O. Jarsaillon. "Efficacy of Task-Based Learning in a Chinese EFL

Classroom." *English Language Teaching*; Vol. 8 (5) (2015): 168-176.

Tudor, I. *The Dynamics of the Language Classroom*. Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Turnbull, M. "There is a role for the L1 in second and foreign language teaching, but..." *Canadian Modern Language Review* 57 (2001): 531-540.

Ur, Penny. *A Course in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Van Lier, L. "From input to affordance: Social-interactive learning from an ecological perspective." *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning*. 2000. 245-259.

Van Lier, L. *Interaction in the language curriculum: Awareness, autonomy and*. Harlow, England: Addison Wesley Longman Limited, 1996.

Volet, S. E and C Mansfield. "Group work at university: Significance of personal goals in the regulation strategies of students with positive and negative appraisals." *Higher Education, Research and Development*, 25 (2006): 341-356.

Wicking, P. "Transforming textbook activities into successful tasks." *JALT2009 Conference Proceedings*. Ed. A. M. Stoke. Tokyo: JALT, 2010. 466-473.

Willis, J. *A framework for task-based learning*. Harlow: Longman, 1996.

Wray, D. Kumpulainen, K. "Researching classroom interaction and talk." (Ed.), D. Hartas. *Educational research and inquiry, Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2010. 170-185.

4. Contenidos

El documento fue dividido en 8 capítulos de la siguiente manera:

Capítulo 1: Introducción

En esta parte se describió el contexto general en el que se enmarcó la investigación, la población con quien se aplicó, el planteamiento del problema, la justificación del proyecto, así como la pregunta problema y los objetivos establecidos para la implementación.

Capítulo 2: Marco teórico

Este capítulo describió conceptos y teorías tomadas como base para la construcción de la propuesta y la revisión de investigaciones elaboradas previamente que presentan puntos en común con este proyecto.

Capítulo 3: Metodología de investigación

Aquí se describieron aspectos importantes en relación con la metodología como el enfoque investigativo, la técnica de recolección y tratamiento de los datos, y los indicadores a ser analizados.

Capítulo 4: Propuesta pedagógica

Este apartado describió la propuesta pedagógica en general, da a conocer su enfoque, las etapas de implementación, el tiempo en el aula y las actividades que fueron desarrolladas.

Capítulo 5: Análisis de datos

Se presentaron los resultados obtenidos y analizados durante el proceso de implementación en función de las categorías y los indicadores expuestos anteriormente. Se hizo también una exposición general de los resultados obtenidos en el análisis de cada una de las categorías.

Capítulo 7: Conclusiones

Se realizó un balance de cada uno de los objetivos planteados para el proyecto y de los aprendizajes obtenidos de la intervención pedagógica.

Capítulo 8: Recomendaciones generales

Por último, se dio una serie de sugerencias pedagógicas, investigativas y disciplinarias dirigidas a los diferentes actores del proceso pedagógico en la institución y en la universidad.

5. Metodología

El proyecto se rigió bajo los principios de la investigación acción, siguiendo las siguientes etapas:

- Observación: Se hizo una observación y se diagnosticó una situación en el aula de clase susceptible a ser mejorada a través de una intervención.
- Planeación: Se diseñó un plan de intervención para ser implementado durante los dos semestres del año 2016 teniendo como base la aplicación de tareas pedagógicas y lo que pudiera revelar sobre la interacción entre estudiantes.
- Reflexión: Se recolectó información acerca del proceso de implementación con el fin de reflexionar acerca de la efectividad de la intervención y posibles puntos por mejorar.
- Re-planeación: A partir de los resultados recolectados en la etapa anterior, se replantearon aspectos dentro de la propuesta y las planeaciones de clase para maximizar así la efectividad de las técnicas empleadas.

6. Conclusiones

Teniendo en cuenta la implementación y sus resultados, se llegó a las siguientes conclusiones:

La aplicación de tareas pedagógicas garantizó a los estudiantes el hacer uso de la lengua extranjera ya que les permitió involucrarse en actos comunicativos en los cuales afianzaron sus habilidades comunicativas, pero se necesitó que los niños se hicieran conscientes de su proceso de aprendizaje para tener éxito.

Los estudiantes más inseguros en términos de habilidades de escucha y habla sintieron una mejora considerable luego de la aplicación de las tareas pedagógicas en clase, al mismo tiempo mejoraron su auto confianza en términos de uso de la lengua extranjera

gracias a la interacción entre pares.

El investigador aprendió y reflexionó sobre las ventajas y las desventajas en la implementación del aprendizaje por tareas pedagógicas, también aprendió el fin de la preparación de clases como una forma de ejecutar de manera apropiada las tareas en clase. El investigador reflexionó también sobre las implicaciones que conlleva el trabajar con niños.

Elaborado por:	César Andrés Meneses Perdomo
Revisado por:	Ronald Andrés Rojas Lopez

Fecha de elaboración del Resumen:	02	10	2016
--	----	----	------

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	11
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	12
1.1 Setting	12
1.2 Population Characteristics	14
1.3 Needs Analysis	16
1.4 Statement of the problem	19
1.5 Rationale	20
1.6 Research Question	23
1.7. Research Objectives (General-Specific)	23
CHAPTER 2: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	24
2.1 Review Literature	24
2.2 Theoretical framework	30
2.2.1 Interaction	31
2.2.2 Student-student Oral Interaction	33
2.2.2.1 First Unit - Cognitive Processing	34
2.2.2.2 Second Unit - Social Processing	36
2.2.2.3 Third Unit - Discourse Functions	37
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METODOLOGY	40
3.1 Type of study	40
3.2 Method of research	40
3.3 Roles	41
3.3.1 Role of the Teacher	41
3.3.2 Role of the Student	42
3.4 Purpose of the Study and Possible Outcome	42
3.5 Research Design	42
3.6 Categories of Analysis	43
3.7 Population Mean	44
3.8 Data Collection	44
3.8.1 Instruments for data Collection	44
CHAPTER 4: PEDAGOGICAL PROPOSAL	45
4.1 Language Teaching Approach - Task Based Learning	46
4.1.2 Pedagogical Tasks	46
4.2 Vision of Language	46
4.3 Vision of the classroom	47
4.4 Type of Contents	47
4.5 Results, Expected Products and Potential Beneficiaries	47
4.6 Resources and Activities	48
4.7. Stages of the Intervention	49
4.7.1 Observing Stage	49

4.7.2 Application Stage	49
4.7.3 Closing Stage	50
4.8 Pedagogical Platform	51
4.9 Type of Evaluation	51
CHAPTER 5: DATA ANALYSIS	52
5.1 Analysis management	52
5.2 Data analysis	53
5.2.1 Cognitive Processing	54
5.2.2 Social Processing	59
5.2.3 Discourse Functions	63
5.3 Analysis of Results	67
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS	68
CHAPTER 7: GENERAL SUGGESTIONS	70
REFERENCES	71
APPENDICES	75

LIST OF TABLES AND ANNEXES

TABLE 1. List of projects to support the literature review

TABLE 2. Units of analysis

TABLE 3. Description of the appendices

ANNEX 1. Data Collection-Analysis Chronogram

ANNEX 2. Academic program for the year 2016

ANNEX 3. Lesson Plan Model

ANNEX 4. Informed consent form

ANNEX 5. Field Notes sample

ABSTRACT

This study explored the impact generated by the use of Pedagogical Tasks in an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom, on student-student oral interaction. It examined the changes produced in twenty-one Colombian EFL students' cognitive processing, social processing and discourse functions when interacting among peers by means of solving pedagogical tasks in the languages center of a public university located in Bogotá Colombia.

Among the findings, the students recognized the use of the Foreign Language by means of Pedagogical Tasks as being of use in order to master their language employment, on the other hand it showed that some students required the use of their mother tongue as a valid mean to master their FL and complete tasks. The students were also able to communicate their misunderstandings, and were also willing to help their classmates when using the FL or when solving tasks; the students also made meaning by actively participating in the task solving process. The use of interrogative and informative functions in the students' speech evidenced not only their intentions of solving the proposed pedagogical tasks, but that constant usage of those functions helped the students to raise to a higher degree their oral skills. The students became aware that they could take an active role as language providers, it was a long process, though.

KEY WORDS

Oral interaction, peer to peer interaction, Task Based Learning, Pedagogical Tasks

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Setting

This study took place at Centro de Lenguas from Universidad Pedagógica Nacional de Colombia in Bogotá DC, located in La Porciúncula, a neighborhood from the Chapinero District. The EFL program is 'Kids from 7 to 9 years old' in the Intermediate 2 level, which was observed from August, second term of the year 2015, to December, second term of the year 2016. The general aim of this English program is to expose students to a first contact with the British and American language and cultures. This languages center offers that program in semester-long courses modality. The kids must attend to 72 scheduled hours of class and 8 hours of autonomous work for a total of 80 hours per level. The classes are on Saturdays from 8:00 AM to 12:00 PM, having a half an hour recess.

Among the resources, the languages center has audiovisual devices at the teachers' disposition. The books and disks to be used for the term are provided to the teachers a week before classes begin.

The program aims to have students able to express orally their opinions about different topics, their experiences and the things they like. Another aim that Centro de Lenguas Universidad Pedagógica Nacional has, is making students understand texts related to familiar topics and also that they can produce descriptive paragraphs and speeches about people, events or processes.

In order to do so, Centro de Lenguas Universidad Pedagógica Nacional follows the understanding and the theoretical postulates from the Communicative Language Teaching method, in which the participant roles and the implemented materials are essential for the development of all the activities in class. The aforementioned is grounded in their function as creators and promoters of communicative contexts that allow the constant interaction in the classroom (Lineamientos Pedagógicos y Metodológicos del Centro de Lenguas de la Universidad Pedagógica Nacional, 2014).

The students are evaluated in three cutoff terms; the evaluation criteria process is based in both qualitative and quantitative system. This was done by means of the activities developed through each of the terms, which aim is to identify the students' weaknesses and strengths. Feedback is given on a regular basis. Formative assessment is done through the use of different activities such as the platform tasks done via Internet through sites like www.edmodo.com and www.schoology.com, which develop the students' autonomy, responsibility and motivation towards their learning process. In those sites the teacher creates a course and assigns every student a code for the course. Then students can access material, such as workshops, links that contain listening and speaking exercises, as well as reading and writing exercises according to the level they are at that moment.

Also an important part of the activities developed throughout the term is classwork. Said activities are developed by the students under the teacher's guidance. A summative assessment is done at the end of every term through the implementation of an exam. The first and the second term contain 30% of the grade each, and the percentages in both terms are assigned this way: The platform activities carry 5% of the grade. The classwork carries 10% of the grade, and the first and second term exams (both of them evaluating reading, writing, listening, grammar and

speaking) carry 15% of the grade. The final term keeps the same percentages for platform and classwork (5% and 10% respectively), but the final exam has a bigger percentage of the grade being this, 25% of it. This final exam also evaluates reading, writing, listening, grammar and speaking skills.

1.2 Population Characteristics

There was a total of 15 students in that group from August 15th (Date in which the observation stage started) to December 11th 2015 (Date in which the observation stage finished), in which there were 10 girls and 5 boys.

All of the students used a text book, different for each level, it provided them with various entertaining and simple activities in each unit. The students also prepared a project during the semester, where the students showed at the last day of the term their speaking abilities to their teacher, parents and peers.

The students in that group came from different educational backgrounds, most of them studied in private schools, the rest of them, studied in public schools. They came from the 3rd and 4th social strata. Most of the students in that group have already had previous instruction in English language and made use of it in class with no difficulty. Quite few students, despite having previous knowledge of the language, were still having difficulties by using it to express themselves.

In the first part of the morning class (8:00 AM to 9:30 AM) most of the students arrived to class earlier than their teacher. As soon as the teacher entered the class, they arranged the sits in a half-moon position. Depending on whether the teacher started the unit or continued it, the students remained silent. Most of the students brought homework done in the book, some of

them brought copies given as homework and at first only few of them brought the project homework. When working in groups, some students used English to talk among themselves, but most of the other groups worked in Spanish.

In the second part of the morning class (10:00 AM to 12:00 PM) the students arrived after their recess, when the group was complete the teacher had them doing an activity, they were silent when the teacher explained a topic. This second part of the class varied the most because the students worked in pages from the book, or in workshops to be solved in class, or the teacher made them play games in which they had to use the FL for one hour, the remaining hour was used to work on the project. The researcher noticed in certain activities (Answering questions in class) that the students used the target language, but in other activities (Work group activities) the students used the mother tongue more.

When working on the projects, the teacher had the students working on the pronunciation of difficult words from the pieces of information they brought. The teacher assisted the groups, in which each student read a part of their presentation to her, following further feedback. To end the class, the teacher gave her students important information in Spanish and made them organize the classroom for them to leave to their houses.

When the students were in exams, the observed part was the speaking part, in it, most of the students performed properly. The researcher got to know about the results of the whole exams thanks to the teacher in charge. According to her, most of the results in listening, written and grammar parts were very good. The researcher was also present in two of the three parents' meetings, in which the teacher congratulated the kids and their parents for their effort and good results.

1.3 Needs Analysis

The process of observation started on August 15th and finished on December 11th 2015. The main objective in those observation sessions was to look for any relevant issue that affected somehow the students' learning process of the English language. To register those sessions field notes were used, it is an instrument which for Burns (1999) are accounts of the events occurred in the research setting which are written in a factual-objective like style.

The collected data from the observations in the field notes were all the events that occurred in the classroom, including the observer's personal opinions about those situations. All that information was taken and was organized in proformas, which helped to separate objective observations from subjective observations through headings that separate both of them (Burns, 1999), they helped to keep in order the collected information for it to be accessed easily. The model used for the proformas was a four-column document that contained the following information under the four headings (Notes taken -to register the events of the classes as they occurred-; Notes made column -to register the personal points of view of the observer-; Issues column -to register the situations that were considered negative in that class-; Theoretical background column to register the theoretical back up that confirmed the detected problem-)

The proformas helped deducing a persistent phenomenon in each observed class, the students were not making use of the FL to interact among themselves despite they were at that moment part of an Intermediate 2 level, in which students were supposed to use of the FL in class more.

There were communicative activities done in the classroom in which they had to interact in the English language:

“the kids were supposed to practice a simple and brief conversation; some kids were translating the conversation into Spanish and practiced the conversation in the mother tongue.” (Proforma 3 August 29th 2015)

In another class the students were supposed to carry on a brief project in which the use of the English language was essential, some of the kids used English at the beginning of the activity and at certain point of it, one kid from the group said:

“Ay me cansé, hablemos en español ¿Si?” (Proforma 3 Sat Aug 22nd 2015)

So, as a result the kids who were speaking in English stopped doing it and consequently started communicating with their classmates in the mother tongue.

In other activities, some students asked the teacher to let them talk in Spanish, the teacher refused to such requests because she understood the importance of using the FL in classroom activities, the kids then either spoke in English, or babbled or even simply restrained themselves to express what they wanted to say.

Having into account that only field notes and proformas were not enough to accurately find an issue, the researcher applied surveys because they provided more information from the students and teacher's points of view, which allowed the data triangulation. Instruments as surveys "involve predetermined questions presented in written form ... and have the advantage of being easier and less time-consuming to administer than interviews, and the responses of larger number of informants can be gathered" (Burns, 1999, p.129).

The designed surveys for the teacher and the students were no longer than three (3) pages. The teacher's survey was written in English and contained questions regarding with her students' progress in the use of the FL. The students' survey was written in Spanish and contained questions related to the way they saw their foreign language learning process. Both

surveys contained questions with a common element, the factors they considered were hindering the students' use of the foreign language in class.

From the teacher's survey, it was concluded that despite most of the kids knew the basics of the language, some of them simply did not make use of it due to factors such as the lack of practice at home and their age, now, when asked about the reasons why these factors could hinder the students' language acquisition process, the teacher did not say much to clarify it. Jamshidnejad (2010) pointed the unsupportive environment in and out of the classroom and the lack of partners (which not only had to be present, but also willing to use of the language in class) is considered as the main reason for low proficiency in L2 oral communication among learners in an EFL context. Bearing in mind that, it is understandable what the teacher says about the lack of practice at home, without partners willing to practice or without encouragement in the students' homes, their speaking skills will not develop much.

But when it came about the age of the students it is difficult to agree with the teacher, Carroll (2008) thinks that young children learn L2 better than older children and adults. He adds to this idea that although "older learners seem to do better initially but they reach a plateau; younger learners eventually catch up and pass them" (p.331). This just means that learners, especially children are able to learn languages even better than teenagers or adults.

The teacher said (When she explained the results she gave in the survey) that despite students brought homework most of the times, a good way to practice the language was by developing the exercises left on the platform, which very few of the students did. She also insisted very often to students to use the FL at least in classes because those were the only times they could use what they were learning. She also said that students and parents considered that

the work done in class was enough practice for the week, and that might be, according to the teacher, one of the reasons why some students in the course did not use the FL.

The teacher also considered that maybe young learners were not able to make use of the language despite they understand it. Why did the teacher consider that age is a limitation to make use of the foreign language? The lack of practice of the FL can indeed be a problem to the development of the language, but can the learners' ages be a problem?

The following questions arose from the students' responses, if they were in an intermediate 2 level then, why did they feel they lacked of vocabulary to understand their peers and teacher when at that level, they were supposed to have a considerable amount of words and expressions to speak their minds? Could it be a lack of commitment from the students with their learning process? Could the students that translate information be affecting negatively their peers in terms of them understanding a FL message? Did the students feel any need to make use of the FL in class? Why were not the students considering themselves as the source of vocabulary and expressions for their peers?

1.4 Statement of the problem

The triangulation of the collected data by means of field notes (organized in the proformas), and surveys applied to both teacher and students in the observing stage, confirmed after a process of analysis, the following: The students' responses revealed that a considerable number did not feel able to express what they wanted or needed to say in the FL, that explained why they were always speaking in Spanish, and some of them, despite having little to no difficulty speaking in English, did not make use of it because the rest of their peers preferred to use Spanish.

The teacher's answers in the survey revealed that students only used English for the activities, but when it came to interaction among peers Spanish was frequently used and due to the lack of use of the FL, she thought her students faced difficulties when interacting in it.

The in-class observations revealed that despite the students' good performance in exams, and some class activities, according to the results given to the parents on the first meeting, the students used Spanish language to interact among themselves and to their teacher in class instead of making use of the English language. That lack of use of the target language at in-class interactions with their teacher and peers affected its learning and subsequent mastery.

1.5 Rationale

What this section intends to prove is that the constant use of the FL in class is a valuable source to learn vocabulary as well as different expressions that are used to express opinions, ideas and feelings. It also intends to show that the teacher is not the only source of these expressions but the learners themselves in class.

To begin with, according to Krashen's (1982) comprehensible input hypothesis defenders, justify the exposition of learners to extensive periods of comprehensible TL input in order to master it. Additionally, to that, Swain (1985) argues that producing the TL is a relevant aspect of the learning process and opportunities should be given to students to produce spoken output regarding with the TL.

Macaro (2005) indicates that there is a continuity of the points of view regarding with the uses of target language and first language. One of the sides pleads for the FL to see a little pedagogical or communicative usefulness in the first language. Besides, researchers have demonstrated that the amount of FL input affects learners' FL improvement (for example

Larsen-Freeman, 1985; Lightbown, 1991; Turnbull, 2001; Liu, 2008) and have conclusively proved a direct and positive correlation between learner achievement and teacher use of the target language (Burstall, Jamison, Cohen, & Hargreaves, 1974; Carroll, 1975; Wolf, 1977). Van Lier (2000) and Cook (2001).

Additionally, for this study all of the TL input does not only come from the teacher, according to Nunan (1992) learners do not have to be dependent on their teacher to be their only interlocutor and their language input supplier and what is more, according to Erten (2000) it is possible for peers to put at disposal of their equals the target language models used in order to interact with each other.

About FL classes and the materials used in them, Lineamientos Pedagógicos y Metodológicos del Centro de Lenguas de la Universidad Pedagógica Nacional (2014) state that the materials used in class are Task Based because they can be shared with other students in couples or groups, which helps students to focalize language functions, carry out inference, deduction exercises, and exchange of comprehension questions and arguing.

Concerning to the introduction to the class, Richards (Quoted by Lineamientos Pedagógicos y Metodológicos del Centro de Lenguas de la Universidad Pedagógica Nacional, 2014) indicate that there are two leading principles. Being the first, language going beyond grammar patterns and vocabulary, and the second being language presented and used in communicative situations by giving the students chances to know and use the language. This means that the students will learn the formal and informal foreign language taught in class, they are also going to use it in class, and outside the class for them to express their thoughts and ideas.

Regarding with the use of language, Lineamientos Pedagógicos y Metodológicos del Centro de Lenguas de la Universidad Pedagógica Nacional (2014) declare that in the practice of

the foreign language, the students will evidence its comprehension and they will enhance the acquired knowledge through the oral interaction exercises. Besides, one of the teachers' duties is to prepare exercises that aim to the use of the target language under communicative contexts, and to make sure that the students are indeed using the target language in class.

Lineamientos Pedagógicos y Metodológicos del Centro de Lenguas de la Universidad Pedagógica Nacional (2014) also state that despite the use of the mother tongue to translate is a natural mechanism in the FL learning process, the goal is that both teacher and students keep the use of the mother tongue as a last resort under certain circumstances e.g. the students not understanding an instruction given too many times.

About the abilities to develop in class in terms of speaking, Lineamientos Pedagógicos y Metodológicos del Centro de Lenguas de la Universidad Pedagógica Nacional (2014) point that the production skills (writing and speaking) are the most important because they are the main evidence of a successful language learning process, in which is possible to notice how the learners have internalized the structures to communicate their points of view from the use of the FL. The document also says that oral interaction based activities and task based activities not only motivate the students to talk more because of their dynamism or because they simulate communicative contexts, but also helps the teacher to provide feedback on the students' progress so students can improve their autonomous use of the FL.

All in all, there is literature that supports the use of the TL in the Foreign Language Classroom as a way to foster the English language interaction in class. It has been shown that the languages center of Universidad Pedagógica de Colombia supports the use of TBI activities and materials because said activities motivated the students more to make use of the target language in the classroom in to express their ideas, thoughts and feelings. The fact that the Languages

Center students' use the FL for oral interaction, evidence their knowledge of the FL. The languages center also considers that the use of the FL in the classroom helps both the teacher and the students, the teacher provides feedback which will be helpful for students to improve their oral production skills. The importance of this study is backed up with the exposed information here.

1.6 Research Question

What does the implementation of pedagogical tasks reveal about student-student oral interaction in an A2 EFL classroom?

1.7 Research Objectives

General

To analyze the impact of pedagogical tasks over the EFL oral interaction in the students of the intermediate-advanced group at the Languages Center of Universidad Pedagógica Nacional.

Specific

- To establish the relationship between the use of pedagogical tasks and the students' oral communicative process.
- To examine changes in the students' oral interaction when working with pedagogical tasks.

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Literature Review

In order to begin with this research project, ten documents among studies and projects were read, analyzed and given a digest, and they describe the impact of the use of pedagogical tasks in the EFL classroom as a way to improve oral interaction, as well as some extra learning strategies in the EFL classroom that are closely linked to the use of tasks. The following research studies provided worthy and useful information for the development of this study.

Table 1

<i>List of projects to support the literature review</i>				
<i>Name of the project</i>	<i>Author (s)</i>	<i>University</i>	<i>City/Country of publication</i>	<i>Year of publication</i>
Task-Based Learning Strategies and Autonomous Work: A Way to Develop Speaking Skills on Students	Rodriguez Aldana Sergio Andrés	Universidad Pedagógica Nacional de Colombia	Bogotá Colombia	2013
Developing English Language Communicative Competence by Doing Pedagogical and Real World Tasks	Nidia Elizeth Castañeda and Lorena Diaz Bedoya	Universidad Pedagógica Nacional de Colombia	Bogotá Colombia	2007
The Impact of Teaching Grammar Inductively Through Textbook Songs and The Task Based Language Teaching	Elizabeth Rojas Calderón	Universidad Pedagógica Nacional de Colombia	Bogotá Colombia	2015
Promoting Oral Interaction in Large Groups through Task-Based Learning	Forero Rocha Yolima	Universidad Nacional de Colombia	Bogotá Colombia	2005

Promoting Oral Production through the Task-Based Learning Approach: A Study in a Public Secondary School in Colombia	Peña Mireya, Onatra Amparo	Universidad Nacional de Colombia	Bogotá Colombia	2009
Cooperative Structures of Interaction in a Public School EFL Classroom in Bogotá	Parga Herrera Fernando	Universidad Distrital Francisco José de Caldas	Bogotá Colombia	2009
Authentic Oral Interaction in the EFL Class: What It Means, What It Does not	Herazo Rivera José David	Universidad Nacional de Colombia	Bogotá Colombia	2009
Communicative Tasks in A Group of Children at The International Language Institute at The UPTC	Sánchez Matamoros Sergio Nicolás	Universidad Pedagógica y Tecnológica de Colombia	Tunja Colombia	2012
The Effect of Pedagogical Tasks in EFL Learners' Performance	Ali Sorayaie Azar & Raheleh Taheri Maragheh	The Modern journal of Applied Linguistics	Teheran Iran	2012
Efficacy of Task-Based Learning in a Chinese EFL Classroom	Hersong Tang, Jer-Shiou Chiou & Oliver Jarsaillon	Shih Chien University	Taiwan, China	2015

The first project read is *Task-based Learning Strategies and Autonomous Work: A Way to Develop Speaking Skills on Students* by Sergio Andrés Rodríguez Aldana. In that project the author describes the learners' impact in the development of their communicative skills through autonomous work, emphasized in the students' oral skills it also analyzed the impact caused by the application of autonomous work over the students' target language learning process in a centered textbook-class framework. The contributions from this project can be seen in the following: Both were carried on at Centro de Lenguas de la Universidad Pedagógica Nacional;

the main objective of that project is the same as the one found in this project, which is having students making use of the foreign language in class; the use of tasks and having students working in couples or groups and some theoretical references as well as the positive results obtained in this project were also useful.

The second project read was *Developing English Language Communicative Competence by Doing Pedagogical and Real World Tasks* written by Nidia Elizeth Castañeda and Lorena Diaz Bedoya. The authors carried out an action-research proposal in two public school seventh grade EFL courses in Bogotá. From those courses four students of each course were selected to solve pedagogical and real world tasks. The researchers used field notes, recordings and surveys to collect data. The authors concluded that the students were motivated by the use of real material in the context of authentic communication, which helped them to learn English grammar without difficulty. Besides that, it is seen that the use of pedagogical tasks developed in the students a sense of cooperation among peers while carrying them out. The contributions from this study are seen in the suggested materials for the data collection in TBA, as well as the positive outcomes in terms of the students' increasing understanding of the FL and the development of cooperation among peers.

The third study read is titled *The Impact of Teaching Grammar Inductively Through Textbook Songs and The Task Based Language Teaching*, written by Elizabeth Rojas Calderón was conducted at Centro de Lenguas de la Universidad Pedagógica Nacional with a group of seven to nine-year-old kids. The main objective of the project was focused on the use of Task Based Learning to teach grammar inductively through textbook songs. They had the purpose of enrichening the students' knowledge about grammar through an inductive approach, which proposed songs in a textbook as the main tasks that sought to develop communicative and

writing processes by creating trust, and cultural reflection about the topic the songs presented. The pedagogical proposal was based in the six steps of class proposed in both TBA and the inductive approach. The data was analyzed under a qualitative framework. The project contributed to this study with the positive results that textbook songs seen as tasks had in helping the students understand the English grammar better, and thus improving the students' development in class.

The fourth study read was *Promoting Oral Interaction in Large Groups through Task-Based Learning* written by Yolima Forero Rocha. The study was performed in a public school in Bogotá named Instituto Educativo Distrital Isabel II on some seventh-grade students who did not take the chances to communicate in English. The teacher-researchers chose the task based learning methodology for use in large groups to provide them with reasons to interact by making use of the target language. Forero's study was helpful because in it the author proposed the use of task based activities in large groups, the target population in this research is considerably large but not as large as the one in Forero's study. The change of seating arrangements depending on the activity was also something very useful that contributed to this study as well as the way the author used the Willis' framework for task based activities in her study.

Promoting Oral Production through the Task-Based Learning Approach: A Study in a Public Secondary School in Colombia was the fifth study read and it was written by Mireya Peña and Amparo Onatra. EFL students at Francisco de Paula Santander School in Bogotá Colombia did not use confidently the spoken language due to the institution's emphasis in literacy and preparation of students on standardized tests. That lead the English teachers in there to set the oral skills activities aside in classes. Peña and Onatra's contributions for this project are seen in the shared purpose of having EFL students interacting and expressing their ideas by using the

foreign language; the way they followed the three cycle phases proposed by Willis (1996); the way how students' mistakes are seen as a positive learning tool that reinforced learning processes, adding to it that despite students are exposed to accurate pieces of the TL, some of them did not reach a high level of proficiency in the language; it showed how teachers encouraged their students in class to use the FL to express themselves.

Cooperative Structures of Interaction in a Public School EFL Classroom in Bogotá by Fernando Parga Herrera was the sixth study read. It aimed to answer how the implementation of cooperative learning structures of interaction affected the communication skills of eight graders with interpersonal conflicts at a public school in Bogota. As contributions, this project listed the different models of action research peer to peer interaction analysis; the different ideas of the activities that were used on students, and how they helped in improving the classroom's environment (the students' problematic interpersonal relations). Another contribution is seen in a conclusion that shows how low-level students use non-verbal strategies when interacting, and the use of pronunciation strategies to present information from the mother tongue to the TL by students with proper non-verbal gestures. The article also provided valuable information about how to deal with reluctant students in these kinds of projects.

The seventh article read was written by José David Herazo Rivera and it is titled *Authentic Oral Interaction in the EFL Class: What It Means, What It Does not*. In that study the author provides information about the activities that can be considered as authentic oral interaction in EFL classrooms in Colombia, and how effective they are to develop meaningful oral production in student-student and student-teacher exchanges of information, through showing four samples of oral communication exchanges that occurred in Colombian EFL secondary school classrooms in Monteria. Rivera's article contributed greatly to this research by helping the researcher to

define what interactive activities are considered to be true and meaningful for the students in EFL classes.

The eighth study read was written by Sergio Nicolás Sanchez Matamoros. Titled *Communicative Tasks in a Group of Children at the International Language Institute at the UPTC*, showed the implementation of two of communicative tasks for student interaction to take place at the International Language Institute at UPTC. The contributions from Sanchez's study to this research are seen in the both researches the populations' ages, which are almost near. Both researches are held at a languages center or institute belonging to a public university. The activities done in the research gave a glimpse of what activities can be used in classes with kids in a public languages center to stimulate interaction in the FL, as well as the positive outcomes the researcher showed in the study, which are also expected in this project.

Ali Sorayaie Azar and Raheleh Taheri Maragheh were the writers of the ninth study which is titled *The Effect of Pedagogical Tasks in EFL Learners' Performance*. This research studied the influence of the TBL approach, specifically on the Pedagogical Tasks on the students' motivation and language performance in the EFL classroom, and the effectivity in the implementation of the approach. The research was carried out at Maragheh Islamic Azad University in Iran, and the subjects of the study were university students between 17 and 23 years old. The researchers used diaries, and questionnaires as data collection instruments and a T-test to analyze data. The researchers concluded that TBL was helpful in boosting the students' learning and motivation because they found they were given opportunities to practice the TL as a result of the completion of tasks. This article contributed not only with the theory regarding with Pedagogical Tasks, but with the positive outcomes that the application of the aforementioned approach, including the students' motivation in class and enjoyable classroom atmosphere.

The last article titled *Efficacy of Task-Based Learning in a Chinese EFL Classroom* was written by Hersong Tang, Jer-Shiou Chiou and Oliver Jarsaillon. The objective in the study was to know how TBL developed the oral competence of 76 non-English major Chinese EFL learners in a Freshman English course at a university in Taiwan. In order to do so, during fifteen weeks comprised of five stages, the students underwent an initial general English proficiency test, oral presentations of students were audio-recorded by group, a post GEPT was applied and the participants had to fill self-report questionnaire. After the analysis, the researchers concluded that TBL was effective in developing fluency, lexical and syntactic complexity, but ineffective in developing accuracy. TBL was also motivational and useful for language acquisition. This article contributed with realistic outcomes that had not been seen in any of the other studies read so far.

To sum up, all of the ten articles contributed in similarities such as: Being carried on under the same settings with the same objectives (Having students using the FL, interacting and expressing their ideas, in class) and used the same approach. Other studies provided valuable theoretical information about TBL and pedagogical tasks. All of the studies contributed with their positive but realistic results obtained in terms of improving the students' oral skills and motivation, but sacrificing accuracy. Other contributions were with the suggestion of different data collection instruments, and tasks that ensue oral interaction, as well as the use of TBA in terms of class planning, management of large groups, and dealing with reluctant students. The depiction on the use of strategies by low-level students to interact using non-verbal gestures was also another significant contribution. Other study helped to clarify what can be considered interaction in class and what cannot.

2.2 Theoretical Framework

In this part of the chapter, the theories of the constructs that emerged from the formulated research question in Chapter I will be presented. It will show what can be considered as peer to peer interaction in EFL classrooms. The pedagogical platform used to achieve the objectives of the research project, Task Based Instruction will be exposed in Chapter IV.

2.2.1 Interaction

Interaction is a fundamental key to reach the use of communication either written or spoken, is what according to Brown (2000) we use to send, receive and interpret messages, to negotiate meanings and collaborate with other person or people to complete certain objectives.

Interaction is described by the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (Council of Europe, 2004) as it comes next:

In interaction, at least two individuals participate in an oral and/or written exchange in which production and reception alternate and may in fact overlap in oral communication. Not only may two interlocutors be speaking and yet listening to each other simultaneously. Even where turn-taking is strictly respected, the listener is generally already forecasting the remainder of the speaker's message and preparing a response. Learning to interact thus involves more than listening to receive and to produce utterances. (p.4)

This means that the interaction process requires more than one person, any conversation is considered to be an oral exchange as long as the participants are both listening and speaking to other participants.

As Ellis (1990) points out, interaction is meaning-centered and it is performed to make the process of exchanging information easier in order to prevent any communication failures. This means that by having in a conversation a considerable amount of exposure to the TL (according to the learners' level), they can increase their language knowledge easily, so in further interactive events all the members engaged in a conversation will use the acquired vocabulary and expressions in order to commit less disruptures.

But in an EFL classroom the interaction is of a singular nature, every communicative situation that is happening in the classroom, the instructions given by the teacher or the students' exchange of utterances, are included. About the exchanges of information in the classroom, Ellis (1990) defined broadly the classroom interaction as: "not only to those exchanges involving authentic communication but to every oral exchange that occurs in the classroom, including those that arise in the course of formal drilling" (p.12).

For that simple reason, it is possible to say that there are two varieties of classroom interaction, about it Robinson (1994) states that: "Interaction is the process referring to "face-to-face" action. It can be either verbal channeled through written or spoken words, or non-verbal, channeled through, proximity, eye-contact, facial expressions, gesturing, etc." (p.7). This means that the one related with the students' behaviors is known as non-verbal interaction (the use of body gestures like hand raising, head nodding and eye contact); and the one that contains both written and oral interaction (the expression of ideas and thoughts through written words or documents, and the interaction with others by speaking in class, making comments and asking/answering questions) is known as verbal interaction.

Verbal interaction in the classroom can occur as stated by Angelo (1993) between teacher and learners, or among learners either collectively or individually, but Van Lier (1996) has

denoted that these types of classroom interaction present different moments for negotiation, which means that the analysis of each kind of interaction is going to be different due to those differences in their particular contexts. The kind of interaction that this study is going to focus on, is student-student interaction.

With all of this in mind, interaction is the process in which individuals get involved in a communicative event in order to express their ideas, opinions and thoughts. The interactive process has two or more individuals engaged in conversation, the interaction of these individuals is meaning-centered which implies that the more a person gets engaged in interactive events, the more and richer vocabulary and expressions that individual will learn and use in further communicative events in the target language. The classroom interaction includes both non-verbal and verbal interactions, if you pardon the repetition, in the classroom, which differ from the regular interaction processes in non-academic environments. The verbal interactions can be classified into written interaction and oral interaction, which can occur between teacher and learner or among learners.

2.2.2 Student-student Oral Interaction

As affirmed some lines above, student-student interaction is the one that takes place among students, it is also known as learner-learner interaction or peer to peer interaction. In this variety of classroom interaction, the students are the main partakers and the teacher plays a monitoring role, or as Nunan (1992) states, learners do not have the necessity to depend on the teacher to be their only interlocutor and source of language input.

This means that it is among learners that TL knowledge can be constructed, or putting it words by Erten (2000), peers provide language models through the interaction they have in class.

In addition to the previous idea, Long & Porter (1985) said that student-student interaction is considered as an attractive alternative to the classic teacher-student interaction because of its contributions to a more easygoing classroom atmosphere by reducing anxiety and restraints generated in a typical teacher-learner interactive class, it also raises the quantity and quality of the oral utterances practice (Ur, 1996, Altay & Ozturk, 2004). Added to that, Sullivan (2000) points out that group or pair work is considered the most interactive way because it does not mind the socio-cultural and personal experience which guide learners' in-classroom behavior, and compared with teacher-learner in-class interaction, it maximizes each learner's chance to speak.

Essentially for the student-student interaction to take place, the teacher must grant the students, opportunities to use the TL in the EFL classroom. In order to do so, the teacher must prepare tasks that require pair or group work. When the students are grouped, they can feel at ease because the interaction occurs among equals and the teacher just guides the processes to complete the task, and since the teacher is moving group to group to help the students, the students get more time to produce the FL and also get more exposure time to it, which grants them the proper acquisition of the English language.

2.2.2.1 First Unit - Cognitive Processing

One way to see the learners' cognitive processing implies that most of Second Language and Foreign Language Acquisition theories have supposed a manner of working from universal grammar to L1 and L2 grammars. It has been documented and assumed, just as for first language acquisition, that a second language system develops in the mind without consciousness, involuntarily. It is also said that the L2 triggers the language acquisition device, which operates

very anonymously, autonomously from and without any interaction with other cognitive faculties like bodily experiences, perception, attention, image schemas, categorization, emotion or other mental faculties. (Pütz & Siccola, 2010)

Another view on cognitive processing is more focused on the essential role of the processing generated with the common learners in Second Language Acquisition, which can be only understood and explained, like all human learning processes, if they are seen as oriented processes pertaining to the learners and based on examples which have to be adjusted in a bigger framework of how people interact with the world that surrounds them, acquire and retain knowledge in some symbolic form or other and in that way it is possible to establish a link between cognitive development and language acquisition. (Pütz & Siccola, 2010).

According to Wray and Kumpulainen (2010), the analysis of cognitive processing examines the particulars of the ways students begin to work on learning tasks and their social activity (Working techniques in tasks, presented situations in learning and knowledge and the problem-solving subjects). The procedural processing deals with the execution of routine tasks that do not involve thinking; the interpretative/exploratory processing deals with situations in which the process of thinking is visible through the students' use of language; the off-task activity deals with the situations presented when the focus on the task is not present in the students. (Wray and Kumpulainen, 2010)

Both procedural processing and off task can be caused due to peers and groups having to face difficulties generated by the cognitive processes required in learning, like the ones involved in creating a joint ground in shared problem solving (Makitalo, Häkkinen, Järvelä, & Leinonen, 2002), negotiating multiple mental views, and managing composite concepts (e.g., Feltovich, Spiro, Coulson, & Feltovich, 1996). Besides, challenges can also be caused by external

circumstances to the task itself. E.g. group members might be involved in practical obstacles that restrain their full commitment and participation (Järvenoja & Jarvelä, 2009; Volet & Mansfield, 2006). These challenges place meaningful emotional pressure on individuals to restore their contentment, sustain their motivation, and reach personal and group oriented goals.

The Procedural and explorative processing as well as the off-task activities, are manners of acting that describe the students cognitive processing when working with peers or a group in a task, and are meant to be taken as heuristic devices.

2.2.2.2 Second Unit - Social Processing

Social processing is a theory on the way children establish relationships with peers (Fontaine, 2006). That leads to understand the way how young learners process information through what they perceive and interpret. Some theories suggest that information is processed when learners use behavior and cognitive skills (Crick & Dodge, 1994).

Dodge (1986) explained that when children faced a social prompt, they engaged in four mental series of stages before performing proficient social behaviors: Converting situational cues; bringing clearly before their minds and understanding the cues; mentally examine for possible responses to the condition and the selection of a response. Throughout the duration of steps 1 and 2, children direct their concentration and encode particular cues in a given situation, and then on the basis of those cues, compose an explanation of the situation, e.g. drawing a conclusion about the intentions of a learner with whom the child is interacting. In steps 3 and 4, children can access feasible responses to a situation from long term memory, for then assessing those responses and selecting the most favorable one for performance (Dodge, 1986).

As Wray & Kumpulainen (2010) point out, the description of the social relationships and types of participation in peers and groups is the objective of the analysis of social processing. The following modes (which for this research work as categories of analysis) shown by Wray & Kumpulainen (2010), construct social processing in peer or group interaction:

Collaborative: Learners try to reach a mutual understanding of a situation; ideas are shared and negotiated. They create two-way zones of proximal development by supporting each other (Forman, 1989).

Confusion: The students show a lack of joint understanding among peers.

Unlike the functional analysis of peer and group interaction, the unit of analysis for social processing is based on their progress in peer or group interaction on a moment-by-moment basis.

In other words, the objective of the analysis of social processing is to describe the social relationships and the varieties of participation in peers and groups by having as unit of analysis the learners' progress in peer group interaction on a moment-by-moment basis. The modes that construct social processing in student-student interaction are collaborative and confusion.

2.2.2.3 Third Unit - Discourse Functions

The first dimension involved in learner-learner interaction is called discourse functions. Known also as the functional analysis of verbal interaction, it focuses, according to Wray & Kumpulainen (2010) in the goals verbal language has when used under certain contexts. A couple or a group of students engaged in oral interaction will use certain vocabulary and expressions when they are in a given situation. Halliday & Hasan (1989) indicate that the functional analysis of verbal interaction inquires into and emphasizes on the strategies used in communication that are applied by people (the TL learners, partakers of the interaction) This sort

of analysis is often focused on the illocutionary strength of an utterance on its functional meaning (Austin, 1962; Edwards & Westgate, 1994).

In addition to that Wray & Kumpulainen (2010) state that the functions the students use in their oral interactions in the classroom are connected to topics discussed in class, as well as the expectancies the learners have and how interpretations of the situation evolve by the sociocultural context of the activity, and how those functions of language serve intra and interpersonal purposes in the course of interaction. This means that purposes and intentions serve a cognitive function, when carried by means (Wray & Kumpulainen, 2010), but on the other hand, when related to the personal and social relationships between interactors, they serve an interpersonal function (Halliday & Hasan, 1989).

The identification of language functions in peer interactions take place according to Wray & Kumpulainen (2010) on the foundation of implication, which means that specific linguistic forms do not help identifying the functions, they are rather recognized in terms of their retrospective and prospective effectiveness on the actual speech both in terms of content and form.

The functions of peer interaction are minimum units examined in the system, and are recognized on an utterance basis and are characterized in terms of origin, objective and situated conversational meaning. Utterances are also seen as significant units of speech, a message unit, and the understanding of the functions used by the students in their speech (utterances) can be assisted by the data gathered from direct observation, student interviews and video recording (Wray & Kumpulainen, 2010). Additionally, Wray & Kumpulainen (2010) indicate that what linguistically demarks each utterance are the contextual cues, and since an utterance can be

employed for many different functions, more than one function can be registered for each utterance.

Wray & Kumpulainen (2010) show the following language functions (categories in this research) identified in peer and group interaction over learning situations: Informative, Reasoning, Evaluative, Interrogative-Responsive, Organizational, Judgmental (agrees/disagrees), Argumentational, and Repetition. Some of these functions can be described from different perspectives on the analysis of verbal interaction (opinion about the activity, interpretative/cognitive, or social viewpoint), in other words, functions are not necessarily understood as belonging to specific categories, it is the situation that defines functions for each interaction situation (Wray & Kumpulainen, 2010).

Taking into account the concepts mentioned, it is important to consider that this project aims to analyze the impact of pedagogical tasks in learner-learner interaction at the EFL classroom by using the analytic method for investigating the situated dynamics of peer and group interaction developed by Wray and Kumpulainen. The application of this method focuses on the three analytic dimensions, to wit the functions of verbal interaction, cognitive processing and social processing approached to the students in different moments along the implementation (despite they could be treated separately for analytic purposes, they are closely linked together, thus, they cannot be separated due to each dimension giving and obtaining meaning from and to the other dimensions).

The participants of this project underwent a controlled practice with frequent opportunities to interact among themselves while solving pedagogical tasks, whose main objective was to encourage them to use the FL through peer to peer interaction, thus in the process enhancing

their speaking skills. The participants also received proper feedback and correction at the end of each class.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Type of study

The type of study selected was a qualitative research. Qualitative studies aim to resolve and/or analyze problems (Creswell, 2013). The issue was to examine the changes the use of TBL caused in a group of intermediate two students in an EFL classroom from a languages center in Bogotá Colombia.

It also aims to provide a definite rendering of the composition, order, and extended patterns found among a group of participants. Also known as ethnomethodology or field research, it generates data about human groups in social settings. (A. Saint-Germain, 2001).

Denzin and Lincoln (2005) characterize qualitative research as consisting of "... an interpretive naturalistic approach to the world. This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of or interpret phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them." (p. 3).

Schutt (2015) indicates that qualitative data is inductive, which means that analysts seek to describe their textual data in ways that show the setting and people who produced texts by using their own words instead of measures and hypotheses already predefined, so the analyst is able to identify patterns, relationships and important categories through a process of ascertainment.

3.2 Method of research

The method of research used was action research in the language classroom, according to the fifth of the general ends of Action Research suggested by Cohen and Manion (quoted by Nunan, 1990) it provided an alternative to the more subjective, impressionistic approach to problem solving in the classroom. There was an issue to be examined in the observed classroom, the action research in the language classroom was the proper tool that could help in that situation. It followed the five stages to the action research in-service program proposed by Nunan (1990).

The teacher-researcher thought about the theory and practice of classroom observation; learned techniques to observe classrooms and identified certain useful aspects (problems) in a classroom to reveal the wrong ideas he had about the observed group. He had to be aware of the predicaments and questions compliant to the starting action research. Both the teacher-researcher and the project director explored the possible issues from the observed classroom and selected the one they found most relevant, analyzing the impact of TBL in learner-learner interaction in an EFL classroom. The teacher-researcher looked into the issue found in the classroom to develop an action research proposal, which evolved into this study.

3.3 Roles

3.3.1 Role of the Teacher

Lineamientos Pedagógicos y Metodológicos del Centro de Lenguas de la Universidad Pedagógica Nacional (2014), states that the teacher from the Languages Center eases the learning process, advises the group and coordinates the classroom; manages, creates and organizes the resources and materials of the class for his group of students; analyzes, guides and motivates the

students to appropriate the knowledge in the target language, so they can express their own opinion. He is also responsible to keep an ideal environment that fosters communication, he observes and researches on his class' strengths and weaknesses so accurate decisions can be taken when it comes to solve and give answers that head forward the target language learning process.

3.3.2 Role of the Student

Lineamientos Pedagógicos y Metodológicos del Centro de Lenguas de la Universidad Pedagógica Nacional (2014), says that the students from the Languages Center are active and autonomous agents that lead their learning process. They negotiate and communicate when it comes to contribute with their experiences, opinions and proposals to progress in their FL learning process. The students are responsible of their homework and must keep an open-participative work rhythm, where there is place for them to lay out doubts and suggest alternatives to make the class dynamic and environment more beneficial. They are expected to recognize their weaknesses and strengths for them to identify their needs, so they can be aware that the evolution of their progress relies on themselves.

3.4 Purpose of the Study and Possible Outcome

This study was carried out to see whether the impact of pedagogical tasks and the evolution the students showed in terms of learner-learner oral communication skills by using the FL in class.

It was expected as result, that the students made use of the English language to interact in class, and to express their thoughts by interacting with other learners in situations different to the classroom environment.

3.5 Research Design

In terms of data and data analysis in qualitative studies Schutt (2015), states that the difference among qualitative and quantitative data analysis is that the data that will be analyzed in qualitative studies is always text, which can be found in transcripts of notes or interviews from observation sessions that had the researcher in a participant role, text is seen as a way to understand what the participants did, thought or felt in a certain point or situation during the research.

Pine (2009) states that the process of recursion in action research starts with the data triangulation in which the research question is studied from three separate pieces of data and three different points of view; all the data collected are put in order and the data that was collected earlier in the research is compared with the data that was collected later; the data is then coded, analyzed and reviewed after. Pine (2009) adds that the conclusion phase brings the research together, provides interpretation of the data, and summarizes relevant recommendations for further research. It offers an opportunity to communicate the meaningfulness of the research. This phase is solidly secured in the study findings; their limitations are then to be portrayed in order to avoid generalization.

3.6 Units of Analysis

The following units of analysis are based on the categories for the analysis for learner to learner interaction proposed by Wray and Kumpulainen (2010).

Table 2. Units of Analysis

Units of Oral Learner to learner Interaction	Category	Indicators
Cognitive Processing	-Procedural / Routine -Exploratory / Interpretative	*The students proceed to handle, organize and execute the pedagogical task without reflective analysis. *The students plan, test hypothesis, evaluate and experiment on critical and exploratory pedagogical tasks.
Social Processing	-Collaborative -Confusion	*The students participate equally in a joint pedagogical task to make meaning. *Students do not understand the task or each other.
Discourse Functions	-Interrogative/ Informative	*The students ask and provide information in the FL.

3.7 Population Mean

This study took place in a languages center belonging to a public university in Bogotá, Colombia, located in La Porciúncula, a neighborhood from the Chapinero District. The classes were on Saturdays from 8:00 AM to 12:00 PM, having a half an hour recess that went from 9:30 AM to 10:00 AM. The name of the EFL program is 'Kids from 7 to 9 years old'. When this study begun in the second term of 2015 in the Intermediate 2 level there were 15 students in that group, there were 10 girls and 5 boys in the group. In the second phase, first semester of 2016, the students were in the Advanced level, and there was a total of 23 students in that group, 14 girls and 9 boys. In the third phase the students were in the Conversational level. There was a total of 21 students, 14 girls and 7 boys.

3.8 Data Collection

3.8.1 Instruments for data collection

Three instruments for data collection were used in this study. Field notes, audio and video recording including their corresponding transcriptions and surveys. Field notes "are descriptions and accounts of events in the research context which are written in a relatively factual and objective style" (Burns, 1999, p.87). Audio and video recording "are a technique for capturing in detail naturalistic interactions and verbatim utterances" (Burns, 1999, p.94). Transcriptions are a way to handle captured data through audio and video recording (Burns, 1999). Surveys "involve predetermined questions presented in written form ... have the advantage of being easier and less time-consuming to administer than interviews, and the responses of larger number of informants can be gathered" (Burns, 1999, p.129).

The field notes were taken once per week, in order to jot down every significant event in the class, in terms of the evolution of oral interaction. The students' oral interactions from the languages center while performing pedagogical tasks, were recorded at the classrooms and transcribed later once per week. The students' points of view on the approach used were taken from a survey in Spanish applied at the end of the research closing stage, to know the ways TBL affected their FL learning process as well as their oral interaction process.

CHAPTER IV

PEDAGOGICAL PROPOSAL

4.1. Language Teaching Approach – Task Based Learning

To define what a task is can be troublesome due to the contention regarding with its specific definition. Kumaravadivelu (1993) sees tasks as curricular content instead of as a methodological construct. Long (1985) defines a task as any sort of activity, as something "done". Skehan (1998) has five criteria to define what a task is: (a) meaning is fundamental, (b) there is a communication issue to solve, (c) there is a kind of link to comparable real-world activities (d) task fruition is partially a priority, and (e) the valuation of the task is in terms of results. Wicking, P (2010) indicates that a task is a work-plan, it means that tasks can change due to their dynamic nature, and despite they can be modified and adapted as they are carried into effect, they do not always proceed as planned.

4.1.2 Pedagogical Tasks

Richards (2006) defines pedagogical tasks as specially designed classroom tasks that need the use of specific interactional tactics and the use of precise kinds of language, and also adds that the task itself is not something that can be found in the real world. Ellis (2003) states that pedagogical tasks can engage various cognitive processes and productive-receptive oral or written skills. Nunan (1989) points that pedagogical tasks should bear a sense of entirety, so it can stand alone as a communicative act with an opening, a middle and an end.

4.2. Vision of language

Tudor (2001) points out that the language is seen as both, social action and self-expression. The aim is that learners make use of the target language in social contexts, where their ideas, thoughts and feelings are expressed and contribute to the class, or to their peers' knowledge of the language. Their current language needs are linked to the future use they will make of it.

4.3. Vision of the classroom

The classroom is for Tudor (2001) a place where the acquisition and advancement of the language are best supported because the focus lies on the learners and their needs only. It also provides the solution of obstacles regarding with the target language learning and abundant communicative possibilities for the development of the language. It is in the classroom where learners are able to express their anxieties and doubts.

4.4. Type of Contents

The pedagogical platform that was used was Task Based Learning. The pedagogical tasks were modeled after activities contained in the books Backpack 5 and 6, which were used by the students in the languages center. Said content was organized and applied following the model offered by Willis (1996).

4.5. Results, Expected Products and Potential Beneficiaries

From the learners is expected that they not only can make use of the target language in the classroom, but outside the classroom, that the English language that they learn, does not

transform them into automatons that use their language to help other people's reach their goals, but their very goals and dreams by becoming fair and exemplary citizens through the use of the TL. The students would be the main beneficiaries. It is also expected that the development of this study, and the solutions it might provide, can one day be helpful to another languages student, when they face a similar situation in their teaching practices, for them to use it to either improve their teaching practices or to expand and even create new knowledge. They would also see themselves as beneficiaries.

4.6. Resources and Activities

Bearing in mind that the use of TBL implied to set the syllabus from the Languages Center aside, the researcher decided to follow four key strategies -Focus on form (present vs. absent); information exchange (two way vs. one way); planning (planned vs. unplanned); and task solution (closed vs. open)- to transform ordinary textbook activities into tasks developed by Wicking. P (2010). About the focus on form Wicking. P (2010), says that in TBL students are directed away from it because the priority in a task is the exchange of meaning; textbook activities on the other hand focus on linear-isolated skills giving a high priority to accuracy, so to keep the TBL focus on meaning, the focused form activities should occur after the task completion in order to consolidate what the students completed, and for them not falling into the word manipulation to complete the task.

Regarding with Information Exchange Wicking. P (2010) points that a task with a two-way exchange of information is much more effective in terms of language acquisition than one-way tasks. Referring to planning Wicking. P (2010) indicates that planning has a positive effect on task performance. Planning increases confidence (Brown, 2004). On Task Solution Wicking.

P (2010) says that it can be open (there is no predetermined solution) or closed (there is one solution the students have to find). Long (Quoted by Ellis, 1997) stated that closed tasks produced more useful negotiation work than open tasks. In closed tasks the topic has to be motivating for the students not getting-off task, and even with motivating topics the students can abandon English to complete the task in their MT. The students are eager to know the correct answer, and that causes students to persevere with the task until fruition, and a sense of satisfaction. Wicking. P (2010) concludes that "Not all tasks are effective with all students all the time" (p,471). Wicking. P (2010) also concludes that even with task-based textbooks, there are activities likely to fail in classes without adaptation of some degree.

4.7. Stages of the Intervention

4.7.1 Observing Stage (1st Semester)

This first stage went from August 15th 2015 to December 11th 2015. The instruments used by the researcher to collect data were surveys, field notes and proformas.

The researcher took notes of each observed class during two hours every Saturday during that period, and organized the information from the field notes in the proformas. In this stage the researcher looked for theoretical backup that could help him support the issue detected in the classroom, and theoretical backup to start elaborating both the theoretical framework and the literature review of the study. The theoretical backup that supported the problem evidenced in the classroom was registered in the proformas.

4.7.2 Application Stage (2nd Semester)

This second stage went from February 6th 2016 to June 11th 2016. In this stage the students' objective was interacting with their peers to solve tasks by means of textbook activities transformed into pedagogical tasks, which made them talk about topics from the textbook related to their daily lives. The researcher gathered data by using field notes, audio and video recording and transcriptions.

The indicators of research analysis that students reached in this period were the following. For the first category, the students planned, tested hypothesis, evaluated and experimented on pedagogical tasks. For the second category, the students participated equally in a joint pedagogical task to make meaning and assisted each other regarding with the use of the language or with the development of the pedagogical task with their teacher's assistance. For the third category, the students asked for and provided information among them in order to complete the assigned pedagogical tasks.

4.7.3 Closing Stage (3rd Semester)

This third stage started in July 30th 2016 and finished in September 17th 2016. In this stage the students' objective was interacting with their peers to solve tasks by means of textbook activities transformed into pedagogical tasks, which made them talk about topics from the textbook related to their daily lives. The researcher gathered data by using the instruments mentioned in the previous stage plus a survey for the students at the end of the stage. The indicators of research analysis that students reached in this period were the same as in the previous stage, but with one special addition, the students in this stage showed self-awareness

and autonomy in terms of completing the pedagogical tasks by interacting with their peers in the FL, in which the students needed little to no assistance from their teacher.

4.8 Pedagogical Platform

The pedagogical platform used in the application and closing stages of the research was Task Based Learning. Three stages will be followed as noted by Willis, J. (1996).

4.9 Type of Evaluation

The students were evaluated in terms of participation in the pedagogical tasks, assigned homework (platform and workshops to solve at home), quizzes (two per term) and the three term exams. Their grades ranked from 0 to 5. For a student to approve the tasks in class, the platform activities and the exams, it is required for him/her to have at least 3,5. This is due to the evaluation method Centro de Lenguas de la Universidad Pedagógica Nacional de Colombia has.

CHAPTER V

DATA ANALYSIS

5.1. ANALYSIS MANAGEMENT

This section of the chapter intends to show the achievements and limitations of the process executed in both data collection and data analysis in the light of the pedagogical implementation, as well as the factors that hindered the achievement of the initial proposal.

The limitations in this study during data collection were just very few. The first one was the students' initial reluctance to make use of the TL. In the development of the pedagogical tasks, the teacher used to monitor them constantly and in the early class sessions he noticed that the students were not making use of the TL for the classes despite he asked them to do it, he convinced the most skillful students in the classroom to help the students who might face difficulties when producing the language, which did not occur (further in the document is explained why mutual tutoring as a category was not present). The teacher also designated monitors at random, who gave him the names of the students that were not making any progress in terms of the use of the language, so the teacher could talk with them personally to encourage them. The idea behind the aforementioned strategies was to ease the classroom environment for the students to take the chances given in class to use the target language.

The second limitation found in the study for data collection were the situations of public order presented during the time the research was held. It is important to clarify the following, due to the nature of the Colombian public universities, and being Universidad Pedagógica Nacional de Colombia a public institution, it is no surprise that certain organized and illegal groups made

by people unconnected to the university who call themselves "students" start riots inside the buildings of the university on 72 street branch, always on the weekdays that sadly end up with damage on the infrastructure, which if not repaired properly might cause harm to the students.

The issue mentioned some lines above is the reason why Centro de Lenguas de la Universidad Pedagógica Nacional, in order to protect the students' physical integrity, cancels the classes as soon as a riot occurs.

During all the process of research the classes were interrupted twice, being the first in the observing stage while taking data to formulate the research question, and the second time a session of class was called off was when the students were about to present the final term exam (In which there was a need to take data). Since the riots occurred during the data collection phase, the process was slightly hindered and forced the researcher to postpone for a week (the classes are given weekly) what he had already planned in terms of data collection and data analysis, but despite that, there was enough time to comply with the research schedule. The data collected was indeed useful and compliant with the categories of analysis that were used in this study.

In terms of the units of oral interaction, it is important to state that the indicators showed are just a guideline to explain the performance that the researcher wanted to examine along the whole process. Originally for this study the researcher intended to use all of the categories and indicators proposed by Wray and Kumpulainen (2010), which had a bigger number in terms of categories and indicators. The thesis assessor suggested a reduction in the number of categories to analyze, firstly, due to a page limit in this project, and secondly, due to certain categories and indicators not being present in the students' utterances, despite the pedagogical tasks the teacher-researcher designed were intended to make the students produce them.

5.2. DATA ANALYSIS

To begin with, it is important to state that this study attempted to discover what the implementation of pedagogical tasks revealed about student-student interaction in an EFL classroom, as well as to establish the relationship among their application in the EFL classroom and the students' oral communicative process.

The units are presented taking into account that the interest of this research was to answer, if you pardon the repetition, the research question, which for this study is: What does the implementation of pedagogical tasks reveal about student-student oral interaction in an A2 EFL classroom? It is also relevant to remind the reader that the indicators from the categories showed are just a guideline to explain the performance that the researcher wanted to examine along the whole process.

In order to protect the students' identity, their names were changed to an S and a number. The following conventions will help understand the transcriptions better. A word with the (?) symbol next to it, shows that in the audio there is no certainty if that was the word said. The _ symbol indicates that the overlapping of voices, or the student not speaking up enough makes it difficult to distinguish the word from the many noises. The ... Symbol indicates a considerably long pause in the interaction. When a sentence has the ** symbol, it describes the actions or gestures students are making. The symbol the (:::) will be used when the students provide sensible data that compromises their identity.

5.2.1 Cognitive Processing

During the application and closure stages, the students were engaged in a series of pedagogical tasks. During the task solving cycles the students were in constant contact with their

peers, this means they were not only made to work in couples or in group, but they also were informed that the use of the FL was part of the task completion.

During the application stage the students were only executing the pedagogical tasks to obtain a product, and they often used their MT to do so. While monitoring the class, the teacher realized of that situation and had to remind the students constantly in every class that an important part of the task solving process was the use of the FL.

“Whenever I heard Spanish, I reminded the students that the activity was to be done in English” (Field Notes March 5th 2016)

Storch (2001) and Swain et al. (2002) proved that through learner-learner interaction on the FL learners can control and restructure their knowledge. Bearing in mind that, the teacher insisted a lot on his students making use of the FL for them to improve their familiarity in terms of oral interaction in the English language.

The students had to evidence that there was a process in which planning and thinking in the FL were involved, and that process is related to the students’ creativity. Nemat & Naziri (2011) say that “Tasks make our learners more autonomous and creative” (p.334). Bearing that in mind, there were situations in which neither use of the FL nor creativity were evidenced in the pedagogical task solving process. To exemplify that, in one of the classes, the students had as a task to develop and present an invention, the researcher noticing the loud voices due to the relaxed environment of the classroom considered it was a proper moment to record the students’ interaction, but.

“Whenever I got close to a group of students to record their interactions, they gradually stopped talking noisily, some of them like S8, S14, S13, S17, S11 and S6, switched back to talk in English, but students like S0, S19, S21, S10 and S18 started saying nonsense sentences” (Field Notes May 7th 2016)

Those students had the intention to make their teacher think they were using the FL to solve the task when they really were not doing it. The following transcription comes from that very same class; it shows a group of students presenting their product, the students S10 and S18 that neither used the FL to solve the task nor engaged in using their creativity as a factor to solve it. The students had to present an invention, but these students presented a pencil holder.

S18: What is it made of?

S10: It's made of clay.

S18: What is it used?

S10: It's used to the pencil, markers, rubber, pen, scissors and erasers _ ...

S18: What is the materials?

S10: Markers eh pens, colors, pencils eh markers ... (Video recording/transcription May 7th 2016)

The students might have seen in the development of the pedagogical task a challenge caused by external circumstances to the task itself. E.g. group members presenting obstacles (such as a way too relaxed class environment or students facing difficulties when using the FL to communicate) that restrained their full commitment in the task solving process (Järvenoja & Jarvelä, 2009; Volet & Mansfield, 2006).

When asked about the reasons for them to use the MT during tasks, some of the high skilled students confirmed that for some of their peers it was easier and more comfortable that way because it allowed them to communicate easier in order to complete the tasks in the class.

“S14: Es más fácil para nosotros comunicarnos así y poder completar las actividades”

“S6: Lo hacemos también porque es mucho más cómodo para los compañeros que no pueden entender el idioma” (Field Notes May 7th 2016)

It is in that sense in which students considered at first as a valid strategy, the use of the MT to approach their knowledge of the FL while in peer/group work. That is the students' position, and a very valid one from the theory. Larsen-Freeman (quoted by Paker & Karaagaç, 2015) indicates that the MT use is allowed in various methods and approaches, among them Task Based Learning. But when the teacher was insistent on the idea to use the FL while solving pedagogical tasks, it was due to the teacher sticking to the rules established in Lineamientos Pedagógicos y Metodológicos del Centro de Lenguas de la Universidad Pedagógica Nacional (2014) in which the constant use of the FL is seen as a goal for both teacher and students despite the use of the MT to translate as a natural mechanism. Bearing in mind the previous ideas, completing a task without the use of the FL implied that there was an incomplete planning. It showed that there was a process in which no learning was involved, but a product to present, that is the evidence of a procedural routine.

Now, as it was said before, the procedural routine was seen in certain groups of students, but most of them showed during the application and closure stages that they, according to Wray and Kumpulainen (2010) were in “a situation during which thinking is made visible through language ... The students’ activity reflects their deep engagement and interest in the problem-solving task” (p.15). That is known as interpretative or exploring processing, and it is shown when the students use the FL to plan when solving tasks. The following transcription shows the students planning creatively by using their FL a way to solve a task, which was to make an advertisement about a product from the future.

S14: If we present a flying car?

S6: No.

S11: And a teletransporter?

S5: What's that?

S11: It is something that take you to other places quick.

S15: It's a good idea. What that does?

S14: You put it in your head and think the place you want to go.

S6: If I want to go to the park, I put that in my head, I think in the park and I am in the park?

S5: It's OK

S15: Ok

(Field Notes August 27th 2016)

As stated before, all of the students were solving pedagogical tasks during all of the task cycles from the pre-task cycle to the report and closure, and in them all of the students were provided with many constant different moments in the class to make use of the FL. Swain (1985) argues that producing the TL is a relevant aspect of the learning process and opportunities should be given to students to produce spoken output regarding with the TL. That constant production of the FL by students gets transformed into exposure to the TL, which is necessary for the students to master the language (Krashen, 1982).

Taking into account what was mentioned some lines above regarding FL production and exposure, it is important to mention that the students have accepted and recognized that the use of the FL on task solving has been useful to their language learning process and subsequent mastery of the FL.

- ¿Qué te ha gustado de las clases de inglés? ¿Por qué?

-Sí, porque nos pone trabajos en grupo que nos ayuda a fortalecer nuestro spequeen

(Surveys September 17th 2016)

- ¿Se te facilita más que antes hablar en inglés con tus compañeros? ¿Sí o no? ¿Por qué?

- Sí porque el profesor nos pone actividades con las que podemos dialogar con todos nuestros compañeros (Surveys September 17th 2016)

To conclude, this unit showed the way the students approached their FL learning through the completion of pedagogical tasks. A few groups of students considered at the beginning of the implementation, that the use of the MT made the task completion easier, which indeed it did, but

without the use of the FL and their corresponding planning and thinking processes, the completion of the pedagogical task was pointless, thus showing a product of the routine processing. On the other hand, most of the students showed that the point of solving the tasks was not the only thing to achieve, but the use of the FL, which for them was seen as an important part of their language learning process and subsequent mastery.

5.2.2 Social Processing

Along the process the students were able to show the social processing unit by means of participating in pedagogical tasks and making meaning, this is, collaborating with their peers. In that sense, most of the students engaged in the completion and reporting of the pedagogical tasks demonstrated them in the utterances they produced along the application and closure stages. The following situation shows a pair of students engaged in a task, which was discussing the best way to communicate predictions in the future.

S14: It is better to use will, not are going

S8: So the answer is womens will be more beautiful in the future, ok?

S14: Ok

(Field Notes April 9th 2016)

The next situation shows students preparing their final term project presentation, about the story of drawing.

S6: We can draw what we want?

S1: Yes

S20: But we need to present. What we do?

S3: What is drawing?

S6: That is a part of the presentation

S3: What is drawing in Spanish?

S6: Dibujar

(Field Notes April 22nd 2016)

In that sense Brown (2000) states that during interaction people send, receive and interpret messages, to negotiate meanings and collaborate with other people to reach certain objectives. Forman (1989) indicates that learners create two-way zones of proximal development by supporting each other. This means that in order to create meaning the students had to necessarily interact among them, and at the same time they were reaching the proposed objective for the class, which were processes that occurred during both the application and closure stages of this project.

To solidify the aforementioned, the students recognized themselves as their peers' collaborators in the FL learning processes. In order to evidence it, two students answer to the same question are shown next.

- *¿Ayudas a tus compañeros a completar las tareas que el profesor deja para la clase en inglés? ¿Sí o no? ¿Por qué?*

-*Si porque me gusta que mis compañeros comprendan el tema conmigo*

-*Si porque nos debemos ayudar para mejorar nuestro nivel de inglés* (Survey September 17th 2016)

Another way in which collaboration is expressed is by means of equal participation, this means that certain learners were aware that they could also grant their peers opportunities to make use of the FL. The following transcription shows a situation in which equal participation is seen. The students were reading the comprehension questions made by their peers in a previous pedagogical task to answer them in groups. It is possible to notice that the students are taking turns to ask and answer the questions.

S9: What was the first hot air balloon made of?

S11: The first balloon made of was of paper _

S16: What are rubber bands made of?

S00: The rubbers bands are made of eh _ stick.

S9: When was the first rubber band create?

S11: I don't know?

S16: No?

S11: No

S16: What were the first eye contact lense made of? _

S9: What are contact lense made of?

S00: It's made of to _ and _ the glasses?

S16: Who invent the first wireless remote?

S00: _ No I don't know, the next.

S9: What is a remote control made of?

S11: Is to change the channels?

(Audio Recording/transcription April 30th 2016)

Kagan (quoted by Kondo, 2010) states that equal participation is the active participation of all of the members within a group work. Greeno (2006) arguments that groups permit various forms of participation, regulation and engagement with content. Sachs & Ho (2007) indicate that "The equal sharing of responsibilities allows every student the opportunity to lead the group and hold the job of asking different comprehension questions" (p.172).

The Social Processing was not only seen in the collaboration peers usually show. This unit was also seen in students that, when engaged in peer to peer interaction in the pedagogical task solving process, were also able to show the need of understanding the pedagogical task or their peers along the whole process by means of their oral utterances. The responsibility of assigning the tasks to students and making the students understand it, always lied on the teacher. When an assigned task was not understood by the whole group, the teacher found ways to make himself understand that did not imply the use of the MT, one of those methods was modeling the task with the students in front of their peers. But when after explaining the task, just one student did not understand it, that student did not communicate his/her need for clarification in class to the teacher. That is what Wray & Kumpulainen (2010) consider as a silent episode. Some

students considered their lack of understanding the tasks due to their self-awareness in terms of the FL communicative skills.

- *¿Entiendes las tareas que el profesor te deja en clase?*

-*A veces no porque no soy tan buena en inglés* (Surveys September 17th 2016)

Those silent episodes are usually generated by the anxiety seen in teacher-learner interaction, especially when it comes about low-skilled students. (To clarify, the teacher was always very kind and understanding towards his students). Anxiety according to Long & Porter (1985) can be reduced in student-student interaction because it contributes to a more easygoing classroom atmosphere.

When the students were gathered in groups, they felt at ease, there was no tension because the teacher was only monitoring the tasks and the students' use of the FL. Another way to see this unit reflected is in the way in which students asked their peers to explain them what they could not understand.

The following transcription shows the direct way the students expressed they asked for clarification on their peers' logic when solving a pedagogical task related to match the names of the products with the countries that produce those products in a world map.

S14: What do we do with this?

S8: These papers have the names of products.

S4: I don(?) understand.

S20: Look. This goes in here.

S4: But these are not the names of countries.

S12: I don't understand.

S8: We have to place these papers in the map

S4/S12: Ah ok.

(Field Notes May 14th 2016)

By communicating to their peers that they are not able to understand them or to understand what to do in a task, the students can clarify their ideas and perspectives by discussing them openly with their peers (Gillies, 2006). That is because there is that environment of trust that peers bring in a group work.

To sum up, during the application and closure stages, the students evidenced the social processing unit by showing in their utterances during student-student interaction, the collaborative function by making meaning, this is directly helping their peers regarding with the use of the FL and the solution of tasks, as well as expressing their misunderstandings towards the solution of pedagogical tasks.

5.2.3 Discourse Functions

Along the application and closure stages, the students made use of the FL to interact with their peers, the utterances they produced carried certain intentions, discourse functions, under the context of the completion of pedagogical tasks. Those discourse functions used under the aforementioned context, varied, that is why the functions suggested by Wray & Kumpulainen (2010) are not meant to be understood as already defined in the unit, and they were interpreted bearing in mind not only what the learners wanted to say, but on what the learners really meant to say.

The most frequent function shown by the students along the stages was the interrogative-informative, the students were constantly asking for and providing information to their peers in the context of solving pedagogical tasks. During the whole process, the teacher encouraged the students to ask questions and provide information to the peers in order to keep the oral

interaction process constantly flowing, in order to do that, the teacher used authentic materials that stimulated the students in that way.

The following transcription shows a couple of students engaged in interaction in order to complete a chart-filling task about the students' predictions about the future. Both students were aware that in order to do that, they had to ask and answer questions to their peers and their purpose was precisely to complete the chart with their peer's information.

S10: Hi Zharick. Zharick what do you think the future will be?

S2: I think eh that the future will be, the cellphones will be transpair(?), eh the school will be dissappear, and what about you?

S10: I think that the cars will be fly and the prints(?) will be make food. How technology will be in the future?

S2: In the future technology, technology will be intelligent and advanced, and what about you?

S10: I think that the technology will be mo(?) very modern and very important for the human.

(Audio recording/transcription August 27th 2016)

This other transcription shows a pair of students in an interview task in which the students had to ask for and provide information regarding with the achievements from family members.

S17: My mom is a doctor, she has a doctorate, what does your mother do?

S19: My mother do is a coordinator, what does your father do?

S17: My father is an advertising executive, what does your father do?

S19: My father do is a driver

S17: My cousin Katherine was on Colombia's soccer's team what does your cousin do?

S19: My cousin do is arbo(?) reporter ... what does your aunt do?

S17: My aunt is an a doctor too. What does your aunt do?

S19: My aunt is a is a lauyer(?)

S17: My uncle is a pologist(?). What does your uncle do?

S19: My uncle do is a... how do you say in English, in English amo de casa?

S17: House ... I don't know how do you say amo de casa ...

S17: It's a houswifo(?)

S19: Is a housewifor(?)

S17: My cousin Maria Jose play the piano. What does your cousin do?

S19: My cousin is a reporter. (Audio recording/transcription August 6th 2016)

Loos et al. (2009) defines the interrogative function as "an epistemic mood that signals that the speaker wishes to elicit information concerning the content of his or her utterance from the addressee" (N.I). In this sense, when the learners asked a question, they showed their intentions to obtain the information from their peers because they were engaged in a pedagogical task to be solved.

Questions usually triggered information as an answer. Halliday (Quoted by Chandler & Munday, 2011) defines the informative function in which an individual uses language to communicate information. And the students did precisely that, they made use of the FL in order to provide information to their peers for them to.

In the surveys given to the students, they express the positive value that asking and answering questions in order to solve pedagogical tasks had for their FL learning. Four answers to the same question will be shown.

-Haces y respondes preguntas a y de tus compañeros en inglés? ¿Sí o no? ¿Por qué?

-Sí porque es una parte importante

-Sí porque les ayuda a mejorar su rendimiento

-Casi siempre, porque así puedo aprender más

-Si para ayudarlos a mejorar su nivel. (Surveys September 17th 2016)

That confirms what, Lineamientos Pedagógicos y Metodológicos del Centro de Lenguas de la Universidad Pedagógica Nacional (2014) stated regarding with Task Based materials that helped the students focalizing language functions, among them the exchange of comprehension questions.

All in all, when engaged in peer to peer interaction the students showed two discourse functions, the interrogative and the informative, which showed not only the intentions the students had when solving the tasks, but also the students themselves considered asking questions and providing information as a way in which they could improve their use of the FL. The teacher used the tasks in order to ensure that exchange of information among the students.

5.3 ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

The current project dealt with three units that were analyzed taking into account that the categories and indicators were used as a guideline to explain the performance the researcher wanted to verify along the process. The students' advance and difficulties were also put into consideration during the implementation. In a general sense, there was an increase of awareness towards the use of the FL in class to solve tasks, most of the students recognized these approaches as useful to their language learning process, but despite that some students were still making use of their MT to communicate with their peers.

Few students considered that the mother tongue use in tasks made the task completion easier, on the other hand, most of the students considered that the use of the FL to solve tasks was an important part of mastering their language.

In terms of peer to peer interaction, the students evidenced the development of the social processing unit by expressing their misunderstandings towards the solution of tasks, and by making meaning and participating actively in tasks through the collaborative function, which evidences that students are always willing to help their peers in need when it comes about the use of the FL and the procedures in tasks that result difficult to understand.

In terms of discourse functions in the students' utterances the interrogative and the informative functions were always present due to the students' intentions to solve the pedagogical tasks, which were the material the teacher used for students to keep that students were in a constant exchange of information that allowed them to enhance their oral skills.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions arose from the development of this research project during the scholar year.

There were two specific objectives proposed at the beginning of the project, being the first to establish the relationship between the use of pedagogical tasks and the students' oral communicative process, and the second to examine changes in the students' oral interaction when working with pedagogical tasks.

The pedagogical tasks main aim lies in having the students partaking in situations that grant them the chances to make use of their FL in the classroom, and are also considered to be fun for both teacher and students, as long as both sides are committed with the language learning process. But when one of the sides is not aware of their learning process, and thus cannot realize the great opportunity they have to put into practice what they are learning, then it is time to find a way to make students realize that using a different language is a fun thing to do.

Young learners initially will try to play their own rules, which is the use of their mother tongue to do whatever task is proposed for the class, but from the very beginning of the process the teacher has to raise awareness among his/her pupils bearing in mind that each kid is a different universe. The teacher has to be patient, most of the kids will understand that the use of language is important if they want to learn it, some other kids will take some more time in perceive it, but eventually they will use it, and they will use it to make that language theirs, that

is, to communicate with whomever they want and to solve problems inside and outside the classroom.

Initially there were more the students that were insecure towards the use of the FL in the classroom because they considered their speaking and listening were below the average in the classroom. The use of pedagogical tasks was indeed useful to help them improve a little in the development of those skills. At the same time, those students were also able to raise their self-confidence thanks to them interacting in the FL with patient and good-natured peers.

In terms of discipline, the researcher was very responsible in his research process, and he always tried to be compliant in terms of suggested modifications to the final document, as well as suggested modifications to the instruments of data collection, and suggestions towards his teaching style. The researcher is aware of the relevance this project has for him and for the EFL community.

In terms of the pedagogical intervention, the researcher learned to prepare his lesson plans on time in order to avoid class improvisation. The lesson plan preparation also allowed him to apply the pedagogical tasks in class. The teacher also learned that working with kids implies to be extra careful in the ways a task was explained, he also learned to be patient and caring with young learners.

In terms of the investigative experience the researcher could increase his knowledge of data collection instruments. The researcher was made aware that certain instruments can intimidate children, for what he learned to be prepared with other data collection instruments, related with the project he worked in, in the case of any eventuality.

CHAPTER VII

GENERAL RECCOMENDATIONS

All of the implementation process that was carried out, aimed to make an enrichment of the institution by providing another point of view regarding with the use of the task based learning approach. This section intends to show the reflections the researcher has towards the application of the intervention.

The researcher himself has evidenced the effectiveness of task based materials in the EFL classroom, and agrees with its usefulness in helping students reinforce their communicative skills. But are there any other approaches that can stimulate interaction in an appealing way to young learners in which the accuracy in the use of the FL is not sacrificed? The researcher considers that not only the production of the language is the evidence of FL mastery but accuracy when communicating.

For the upcoming teachers from Centro de Lenguas, TBL materials are the ones to be used until CDL decides to take on a different learning approach. It is very important before “setting the material aside”, to check it, to make it dialogue with the method other researchers might have in mind. The researcher suggests to do some research about the many different ways in which book activities can be transformed into any activities related to that particular approach, TBL included. “Breaking the rules” is just the last resort.

References

- A. Saint-Germain, Michelle. "PPA Research Methods 12th Session." *Data Collection Strategies II: Qualitative Research*. Long Beach: California State University, 1st January 2001.
- Altay, M. & Öztürk P. "Understanding and overcoming student anxieties in speaking lessons." *Sofia University Foreign Language Teaching Journal*, 19 (1) (2004): 23-28.
- Angelo, T.A. "A Teacher's Dozen: Fourteen General, Research-based Principles for Improving." *AAHE Bulletin*, 45(8) (1993).
- Austin, J. L. *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.
- Azar, A, Maragheh, R. "The Effect of Pedagogical Tasks in EFL Learners' Performance." *The Modern journal of Applied Linguistics* 4 (3) (2012): 119-128.
- Brown. *Teaching by Principles*. Longman, 2000.
- Brown, R. A. "Learning consequences of fear of negative evaluation and modesty for Japanese EFL students." *The Language Teacher*, 28 (1) (2004): 15-17.
- Burns, Anne. *Collaborative action research for English language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Burstall, C., et al. *Primary French in the balance*. Slough, England: NFER Publishing Company, 1974.
- Calderón, E. "The Impact of Teaching Grammar Inductively Through Textbook Songs and The Task Based Language Teaching." Bogotá DC: Universidad Pedagógica Nacional de Colombia, 2015.
- Carroll, D. W. *Psychology of language*. . California: Thomson Higher Education, 2008.
- Castañeda, N and L Bedoya. "Developing English Language Communicative Competence by Doing Pedagogical and Real World Tasks." Bogotá DC: Universidad Pedagógica Nacional de Colombia, 2007.
- Chandler, D & Munday, R. *A Dictionary of Media and Communication*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Cook, V. "Using the first language in the classroom." *Canadian Modern Language Review* 57 (2001): 402-423.
- Creswell, John. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design*. Thousand Oaks CA: SAGE Publications, Inc, 2013.
- Crick, N. R., & Dodge, K. A. "A review and reformulation of social information-processing mechanisms in children's social adjustment." *Psychological Bulletin* 115 (1994): 74-101.
- Denzin, N.K and Y.S. Lincoln. "Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research." Denzin, N.K and Y.S (Eds) Lincoln. *The sage handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage Publications Inc., 2005.
- Dodge, KA. "A social information processing model of social competence in children." Perlmutter, M (ed). *Minnesota Symposium in Child Psychology*. Vol. 18. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1986. 77-125.
- Edwards and Westgate. *Investigating classroom talk (2nd ed.)*. Basingstoke: Falmer Press, 1994.
- Ellis, R. *Instructed second language acquisition: learning in the classroom*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd., 1990.
- . *SLA research and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Erten, İ. H. «Student teacher's perception of peer response in writing courses at the tertiary level.» *Işık University ELT conference 2000 proceedings: global problems, local solutions*. Ed. M. Monty & T. Godfrey. İstanbul: Heinle and Heinle, 2000.

- Europe, Council of. "Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: learning, teaching, assessment." Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Feltovich, P. J, et al. "Colaboration within and among minds: Mastering complexity, individuality and in groups." (Ed.), T. Koschmann. *CSCL: Theory and practice of an emerging paradigm*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 1996. 25-44.
- Fontaine, R. "Applying systems principles to models of social information." *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 11 (2006): 64 - 76.
- Forero, Y. "Promoting Oral Interaction in Large Groups through Task-Based Learning." *Profiles*. Bogotá: Universidad Nacional de Colombia, 2005.
- Forman, E. "The role of peer interaction in the social construction of mathematical knowledge." *International Journal of Educational Research*, 13 (1989): 55-70.
- Gillies, R. M. "Teacher's and students' verbal behaviours during cooperative and small-group learning." *British Journal of educational Psychology*, 76 (2006): 271-287.
- Greeno, J.G. "Learning in Activity." (ed.), R.K. Sawyer. *Cambridge Handbook of the Learning Sciences*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006. 79-96.
- Halliday and Hasan. *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective*. Oxford: OUP, 1989.
- Herazo, J. "Authentic Oral Interaction in the EFL Class: What it Means, What it Does Not." *Profiles*. Bogotá: Universidad Nacional de Colombia, 2009.
- Jamshidnejad, A. "The construction of oral problems in an EFL context." *Studies in Literature and Language* 1(6) (2010): 8-22.
- Järvenoja, H and S Jarvelä. "Emotion control in collaborative learning situations - Do students regulate emotions evoked from social challenges?" *British Journal of Educational Psychology* (79) (2009): 463-481.
- Kondo, A. "Students' perception of group work in EFL class." *Nara National College of Technology* (2010): 65-73.
- Krashen, S.D. *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon, 1982.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. "The name of the task and the task of naming: Methodological aspects of task-based pedagogy." Gass, G. Crookes and S. *Tasks in a Pedagogical Context*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1993. 69-96.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. "State of the art on input in second language acquisition." *Input in second language acquisition* (1985): 433-444.
- Lenguas, Centro de. *Lineamientos Pedagógicos y Metodológicos del Centro de Lenguas de la Universidad Pedagógica Nacional*. Bogotá: Universidad Pedagógica Nacional de Colombia, 2014. Digital.
- Lightbown, P. "What do we have here? Some observations on the influence of instruction on L2 learning." *Foreign/Second language pedagogy research* (1991): 97-212.
- Liu, J. "L1 use in L2 vocabulary learning: facilitator or barrier?" *International Education Studies*, 1 (2) (2008): 66-70.
- Long, M. H. "A role for instruction in second language acquisition: Task-based language training." Pienemann, K. Hyttenstam & M. *Modelling and assessing second language acquisition*. Clevedon Avon England: Multilingual Matters, 1985.
- Long, M.H. Porter, P.A. «Group work, interlanguage talk and second language acquisition.» *TESOL Quarterly* 19 (2) (1985): 07-227.

- Loos, Eugene E., et al. "What is interrogative mood?" *Glossary of linguistic terms*. SIL International, 28 12 2009.
- Macaro, E. "Codeswitching in the L2 classroom: a communication and learning strategy." *Non-native Language Teachers: Perceptions, Challenges and Contributions to the Profession* (2005): 63-84.
- Makitalo, et al. "Mechanisms of common ground in case-based web discussions in teacher education." *The Internet and Higher Education* (5) (2002): 247-265.
- Nemat, A. & Nasiri, M. "The Effect of Using Task-Based Activities on Speaking Proficiency of EFL Learners." *The Third Asian Conference on Education 2011 Official Proceedings*. Osaka: JALT, 2011. 333-345.
- NR, Crick and Dodge KA. "A review and reformulation of social-information processing mechanisms." *Children's development. Psychological Bulletin* 115 (1994): 74-101.
- Nunan, D. "Action research in the language classroom." (eds), J. C. Richards and D. Nunan. *Second language teacher education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Nunan, D. *Research methods in language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Paker, T & Karaağaç, O. "The use and functions of mother tongue in EFL classes." *An International Conference on Teaching and Learning English as an Additional*. Ed. GlobELT. Antalya, Turkey: GlobELT, 2015. 111 – 119.
- Parga, F. "Cooperative Structures of Interaction in a Public School EFL Classroom in Bogotá." *Colombian Journal of Applied Linguistics*. Bogotá: Universidad Distrital Francisco José de Caldas, 2009.
- Peña, M. Onatra, A. "Promoting Oral Production through the Task-Based Learning Approach: A Study in a Public Secondary School in Colombia." *Profiles*. Bogotá: Universidad Nacional de Colombia, 2009.
- Pine, Gerald J. "Conducting Teacher Action Research." Pine, Gerald J. *Teacher Action Research Building Knowledge Democracies*. Boston: Sage Publications Inc., Boston College, 2009. 234-262.
- Pütz, M and L Sicola. *Cognitive Processing in Second Language Acquisition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2010.
- Richards, Jack. *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. United States of America: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Robinson, H. A. *The Ethnography of Empowerment – The Transformative Power of Classroom Interaction*. Newbury Park, U.S.A.: Sage Publications, 1994.
- Rodriguez, Sergio. «Task-Based Learning Strategies and Autonomous Work: A Way to Develop Speaking Skills On Students.» Bogotá: Universidad Pedagógica Nacional de Colombia, 2013.
- Sachs, T & Ho, B. *ESL/EFL Cases. Contexts for Teacher Professional Discussions*. Kowloon, Hong Kong: City University of Hong Kong Press, 2007.
- Sánchez, S. "Communicative Tasks in A Group of Children at The International Language Institute at The UPTC." *Enletawa Journal*. Tunja: Universidad Pedagógica y Tecnológica de Colombia, 2012.
- Schutt, R. *Investigating the Social World The Process and Practice of Research 8th Edition*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage Publicatons Inc., 2015.
- Skehan, P. *A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

- Storch, N. "Comparing ESL learners' attention to grammar on three different classroom tasks." *RELC Journal*, 32 (2001): 104-124.
- Sullivan, P. «Playfulness as Mediation Communicative Language Teaching in a Vietnamese Classroom.» *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning* (2000).
- Swain, M. "Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development." Gass, S. and Madden, C. *Input in Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Newbury House, 1985. 235-256.
- Swain, M. "Communicative competence: some roles of comprehensible output in its development." (Eds.), S. Gass & C. Maddern. *Input in second language acquisition*. Cambridge, MA: Newberry House Publishers, 1985. 235-253.
- Swain, M., Brooks, L., & Tocalli-Beller, A. "Peer-peer dialogue as means of second language learning." *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22 (2002): 171–185.
- Tang, H, J Chiou and O. Jarsaillon. "Efficacy of Task-Based Learning in a Chinese EFL Classroom." *English Language Teaching; Vol. 8 (5)* (2015): 168-176.
- Tudor, I. *The Dynamics of the Language Classroom*. Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Turnbull, M. "There is a role for the L1 in second and foreign language teaching, but..." *Canadian Modern Language Review* 57 (2001): 531-540.
- Ur, Penny. *A Course in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Van Lier, L. "From input to affordance: Social-interactive learning from an ecological perspective." *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning*. 2000. 245-259.
- Van Lier, L. *Interaction in the language curriculum: Awareness, autonomy and*. Harlow, England: Addison Wesley Longman Limited, 1996.
- Volet, S. E and C Mansfield. "Group work at university: Significance of personal goals in the regulation strategies of students with positive and negative appraisals." *Higher Education, Research and Development*, 25 (2006): 341-356.
- Wicking, P. "Transforming textbook activities into successful tasks." *JALT2009 Conference Proceedings*. Ed. A. M. Stoke. Tokyo: JALT, 2010. 466-473.
- Willis, J. *A framework for task-based learning*. Harlow: Longman, 1996.
- Wray, D. Kumpulainen, K. "Researching classroom interaction and talk." (Ed.), D. Hartas. *Educational research and inquiry, Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2010. 170-185.

ANNEXES

In this section, you will find a brief description of the support documents in the table below.

Table of Appendixes

	Annex	Description
#1	Data Collection-Analysis Chronogram	Shows the dates in which data was collected and analyzed during the year of implementation.
#2	Academic program for the year 2016	Shows the dates in which the students had class, the class objective for that date as well as the central activity and the units to be developed.
#3	Lesson Plan Model	It is a lesson plan format made modeled to follow the task stages developed by Willis (1996)
#4	Informed consent form	Since the participants of this study were kids, it was necessary to obtain their parents' permission to take audio-visual registers from them. It was done due to ethical reasons.
#5	Field notes model	This was the field notes model used to register all of the events that occurred in the classes at Centro de Lenguas Universidad Pedagogica Nacional de Colombia.

ANNEX #1

Data Collection-Analysis Chronogram

Units of Oral Interaction	Category	Instrument of data collection	Date of collection	Date of analysis
Social Processing	Collaborative	Field notes / Audio recording / Transcriptions	April 9th and August 27th 2016	June 3rd and October 10th 2016
	Confusion	Field notes / Audio recording / Transcriptions	April 9th and August 27th 2016	June 3rd and October 10th 2016
Cognitive Processing	Exploratory-Interpretative	Field notes / Audio recording / Transcriptions	April 16th and September 17th 2016	June 3rd and October 10th 2016
	-Procedural / Routine	Field notes / Audio recording / Transcriptions	April 16th and September 17th 2016	June 3rd and October 10th 2016
Discourse Functions	Interrogative /informative	Field notes / Audio recording / Transcriptions	April 30th and October 8th 2016	June 3rd and October 10th 2016

ANNEX #2

Academic program for the year 2016

Date of the Class	Class objective	Central Activity	Developed Unit of Analysis
February 13 th 2016	-To talk about one's family -To describe physical Characteristics	Make a family tree	1 st Unit
February 20 th 2016	-To talk about one's family -To talk about family events	Find out about peers' plans for a family event	2 nd Unit
February 27 th 2016	-To talk about types of TV Programs -To express opinions	-Make a TV guide with their favorite programs. -Present in front of the class a TV show	3 rd Unit
March 5 th 2016	-To identify and talk about different arts and crafts -To describe crafts and materials -To talk about alternative ideas and possibilities	Produce a sketch (Described by peers).	1 st , 2 nd , and 3 rd Units
March 12 th 2016	1 st TERM EXAM	Speaking, Reading, Grammar, Listening, writing	
March 19 th 2016	-To talk about shopping. - To talk about places to shop	-Buy the groceries the teacher needs to make lunch. - Elaborate the ad for a product that will be sold to peers.	1 st Unit.
March 26 th 2016			
April 2 nd 2016	-To talk about travel experiences. -To talk about weather conditions -To talk about vacation activities and tips	-Elaborate a poster or show a story to show important tips to travel safely.	2 nd Unit.
April 9 th 2016	-To talk about ways of communicating.	-Elaborate and present a poster to present the students' idea for a web magazine.	3 rd Unit.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Talk about future events. -Make predictions about the future. 		
April 16 th 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -To talk about what materials things are made of. -To talk about how things are used. -To make predictions. 	-Present an uncommon gadget for peers to identify what it does and what it is made of.	1 st , 2 nd , and 3 rd Units.
April 23 rd 2016	2 nd TERM EXAM	Speaking, Reading, Grammar, Listening, writing	
April 30 th 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -To talk about what materials things are made of. -To talk about how things are used. -To make predictions. 	-Elaborate and present their ideas for an article in a magazine “10 Things You Can Do with Tin Cans”.	1 st Unit
May 7 th 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -To talk about what materials things are made of. -To talk about how things are used. -To make predictions. 	-Elaborate and present an invention to peers.	2 nd Unit
May 14 th 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -To talk about countries’ imports and exports. -To express opinions. -To support opinions. -To describe steps in processes, Procedures. -To compare quality. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Elaborate and present a country word map. -Exchange information with peers in order to complete a chart. 	3 rd Unit
May 21 st 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -To identify and talk about different kinds of music. -To describe actions. -To ask about preferences and to express opinions. -To talk about experiences. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Make and talk about a musical instrument. -Take a survey, make a chart (musical tastes), and share it with classmates. 	1 st , 2 nd , and 3 rd Units

May 28 th 2016	-To review all the topics seen in the semester. -To prepare for the art exposition.	-Present in front of classmates your master piece.	1 st , 2 nd , and 3 rd Units
June 4 th 2016	3 rd TERM EXAM	Speaking, Reading, Grammar, Listening, writing	
June 11 th 2016	-To prepare for the art exposition.	-Present in front of parents your master piece.	
August 6 th 2016	-To identify oneself. -To count how many. -To identify colors. -To identify classroom objects.	Make a presentation about oneself in front of peers by using different sketches.	1 st Unit
August 13 th 2016	-To identify family members. -To talk about one's family. -To count how many.	Present one's family tree in front of peers.	2 nd Unit
August 20 th 2016	-To identify parts of the body. -To talk about parts of the body. -To use descriptive adjectives. -To identify colors. -To count how many.	Complete a human body map.	3 rd Unit
August 27 th 2016	-To identify and talk about Clothes. -To talk about clothing likes and dislikes. -To use descriptive adjectives.	Describe the clothes one likes to wear and the clothes one has to wear in different situations.	1 st , 2 nd , and 3 rd Units
September 3 rd 2016	1 st TERM EXAM	Speaking, Reading, Grammar, Listening, writing	
September 10 th 2016	-To identify and talk about rooms in a home. -To talk about actions that take place in the home. -Family members. -To identify shapes.	Present to peers one's current house and one's dream house.	1 st Unit

September 17 th 2016	-To identify and describe farm Animals. -To identify actions. -To use descriptive adjectives.	Fund a farm with one's favorite animals (pkmn bst lk exch) and present it to peers (tour like).	2 nd Unit
September 24 th 2016	-To talk about birthdays. -To identify birth dates. -To talk about food and Celebrations. -To talk about likes and dislikes.	Present to peers the things one likes about birthdays.	3 rd Unit
October 1 st 2016	2 nd TERM EXAM	Speaking, Reading, Grammar, Listening, writing	
October 8 th 2016	-To talk about birthdays. -To identify birth dates. -To talk about food and Celebrations. -To talk about likes and dislikes.	Complete a chart with peers' birthdays.	1 st , 2 nd , and 3 rd Units
October 15 th 2016	-To talk about birthdays. -To identify birth dates. -To talk about food and Celebrations. -To talk about likes and dislikes.	Present to peers one's best birthday so far and one's dream birthday.	1 st Unit
October 22 nd 2016	-To identify and talk about toys. -To talk about what people want. -To describe location. -To count how many.	Complete a chart with the toys your peers want and where to get them.	2 nd Unit
October 29 th 2016	-To identify and talk about toys. -To talk about what people want. -To describe location. -To count how many.	Design and present a toy for peers.	3 rd Unit
November 5 th 2016	-To identify and talk about toys. -To talk about what people want. -To describe location. -To count how many.	Complete a chart with peer's favorite toys.	1 st , 2 nd , and 3 rd Units

November 12 th 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -To talk about fun activities. -To describe location. -To use descriptive adjectives. -To identify colors. 	Give peers a tour to the funniest places they know. Peers interview peers.	1 st , 2 nd , and 3 rd Units
November 19 th 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -To talk about fun activities. -To describe location. -To use descriptive adjectives. -To identify colors. 	Peers complete charts with the activities their peers like to do and present in front of the class.	1 st , 2 nd , and 3 rd Units
November 26 th 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -To review all the topics seen in the semester. -To work in the final presentation project. 	-Present in front of classmates (Project not decided yet). Classmates will give you their thoughts.	1 st , 2 nd , and 3 rd Units
December 3 rd 2016	3 rd TERM EXAM	Speaking, Reading, Grammar, Listening, writing	
December 10 th 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -To share with the students (Not decided yet). -To prepare for the presentation of the project. 	-Present in front of parents (Project not decided yet).	

ANNEX #3

Lesson Plan Model

This is the lesson plan model that was used during the Application and Closure stages of this study. The headline of the lesson plan indicates the number of the session and the date in which the class has to be given. The first block in the lesson plan contains the title of the lesson, the name of the institution or school, the level of the course, the number of students in the course, the duration of the class in minutes, the language to use in class and the name of the teacher in charge of the class.

The second block contains the communicative objectives, this is what the students will be able to do after the session of class finishes, usually there are from two (2) to four (4) or (5) objectives per class. The number of objectives may vary.

The third block contains the language objective; those are the grammar structures that are going to be taught in class. The fourth box contains the vocabulary that will be taught in class. The fifth block contains a list of all the materials required for that class.

The sixth box has two columns which are Procedure and Time and Instructional Setting. The Procedure and Time section contains a very detailed description of the activities that are going to be developed during the time in class. It also contains the time that will be used for each activity. The activities within the box correspond to the task stages. Pre-task preparation and Pre-task activity are the pre-task phases according to the lesson planning in task based activities by Willis (1998) in which the teacher provides the students with the corresponding vocabulary and grammar structures of that class. The task cycle contains two stages which contain also very detailed activities of what is going to be done in class. In both of the stages of the task cycle, the

students perform the tasks, prepare what to say in front of their peers and present their results to the class.

The third stage is report and closure, in it the teacher provides the students with feedback which is based on the annotations of the mistakes the students made in their speech. The teacher took notes of those mistakes during the first and second stages of the task cycle. The next block corresponds to the homework the teacher left the students. It is usually related to the topic that corresponds to the next class. The instructional setting box indicates whether the activity is whole class, in groups or in pairs.

The last two blocks correspond to the students' performance in class and the data relevant for the project, which have a field note like function.

LESSON PLAN #9 (Saturday April 16th 2016)

Name of the lesson: Put on your thinking cap Institution: Languages Center Level: Advanced Number of students: 23 students Duration: 210 min Language: English Teacher in charge: Cesar Meneses
Objectives For students to: Talk about what materials things are made of To talk about how things are used To make predictions
Language objective: Made of + noun (Plastic, wood, metal), May and might to speculate, be used + infinitive of purpose.
Vocabulary: Invention-related terms, inventions, types of material, expressions.

Material and equipment: Class audio CD, student book unit 7, whiteboard, board markers, workbook copies, index cards, common and uncommon objects.

PROCEDURE AND TIME (DETAILED DESCRIPTION)	Instructional setting
<p>Pre-task preparation:</p> <p>The teacher will have the students working in groups of 3 people to guess the identity and purpose of something as well as the use of <i>may</i> and <i>might</i> to speculate, for this T will model the conversation on page 75 and will explain to his Ss that they will use said dialogue to identify each picture in the same page and to match the corresponding sticker. T will walk the room to monitor the Ss understanding and use of <i>may</i> and <i>might</i>, which can be used interchangeably. T won't interrupt students to correct mistakes but will take notes of the most frequent errors that will be used to give the students feedback. After that, T will display a few common objects and will ask Ss to identify them, T will write the Ss' answers on the board such as <i>It's a pen. It's an eraser</i>. T will ask Ss what each item is used for, e.g. <i>What's a pen used for?</i> T will model a response if necessary.</p> <p>The T will hold up some items that are not easily identifiable (for example a corkscrew, a plastic toothbrush case). T will ask the Ss what they think each item is, and T will elicit <i>It may be... It might be...</i> Ask Ss if they are sure. T will point out the use of <i>is</i> and <i>are</i> when one is sure about the item, but <i>may be</i> and <i>might be</i> when one is not sure. After that, T will direct the Ss' attention to the grammar box at the top of the page and have them study it for a minute. T will point out the two pictures and explain that Ss will make guesses and write two different sentences about what each item might be, for this Ss will work individually and then will form small groups to share their sentences.</p> <p>T will write the sentences on the board. In the same small groups Ss will brainstorm 10 commonly known objects (Headphones, backpack, stapler, fork) T will write them in individual index cards or pieces of paper and will place them in a pile facing down. In turns Ss will pick up a card and will give a hint as to what the item is by saying <i>It's used to (carry your books)</i>. The Ss continue giving hints until the object is identified. The activity will be modeled first a few times. (45 minutes).</p> <p>Pre-task activity:</p> <p>The Ss will work in groups of 3 people and their attention will be drawn to the pictures on pages 76-77. T will have each S brainstorm as many words as they can to describe each picture. T will not pre-teach any vocabulary, T will help Ss</p>	<p>Groups</p> <p>Groups/Whole class</p>

<p>with words they genuinely need. The groups will share with the whole class their lists. After that, students will read the headings and name what inventions will be talked about. Afterwards Ss will read silently or aloud. If the reading is Aloud, T will interrupt the reading to ask comprehension questions such as <i>What was the first hot air balloon made of?</i> Once the readings are finished, the Ss will create a materials map.</p> <p>T will elicit a definition for materials (what people use to make things). Ss will have to check again on pages 75-77 to find the names of materials. T will have examples of the names of materials beforehand to show the students. T will record on each of the materials the Ss find. T will also help Ss to brainstorm familiar objects that are made of each material. T will encourage Ss to add the word map to their notebooks. Once the Ss finish, T will direct the Ss attention to the dialogues on page 77 and will model the exchange for the class, one model per dialogue. T can make up more examples before the Ss work in pairs. One partner will ask about all four pictures and the other partner will answer, later they will exchange roles.</p> <p>T will walk on the room monitoring the activity and taking notes on the mistakes Ss make. These errors will be review before finishing the class (45 minutes).</p>	
<p>Task cycle</p> <p>Stage one – Student charts:</p> <p>The Ss will be arranged in pairs. The student A will use the information on page 79 and the student B will turn to page 111. T will point out the question headings on the chart that Ss will use to complete the missing information. The Ss will take turns asking questions, then they will brainstorm together what the items might be. T will walk around the room monitoring the Ss' understanding and use of the language and will also take notes of the most frequent errors and review them with the students later. As soon as they finish, T will make Ss change pairs and will explain the Ss that each partner in each pair will create a chart similar to the one in activity 9 in page 79, but with new hints. When the Ss have finished, they will work with their partners to complete each other's chart. (60 minutes)</p> <p>Stage two – Different uses of items:</p> <p>T will bring pictures of unusual gadgets, machines and tools and their purpose, and will give one picture and its corresponding purpose to each group (of 3 people). Ss in their groups will have 5 minutes to learn it. After that Ss will display the picture of the invention and will ask the class to guess what it might be used for. After the class speculates, T will invite the presenters to explain the real use for the invention. (45 minutes)</p>	<p>Pairs / group</p> <p>Pairs / group</p>

Stage three – Report and closure Once the activities are finished, T will ask the students to pay attention to the feedback that will be provided. This feedback will be given by using the mistakes noticed by the teacher in the activities developed in class. The T will register the mistakes in a notebook and will show the students in the board a better way to express what they wanted to say, in order to do so, the teacher will ask his students to listen and repeat. (15 minutes)	Whole class
Homework Students will be asked to work on the online platform. In it, content related to the next class (The uses of the vb to be, may and might) will be uploaded by the teacher that day.	

Students performance in class

Data related to the project

ANNEX #4

Vicerrectoría de Gestión Universitaria
Subdirección de Gestión de Proyectos – Centro de Investigaciones CIUP
Comité de Ética en la Investigación

En el marco de la Constitución Política Nacional de Colombia, la Resolución 0546 de 2015 de la Universidad Pedagógica Nacional y demás normatividad aplicable vigente, considerando las características de la investigación, se requiere que usted lea detenidamente y si está de acuerdo con su contenido, exprese su consentimiento firmando el siguiente documento:

PARTE UNO: INFORMACIÓN GENERAL DEL PROYECTO

Facultad, Departamento o Unidad Académica	Facultad de Humanidades Departamento de Lenguas		
Título del proyecto de investigación	The Use of Pedagogical Tasks in Oral Interaction		
Descripción breve y clara de la investigación	Analizar el impacto del uso de tasks sobre la interacción oral de los estudiantes		
Descripción de los posibles riesgos de participar en la investigación	Ninguno conocido.		
Descripción de los posibles beneficios de participar en la investigación	El posible mejoramiento del nivel de inglés de los estudiantes		
Datos generales del investigador principal	Nombre(s) y Apellido(s): César Andrés Meneses Perdomo		
	N° de Identificación:	Teléfono	
	Correo electrónico:		
	Dirección:		

PARTE DOS: CONSENTIMIENTO INFORMADO

Yo : _____

Mayor de edad, identificado con Cédula de Ciudadanía N° _____ de _____

Con domicilio en la ciudad de: _____ Dirección: _____

Teléfono y N° de celular: _____ Correo electrónico: _____

Declaro que:

1. He sido invitado(a) a participar en el estudio o investigación de manera voluntaria.
2. He leído y entendido este formato de consentimiento informado o el mismo se me ha leído y explicado.
3. Todas mis preguntas han sido contestadas claramente y he tenido el tiempo suficiente para pensar acerca de mi decisión de participar.
4. He sido informado y conozco de forma detallada los posibles riesgos y beneficios derivados de mi participación en el proyecto.
5. No tengo ninguna duda sobre mi participación, por lo que estoy de acuerdo en hacer parte de esta investigación.
6. Puedo dejar de participar en cualquier momento sin que esto tenga consecuencias.
7. Conozco el mecanismo mediante el cual los investigadores garantizan la custodia y confidencialidad de mis datos, los cuales no serán publicados ni revelados a menos que autorice por escrito lo contrario.
8. Autorizo expresamente a los investigadores para que utilicen la información y las grabaciones de audio, video o imágenes que se generen en el marco del proyecto.
9. Sobre esta investigación me asisten los derechos de acceso, rectificación y oposición que podré ejercer mediante solicitud ante el investigador responsable, en la dirección de contacto que figura en este documento.

En constancia el presente documento ha sido leído y entendido por mí en su integridad de manera libre y espontánea.

Firma,

Nombre: _____

Identificación: _____

Fecha: _____

La Universidad Pedagógica Nacional agradece sus aportes y su decidida participación

UNIVERSIDAD PEDAGÓGICA NACIONAL
Pedagogical Practice

Institution and semester: Centro de Lenguas UPN

Class Report N°: 7

Date: April 16th 2016

Hour: 8:00 AM to 12:00 PM

Trainee Teacher: César Andrés Meneses Perdomo

Population of the session: Kids from 6 to 10 years' old

Objectives:

1. To talk about what materials things are made of
2. To talk about how things are used
3. To make predictions

Activities:

1. The groups that could not present last class, took their chance to present their online magazines to the class.
2. The teacher made students work in groups of three people to model a conversation on p. 75 from the book and asked them to modify the dialogue so they could identify pictures on the page, once the picture was identified, the students used the stickers from the book to match the pictures on the page.
3. The teacher displayed common objects (5) and asked students to identify them, when a student answered properly the teacher wrote the answer in the board. The teacher also asked the students what each item was used for. The teacher modeled an answer for students to answer those questions.
4. The teacher showed items (5) that were not easily identifiable and asked the students what they thought they were. The teacher elicited "*It may be...*" "*It might be*". The teacher asked them if they were sure. The teacher pointed out that when they use "is" "or "are" they are completely sure what the object is, but when they use may or might they are expressing they are not sure about what the object is.
5. The teacher asked the students to work on p. 78 in couples and directed the students' attention to the grammar box at the top of that page. The teacher asked the students to study the grammar box for a minute. The teacher pointed out the two pictures and asked the students to make guesses by writing two different sentences about what each item could be.
6. The teacher made the students gather in 5 groups and gave them empty index cards, he asked them to think about known objects. The students wrote the words of these known objects on the empty index cards. Once the students finished, the teacher went group by group explaining them that the cards they were holding should be facing down, so in turns the students picked up a card and gave a hint about what the item was for their peers to identify the object.
7. The teacher asked the students to make groups of three people to work on pages 76-77 and had each student brainstorm as many words as possible to describe the pictures in the pages. Each group made a list with words which was shared in class.
8. The students read aloud. One student per sentence. The teacher corrected the pronunciation mistakes from the students and had them repeating the mispronounced word correctly before continuing to another sentence. The teacher interrupted the reading to ask comprehension questions.

9. The teacher gave the students markers and poster board for them to make a materials map, then he elicited a definition of “material” and got examples of materials from the students. Once the materials map was finished, the teacher asked the students to add the word map to their notebooks.

10. The teacher modeled the conversation on p. 77 with a couple of students for the rest of the class to practice it. In couples one of the partners asked about all four pictures on p. 77 and the other answered, once they finished, they exchanged roles.

11. The students changed pairs. The teacher asked one of the students in the couples to use the p. 79 from the book and the other was asked to open the book in the p. 111. The teacher pointed out the question headings on the chart, which the students used to complete the missing information in it. The students asked questions and brainstormed together what the items were. Once they finished, the teacher asked the students to make charts (two per couple) similar to the one they saw on p. 79 but with new hints. Once the students finished, they worked with their partners to finish each other’s chart.

12. The teacher showed the students pictures of unusual gadgets, machines, tools and their purpose. The teacher made the students form five (5) groups and gave to each group one of the pictures. The teacher gave the students five minutes to memorize the name and purpose of that gadget. When the students were ready, the teacher had the students showing the picture of the invention and asking their peers what it might be used for. Once the class finished speculating, the presenters explained what the real use of the invention was

13. The teacher provided feedback to the students thanks to the notes he took about the most frequent mistakes in all of the exercises and showed to the students in the board a better way to express their ideas.

Absences:

S #9 was absent that day for unspecified reasons.

Special Cases:

The S #0 is a very energetic student. This time I decided to have a couple of words with him before the class started, I have to say that his behavior this time changed for the better a little bit. The student remained calmed and tried to perform the proposed exercises (the ones already mentioned in the activities part). At first the student did not understand what he had to do, but since the exercises implied constant repetition, he might have focused all of his energy into paying attention to the language used by his classmates, which he finally used for the second stage of the task cycle.

Administrative situations:

There are no administrative situations to report.

Evaluation of the session:

It was a great session of class. Most, if not all of the students responded positively to the proposed exercises (tasks) in the way I was expecting, they not only made use of the taught structures (may/might be and be used + infinitive of purpose), they also made use of the vocabulary, which was related to the materials things are made of. S #0 had certain difficulties at first because he did not know how to use the language or what to do, but he was able to sort the difficulties in the end by paying attention to the language used by his classmates. All of the students participated actively by answering their classmates’ questions and by volunteering to read in the reading part. They also showed a nice attitude in class by behaving properly (Not picking up fights and trying to use English among them most of the time in class).

Evidences:

I took notes of the class in my field notes notebook. Most of the students at first would use the verb to be to guess what an object was instead of using may and might to speculate. In the pre-task preparation phase, I showed the picture of a cutter, S #8 raised his hand and said: "It's a cutter" but after another of the students, #11 reminded him the correct language to use by saying: "It might be", S #8 then corrected his sentence to "It might be a cutter". In those same phase and exercise, I asked the question "What do you think it does?" because the students had already guessed the picture (It was a paint brush). The S #4 says: "It's used to paint" one of his classmates, S #17, reminds him the right way to say the sentence by saying: "I think it might be used to paint". From this part I can say that the most skillful students in the class (11 and 17 are some of them) are always willing to correct their classmates to use the right expression. In the same pre-task phase but in the index card game, I also noticed that the less skillful students (for this exercise only are S #8 and S #4, because they usually show a good performance in most classes) I noticed that some students gave clues in a complete way, for example, S #5 said: "You use this object to brush your teeth" and some of her classmates answered: "A toothbrush!"; in another group, S #6 said "You use this object to protect your foots when walking on the street" and some of his classmates answered "Shoes!", but in other groups, when it came to give clues some students used mimics despite the instruction in the modeling of the activity I gave for each group was to give clues in complete sentences. For example, S #00 used mimics instead of giving a clue in a complete sentence, he crossed his arms and shook so his classmates could guess what the object written in the index card was. His classmates answered "A jacket!" which was the right answer. Could it be that the student did not remember the structures and vocabulary to use? Why did not his classmates correct him like it was seen in some other groups when in the group there were people like S #11 who knew the structure used that day in class?

In the pre-task activity, I could notice some utterances from students in Spanish when the students were brainstorming material for the word map, I still had to remind them that no Spanish was allowed in class. By the first stage of the task-cycle most of the students were exchanging information to complete their charts in pages 79 and 111 by making proper use of the language, students like S #10 asked questions such as: "What's it made of?" "What's it used for?" and "What might it be?", and S #3 answered these questions by saying: "It's made of plastic" "It's used to eat food" and "It might be a plastic dish". At first S #10 was helping S #3 to produce the sentences correctly, e.g. in the correction S #10 told S #3: "Tienes que decir it's made of plastic, no it's plastic" and S #3 followed the correction to produce the required utterance. To make an effective correction, S #10 had to use Spanish, but S #3 corrected and produced his sentence in Spanish.

In the second stage of the task cycle most of the students were using the structures taught in order to guess what the device their classmates were presenting was, some students had a hard time when the activity begun because they were still using to be utterances like "It's a drone" instead of using sentences like "I think it might be a drone", maybe it was because the students knew what that picture in particular was. In some other pictures the students presented, some of their peers only mentioned the name of the gadget, e.g. "Bag-scooter!" or "Solar Smartphone!". Maybe it was due to the excitement of the competition the students were having in the class. There was not competition at all in this stage though.

Support councils:

There are no report councils to report.

Learning:

1. Most of the students are trying really hard to make use of English in class, at least with me, about S #0 I can say that maybe by talking with him before every class could indeed improve his behavior, I did not nag him, I rather advised him and encouraged him to do better in class. Now it is time for me to find out how do I have him improving his performance in class, I'm not really sure if talking with Ivan before every class will work the coming classes, but I don't think it'll hurt to do it.
2. This time I realized that sometimes in the correction process among peers, some students use Spanish to help their partners correct and then they switch back to practice in English.
3. By using the field notes I recorded the first category of analysis (Cognitive Processing), I can conclude that my students are exploring the activities and focusing on handling, organizing and executing the task:

"S #6: Do you have scissors?

S #1: Here.

S #15: Do we cut or write the things?

S #5: The teacher said first to write and next to cut the paper.

S #6: I write!

S #1: I cut!"

All of the four children were involved in brainstorming 10 common objects to write them in index cards at the pre-task preparation phase. When asking "Do you have..." S #6 is using the interrogative function as well as S #15 when she asks "Do we cut or write...?", but S #15 is using another function besides the interrogative, and that is the organizational function. S #1 uses his talk in the responsive and organizational functions when he says "Here". S #5 is using her talk in the responsive and organizational functions when she says "The teacher said first to write...". S #6 uses the responsive and organizational functions when he says "I write!" as well as S #1 when he also uses his talk for responsive and organizational functions when he said "I cut!".

"S #16: Valery! Cut was the second thing and writing was the first thing!

S #19: Sorry. Yo creía que se cortaba primero y luego escribíamos

S #17: Valery, the teacher said in English.

S #7: Let's write"

In the pre-task preparation phase the children in this group were engaged in brainstorming and writing 10 common objects in index cards. S #16 is using the organizational function in her speak when she says "Cut was the second thing...!". Despite using Spanish, S #19 uses a responsive function when she says "Yo creía que se cortaba primero...". S #17 uses a responsive function and a judgmental function when she said "The teacher said in English", and S #7 uses an organizational function in her speak when she says "Let's write".

"S #00: How do you say cacho in English?

S #11: I'm going to ask the teacher.

S #3: It's rubber

S #00: ¿Qué?

S #3: Rubber means cacho

S #00: Ah"

In the pre-task activity phase, the children in this group were asked to find the names of materials to make a word map on poster board. S #00 in his speak used the interrogative function when he asked "How do you say...?" and when he in Spanish asks "¿Qué?" after S #3 answered his question. S #11 used the responsive function when he answered "I'm going to ask...". S #3 also made use of the responsive function in his speak when he says "Rubber means...".

In summary S #6, S #15 and S #00 used the interrogative function. S #15, S #1, S #5, S #6, S #16, and S #7 made use of the organizational function. S #1, S #5, S #6, S #19, S #16, S #11 and S #3 made use of the responsive function. S #17 used a judgmental function.