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Abstract

This study aimed at measuring the impact of self-regulation facilitated with mobile devices in order to improve speaking skills. The innovation lasted for six weeks and involved twenty-four students in the first year of baccalaureate in a bilingual school in Manta-Ecuador. They had CEFR B1 level and showed difficulty to express themselves orally. Action research was conducted applying pretests and posttests. The participants were made aware of self-regulation strategies; they were encouraged to make improvement plans; and they were trained to assess their speaking skills using the Cambridge B1 Analytical Scale. They made videos using their mobile devices and assessed their performance on the videos. Quantitative results revealed that the intervention was significant to a medium extent in the students’ interactive communication, Cohen’s $d = 0.4$; and that their acquisition of self-assessment skills enabled them to commit to improvement. Qualitative results demonstrated that motivation to participate orally in class increased and that the self-regulation strategies helped them enhance interaction. These findings have implications for language teachers and curriculum designers. Teaching self-assessment skills to students would show them how to improve; self-regulation would help them become more autonomous learners; and the use of mobile devices would increase their motivation.
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Resumen

El objetivo de este estudio fue medir el impacto de la auto-regulación facilitada con dispositivos móviles para mejorar las habilidades de comunicación oral. La innovación duró seis semanas e involucró a veinticuatro estudiantes de primero de bachillerato de un colegio privado bilingüe en Manta-Ecuador. Los estudiantes tenían nivel B1 del MCRE y mostraban dificultad para expresarse oralmente. Se llevó a cabo una investigación activa sobre el grupo específico aplicando pruebas al inicio y al final. Se les enseñó a los participantes las estrategias de auto-regulación; se los motivó a hacer planes de mejora; y se los entrenó para evaluar sus habilidades orales usando la escala analítica de nivel B1 de Cambridge. Ellos hicieron videos usando sus dispositivos móviles y evaluaron su participación en los videos. Los resultados cuantitativos revelaron que la intervención fue medianamente significativa en la comunicación interactiva de los estudiantes, Cohen’s $d = 0.4$; y que la adquisición de habilidades de auto-evaluación les permitió comprometerse a mejorar. Los resultados cualitativos demostraron que la motivación para participar oralmente en clase aumentó y que las estrategias de auto-regulación les ayudaron a mejorar la interacción. Los hallazgos de este estudio tienen implicaciones para los profesores y para los que diseñan currículos. Enseñar habilidades de auto-evaluación a los estudiantes les mostraría como mejorar; la auto-regulación les ayudaría a ser más autónomos; y el uso de dispositivos móviles aumentaría su motivación.
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Facilitating Self-regulation with Mobile Devices to Improve Speaking Skills in High School Students in Ecuador

The standards for in-service English teachers and students in Ecuador have been in force since 2012 (Ministerio de Educación, 2012). Later on in 2014, the Ministry of Education made English mandatory for all public schools and stated that starting year was 2016 (Ministerio de Educación, 2014). The expected levels were A2 for Grade 10 and B1 for the third year of Baccalaureate. The Common European Framework of Reference (Council of Europe, 2018) was determined as a performance framework.

The private bilingual K-12 school in Manta, Ecuador, where this study took place, started implementing bilingualism long before this with a curriculum that includes Science, Math, and Social Studies taught in English. Students in the third year of baccalaureate mandatorily take either Cambridge First or IB English B High Level as their B2 certification tests. Institutional statistics show that on average three percent of students achieve Level C1, sixty three percent B2, thirty percent B1, and the remaining four percent are supposed to be in a lower level. These figures might sound satisfactory, but school officials believe they can still improve a lot.

In private schools in Ecuador, English is enforced as the language that in the short term will enable students to enjoy vacation in English-speaking countries, most of the time serving as interpreters for their relatives; to access and succeed in college, and to have better opportunities for high quality employment or business. Since Manta is a tourist spot, from my observations and multiple meetings with parents, speaking is considered more important than writing as evidence of English learning and performance skill.

One current issue to be addressed occurs in the First Year of Baccalaureate, where a considerable number of students find it hard to speak in English. Factors such as little
or no motivation, minimal or no exposure to authentic language, peer-criticism, and low self-esteem, can interfere or delay progress in the students’ oral performance. Since the amount of exposure to authentic language is limited, and, in many cases, the number of classes in school does not seem to be enough, it appears to be necessary that students become more autonomous and, thus, more responsible for their own learning. Self-regulation via self-assessment may contribute to achieve this goal.

In this line of thinking, classes should become more student-centered and class time should be optimized, so more student-student interaction should be encouraged. Lessard-Clouston (2018) affirmed that in his experience, with “clear directions and modelling” (p. 20) it was possible to engage students in interaction even in large groups. He said that when working in pairs or in groups they learned to see each other as sources of input and interaction. He pointed out that interaction became meaningful as it involved negotiation, thus the task got further from mere recitations and got closer to authenticity. From a teacher’s perspective, interaction increases the learners’ production time, helps students become more autonomous, and decreases the students’ anxiety by reducing the affective filter.

Self-regulation via self-assessment can help since students are guided and provided with feedback in order for them to get familiar with the standards, set their own goals, elaborate a plan with specific strategies to achieve them, and work towards them. As Shute (2007) stated, a salient facet of feedback is to provide information about learning goals and the attainment of those goals; feedback that is goal-oriented “provides learners with information about their progress toward a desired goal” (p. 10). Bransford, Brown, and Cocking (2000) strengthened this idea stating that transfer improved by helping students to raise awareness of themselves as learners observe and assess their learning strategies.
Oxford (2016) defined learning strategies as:

Complex, dynamic thoughts and actions selected and used by learners with some degree of consciousness in specific contexts in order to regulate multiple aspects of themselves for the purpose of (a) accomplishing language tasks; (b) improving language performance or use; and/or (c) enhancing long-term proficiency (p.48).

She stated that language learners choose their own strategies based on their personal contexts. She also added that strategies were teachable. Consequently, strategy awareness appears to be important so that students effectively put the strategies into practice. A study in Korea, involving more than a thousand students from middle school to university level about strategy use when learning English, concluded that there was a “significant main effect of strategy awareness on strategy use; the more a student was aware of strategies, the more the student reported using strategies” (Lee & Oxford, 2008, p. 16).

Another aspect of the present study implied the use of mobile devices. At present, people seem to literally coexist with their smartphones twenty-four hours a day and teenagers are no exception to this. Miangah and Nezarat (2012) concluded that even though it was evident that the growing use of mobile devices in learning environments could contribute to improvement in speaking and listening skills, and increase learners’ motivation, there was still a lot of research to carry out in this field.

At the high school where this study took place, students already use their cellphones for academic purposes. With their cellphones, students are in charge of the learning process and progress at their own pace (Miangah & Nezarat, 2012). However, how much do students take advantage of the use of their mobile devices within the class environment? Do the cellphones become a distractor that teachers would find difficult to
keep under control? Even if the students develop the necessary maturity, motivation, and commitment, what evidence of progress can be attributed to the use of self-regulation assisted by mobile devices? Furthermore, the fact that B1 Cambridge Analytical Speaking Assessment Scale (see Appendix A) was used as the standard provided an internationally accepted framework of reference.

In this context, it became useful to investigate how students could improve their speaking skills and how to encourage them to become more aware of their own progress via self-regulation, so that their language acquisition could be enhanced. Consequently, this innovation used self-regulation facilitated by mobile devices to improve speaking skills in a group of twenty four students in First Baccalaureate at a private bilingual high school in Manta. The three proposed research questions were: 1.- To what extent will self-regulation assisted by mobile devices improve the students’ speaking skills? 2.- To what extent will the students’ self-assessment skills improve? 3.- What will the students’ perspectives on the innovation be at the end of the study?

**Literature Review**

This study aimed at exploring the possible benefits of using self-assessment to help language learners improve speaking skills. Mobile devices were used to record spoken interaction and facilitate the process. The concepts and theory pertinent to the topic included self-regulation as a way to increase students’ autonomy; self-assessment as a way to lead to self-regulation; and, mobile assisted language learning aiming at improving speaking skills. A key resource in this study, to help students be aware of and use learning strategies, was the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) (Bun-seon, Mi-jeong & Hwang, 1998).

Schunk and Ertmer (2000) defined self-regulation as “the process whereby learners personally activate and sustain cognitions, affects, and behaviors that are
systematically oriented toward the attainment of personal goals” (p. 632). Self-regulation may help students become autonomous learners. If they foresee how much they can grow academically in the future, they can be motivated to improve. As stated by the social cognitive theory of self-regulation, a vision of the future could help students set goals for themselves, and they may plan actions in order to achieve their objectives (Bandura, 1991). It becomes evident that self-regulation necessarily involves action. As stated by Oxford (2016, p. 69), “action is the very heart of self-regulation, just as it is at the core of L2 learning strategies”. According to Schunk and Ertmer (2000), some learning strategies included “goal-setting; focusing on instruction; organizing, coding, and rehearsing information; managing time and the environment; using resources effectively; monitoring performance; and seeking assistance” (p. 631).

A key aspect of self-regulation is self-assessment. Brown and Harris (2014) treated self-assessment as a necessary competence for self-regulation. They stated: “consistent with self-regulation theory, self-assessment contributes to greater metacognitive skills associated with greater achievement” (p.24). Spiller (2012) stated amongst other advantages of self-assessment the fact that it “may motivate further learning and also promote learner responsibility and independence” (p. 4). She also highlighted the importance of engaging students in the formulation of criteria for self-assessment and coaching students in self-assessment by using examples and models. Brown and Harris (2014) distinguished self-assessment as a component of self-regulation and assure it is something students learn through instruction. “We are increasingly persuaded that self-assessment is not a robust assessment practice and that its real place in schooling is as a teachable and learnable component of self-regulated learning” (Brown & Harris, 2014, pág. 26). They made it clear, however, that students need to receive feedback from their teachers as well. They stated, “Insulating self-
assessment perpetually from the teacher would be counterproductive and that the teacher’s feedback would make the students’ judgment more realistic” (p. 26). Brown and Harris (2014, p. 27) pointed out that “the quality of student self-assessment improves with training.” Pathak (2018), in a study of assessment modes regarding oral presentations at college levels, discussed the importance of providing learners with systematic training so that they could assess themselves, and suggested the use of video-recorded presentations as a useful resource for self-assessment. Nevertheless, in the same study, Pathak (2018) concluded that more research was necessary to define appropriate assessment criteria and how to guide students carrying out self-assessment in an effective way. One salient facet and contribution of the present innovation involved teaching students how to self-assess, so that, by becoming aware of their weaknesses and strengths, they aimed at becoming more autonomous via self-regulation.

Lantolf, Thorne, and Poehner (2015) indicated that Vygotsky’s Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) asserted that present mediation would enable learners to complete tasks that they would be able to do in the future in an independent way. Thus, it was possible to think that as students were instructed to assess themselves and received feedback from the teacher, they were acquiring skills that they would transfer in the future. Lantolf, Thorne, and Poehner (2015) contrasted traditional tests with the ZPD in the sense that the latter indicated not only what had been achieved, but what could potentially be achieved. They affirmed that in this view, as learners grew less dependent from expert guidance, then development became evident. Their assertion also affirmed that time seemed not to be a limiting factor to achieve development.

Sisquiarco, Sánchez, and Abad (2017) concluded that feedback that included recommendations to use learning strategies could positively influence students’
preparation for and performance in oral presentations because it helped them to recognize their level of progress and gave them alternative steps to follow in order to get better results.

Provided that the present study aimed at improving speaking skills, interaction among students was a key part of the process. Lessard-Clouston (2018) described the importance of interaction in second language acquisition by stating that interaction provided students with opportunities for the communication of meaning, noticing, and L2 learning, since students needed to ask for clarification, check their understanding and negotiate meaning. He said that input and output came together in interaction, supporting ESL/EFL students’ second language acquisition (SLA).

As a way to increase student interaction, Miangah and Nezarat (2012) stated that one of the advantages of mobile learning was that collaborative learning was encouraged. They also concluded that Mobile Assisted Language Learning (MALL) optimized time and space and gave more freedom to learners as motivation increased. Pellerin (2012), in a two-year study of the use of mobile technologies to develop oral competencies in Canada, concluded that the use of mobile devices contributed in guiding the learner in his or her own learning process, and allowed teachers to explore how digital videos and audio recordings could be used as assessment tools. Lem (2018), in a review of different studies where MALL and Collaborative MALL programs were applied to students in different contexts and in order to develop different language skills, reported the improvement of participants’ language ability in reading, writing, and speaking. In verbal communication, he said that high school students improved their speaking regarding both fluency and accuracy aspects. He stated that research consistently showed that language learners could assist each other in acquiring language skills while enjoying the learning process, which enhanced motivation.
The SILL enables to assess the language learning strategies that the students learning a foreign language use. The Korean Version 7.0 for ESL/EFL students (Bun-seon, Mi-Jeong, & Hwang, 1998) contains 50 items (see Appendix B). It was expected that the administration of the SILL would result in students’ self-evaluation of their self-reported strategy use. Students were asked how frequently they employed a certain language learning style by responding to the scale. Higher numbers corresponded with higher self-reported use of the particular strategy described in the item. The 50 items of the SILL were divided into six subscales: (A) Remembering more effectively, (B) Using your mental processes, (C) Compensating for missing knowledge, (D) Organizing and evaluating your learning, (E) Managing your emotions, and (F) Learning with others.

Pathak (2018) stated the need for more systematic data collection in order to define what assessment criteria should be used and how to effectively communicate them to students carrying out self-assessment. Thus, this study used Cambridge B1 Analytical Scale as the assessment criteria and aimed at training students how to use them. Afterward they could assess their performance on the videos they made in an accurate way and monitor their self-regulation strategies.

**Innovation**

Throughout six weeks, five sixty-minute classes per week, for a total of thirty hours, according to the schedule (Appendix C), the innovation was applied in a twenty-four student class of First Baccalaureate, Tenth Grade under the American system. The learning objective was to get the students to write, read, listen to, and speak about cellphones, internet, social media, and all their implications, according to the corresponding content unit of their syllabus, in a natural, fluent, and accurate way. The development of the classes followed principles of backwards design and designing from goals (Appendix D), in which students engaged in deliberate practice, monitored their
own learning, assumed responsibility for their own progress, and were taught for transfer.

Since the students’ level varied from B1 to B2, at the end of the process it was expected that B1 students would improve their speaking skills via self-regulation and self-assessment assisted by mobile devices, particularly the video recorder in their cellphones.

The innovation consisted of the following three stages:

1. **Introduction:** It involved the assessment of the students’ speaking level, the approach to self-regulation, the elaboration of the students’ own improvement plan, and the training of students to self-assess:

   a. **Pre testing:** Prior to the application of the innovation, the students’ speaking skills were tested using Cambridge B1 Speaking Analytical Scale (see Appendix A). This allowed determining the level of English speaking skills of each student at the beginning of the study. The head teacher of the class is a certified Cambridge Speaking Examiner with more than twelve years of experience. The results showed that a greater number of students had a B1 level.

   b. **Introducing self-regulation:** The students watched an extract of an interview on video in which communication failed because the interlocutor did not manage to get the message across, either because of lack of vocabulary or because pronunciation did not convey meaning. Through this activity they saw the format of an interview and discussed the outcomes. In the second part of the class they watched a second sample video where communication flowed without inconveniences, and they compared and contrasted it with the first video. Then they watched a sample video of a B2
level speaking exam to help them set goals for improving (see Breakdown of the Transfer Goal in Appendix D). In order to know the students’ present self-regulation strategies, they were given the SILL (see Appendix B).

c. **Making an improvement plan**: Based on the previous results, the students were guided to produce their personal improvement plan, including goals and times. First they brainstormed ideas; then they listed the self-regulation strategies that they thought they felt more confident with; later, they thought of the amount of time they were able to devote to using these strategies. This first draft of a plan would be self-assessed later in the process. At a later stage, they participated in the construction of the rubric that assessed their progress throughout the innovation. For this purpose, the Cambridge B1 Analytical Scale was adapted to meet the content, grammar, vocabulary, and skills of the didactic unit of the course (see Appendix E). This became the Progress Test Rubric and was used as the performance or posttest. Cambridge assessment instructions state that students scoring top in a B1 speaking test achieve a B2 level (See Appendix F).

d. **Training**: The students were taught how to use the B1 rubric. The teacher explained each of the descriptors and used several videos to exemplify the grades. Then, in pairs first and individually later, the students used the rubric to assess sample videos and received feedback from the teacher on the way they graded.

2. **Implementation**: It involved the teaching of the content unit using mobile devices to make videos with the acquired language, the assessing of their own videos using the rubric, and the reflection in order to redirect their self-regulation strategies.
a. **Content learning:** Using Transfer Goal and CLT activities the corresponding didactic unit regarding communication, mass media and social networks was studied during regular classes. At the end of each week the students, in pairs, were asked to plan, write up a script, and then make a video, with a different format every week, such as informal conversations, interviews, and impersonations, among others, using the camera in their cellphones. In the first stage, B2 students were paired with B1 students. It was expected that B2 students would provide confidence and linguistic resources to their less proficient peers. As the process developed and students gained more confidence, more homogeneous pairs were assigned. Some of the topics they had to choose from included a conversation between customers coming out of a new tech-store; an interview with the CEO of a big company that manufactured and sold communication devices; an interview with young people to see how they used technology on an everyday basis; a conversation between two parents whose children spent a lot of time on social media, and a conversation between a teacher and a parent/a local educational authority, in which they expressed their concerns about the use of technology in young people.

b. **Self-assessment:** By the time the students produced their first video, they had already been taught and trained how to use the B1 rubric, so it took little time and training for them to transfer to use the Progress Test Rubric (PTR), since the skills remained the same and they participated in the adaptation linked to language of the content unit. In consequence, they were asked to assess their own performance on video using the PTR. Again they received feedback from the teacher. Once each pair of students had made three
videos, they were taken to the school’s computer lab, where they could watch their videos and assess themselves again.

c. **Reflection:** After this self-assessment activity, which took place in week four, in the middle of the process, the students wrote their reflections on the results of their self-assessment, identified their areas of progress, recognized their areas of weakness and related them to their improvement plan. The students’ reflections through self-assessment enabled them to identify and focus on one or more of the four parameters as an area of improvement adapting their plan, in a sort of “Student Directed Improvement Strategies”. This is because each student decided on the strategies they would use in order to better their results.

3. **Closure:** It involved the final assessment and reflection. For the following three weeks, the unit developed and concluded, and the students produced two more videos.

a. **Final self-assessment:** Once they made the last video, they assessed their performance. Then, the teacher assessed this video as well in order to determine the students’ improvement in speaking skills and self-assessment. Finally the students were given a B1 level speaking test as a posttest.

b. **Final reflection:** In groups the students discussed their results and talked about future self-regulation strategies for improvement.

The innovation did not involve changes in the annual plan for this course, since the content and skills stated for the class at the time of the year were covered. It rather enriched it by bringing fresh strategies aimed at improving the students’ motivation, autonomy, and speaking performance.
Methodology

Participants

The head teacher of the study group was the author of the study, so that made it action research. According to Ferrance (2000), in the process of action research educators evaluated needs, analyzed data, and made decisions in order to achieve the expected outcome. As in the case of this study, Ferrance (2000) highlighted that the problem was one that the teacher believed was evident in his classroom and his aim was to find solutions. This research was carried out within the context of the teacher’s environment. This also implied that resulting improvement strategies did not necessarily apply to other contexts. The fact that the teacher carried out the investigation might have also posed certain ethical considerations regarding results. Therefore, in order not to compromise reliability, it was necessary for the author to remain objective at all times and stick to the established methodology. In this study in particular, the teacher had over ten years of experience assessing students at different levels according to the Common European Framework of Reference, so pretests and posttests of speaking skills were carried out with objectivity and according to standards.

The study group included the twenty-four students in a class of First Baccalaureate (tenth grade under the American system) of the aforementioned private, bilingual school in Manta, Ecuador. They belonged to the middle and upper-socioeconomic level. From previous years’ background information, a few of them had lived in the United States; others had travelled there several times; and others had not had any exposure to the English-speaking culture. They all brought a smartphone to school on a regular basis. Several students felt afraid to partake orally in class out of fear of peer-criticism. Sometimes the most able students were reluctant to work in groups with less able students since they felt they were not learning anything new.
The school’s policy stated than once students got to First Baccalaureate, they were divided in two groups: the national program and the IBD (International Baccalaureate Diploma) program. The study group was the one that took the national program.

The research questions were:

1. To what extent will self-regulation assisted by mobile devices improve the students’ speaking skills?
2. To what extent will the students’ self-assessment skills improve?
3. What will the students’ perspectives on the innovation be at the end of the study?

Due to the nature of the study and the three proposed research questions, data were handled both quantitatively by using pre-post tests and self-assessment rubrics, and qualitatively with the use of document analysis and interviews.

**Instruments**

Research variables were stated as follows:

**Independent variables:**

- Self-regulation strategies and self-assessment assisted by mobile devices.

**Dependent variable:**

- Speaking skills as defined in B1 Cambridge Analytical Scale

To answer question one, the Cambridge B1 Analytical Scale was used as a pretest rubric and a Progress Test Rubric (see Appendix E) adapted from the B1 Analytical Scale to course content was used as a posttest rubric by the teacher. By comparing both results, research question one was answered quantitatively. The results were used to determine the students’ improvement in speaking skills after the innovation. The Progress Test Rubric (PTR) allowed both the teacher and the students to assess speaking skills. The students set goals and made action plans related to their course content in
terms of the parameters as stated by the Common European Framework of Reference for the B1 level and using self-regulation strategies. The process that led to the construction of the PTR involved students that had already been trained and therefore were effective users of the B1 rubric in the discussion of the new content language they were studying in the course unit, in terms of grammar and vocabulary and the elaboration of the Progress Test Rubric for the unit of study.

The B1 speaking test involved four sub-skills, each with descriptors of achievement level, and a quantitative grade from one to five, being three a passing grade and five the top one. The first sub-skill was Grammar and Vocabulary, which assessed the control, range, and appropriacy of simple grammar structures and the necessary vocabulary to complete the task. The second one was Discourse Management, which assessed the extension of the discourse, its relevance, and how coherent it was. The third one was Pronunciation and it scored the intelligibility of the speech in terms of intonation, stress, and the articulation of individual sounds. The last sub-skill was Interactive Communication, which implied initiating, responding to, and maintaining the interaction. The mean value of the four marks was considered as the indicator of the level of speaking performance. It was expected that students who scored four or five at B1 level at the end of the study were progressing toward B2 level.

As per the answer to question two, regarding the students’ self-assessment skills, the method was quantitative. Throughout the process, they learned how to use the B1 rubric by watching sample videos provided by the teacher, assessing them, and receiving the teacher’s guidance and feedback. Rater reliability improved as the students practiced assessing sample videos and the teacher’s and students’ assessment grades became closer. Once the students’ scores were close to the ones provided by the teacher, they moved on to self-assessment. They watched their own videos and scored their own
sub-skills using the PTR. Their first self-assessment scores were compared with the ones at the end of the process in order to determine to what extent they improved.

Finally, in order to answer question three, halfway through the innovation process, the students were asked to write their reflections on the score they gave themselves. And during the final interview they talked about their learning of self-assessment and how confident they felt. Regarding the students’ perception of the innovation, field notes recorded by the teacher throughout the six week period, the students’ written reflections about their experience during the project, and a focus group of a sample of eight students were the instruments to collect qualitative data. The sample group to be interviewed was selected by using the IB method of eliminating outliers. Since the scale goes from zero to five, the students with the highest and lowest grades resulting from the average of the grades of each of the four sub-skills were not considered. Then the remaining students having the highest and lowest averages were selected for the sample. The mean grade of this remaining group served to choose the other students for the interviews, by selecting students with grades above and below the mean. The interview aimed at exploring the students’ perception of their self-assessment skills, their improvement in speaking skills, their adherence to the improvement plan, and the self-regulation strategies they used.

Ethical Considerations

It is important to remark that at the beginning of the research study, the students were made aware of the implementation of this innovation. Since the whole project was carried out during class hours and following the course content, it wasn’t necessary to inform or ask permission from parents. Because of ethical considerations, neither the school’s name nor the students’ will be disclosed. The videos that the students produced were used only for self-assessment purposes, so they weren’t posted to any public site.
**Results**

Results are presented in the same order of the proposed research questions.

To what extent did self-regulation assisted by mobile devices improve the students’ speaking skills? In order to answer this question, the results of the pre and posttests were compared. The data for the twenty-four students were tabulated on a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. In a second step, they were migrated to IBM SPSS in order to generate descriptive statistics for later analysis. The confidence percentage was of 95% with a level of significance of 0.005. The mean and the standard deviation were calculated and then they were used to calculate Cohen’s d Effect Size (ES). Cohen states that an effect size of 0.20 is considered small, 0.50 medium, and 0.80 large (Thalheimer & Cook, 2002). The table shows that the effect size for the overall speaking grade is small; the effect size was also small for all of the sub-skills, except for Interactive Communication, in which ES was 0.41, considered as medium. Results are shown on Table 1 below:

Table 1

*Speaking improvement shown by pretest and posttest results.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-skills</th>
<th>PRE TEST</th>
<th>POST TEST</th>
<th>p value &lt; 0.005</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammar and Vocabulary</td>
<td>M=3,31</td>
<td>M=3,33</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Management</td>
<td>M=3,60</td>
<td>M=3,62</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>M=3,64</td>
<td>M=3,64</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Communication</td>
<td>M=3,62</td>
<td>M=3,97</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERALL AVERAGE GRADE</strong></td>
<td>M=3,54</td>
<td>M=3,64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effect size of overall average grade: Cohen's d = (3.64 - 3.54) / 0.83 = 0.12

KEY: N= Sample, M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation, MD= Mean Difference, d= Effect Size
To what extent did the students’ self-assessment skills improve? Table 2 below compares the mean of the grades given by the students and the grades given by the teacher at the beginning and at the end of the training process. The 24 students graded the speakers on each video and an average for each sub-skill was calculated. This is the mean grade given by students shown on the table. Then the difference between the students’ mean grade and the grade provided by the teacher was obtained.

Conventionally, a divergence of one point above or below is considered an acceptable divergence. This was the case of the first sample videos in which the students’ grades were acceptably deviated from the teacher’s grade. The table shows that at the end of the training process the divergence was reduced to one fifth, being a clear indication of development.

Table 2

*Mean of the grades given by students compared with the grades provided by the teacher.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST TRAINING VIDEO</th>
<th>LAST TRAINING VIDEO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker A</strong></td>
<td><strong>Speaker C</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEACHER’S GRADE</strong></td>
<td><strong>TEACHER’S GRADE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G &amp; V 3.5</td>
<td>G &amp; V 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D M 3.5</td>
<td>D M 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 4</td>
<td>P 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I C 3.5</td>
<td>I C 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEAN</strong> 3.7</td>
<td><strong>MEAN</strong> 3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEAN GRADE GIVEN BY STUDENTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>MEAN GRADE GIVEN BY STUDENTS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G &amp; V 4.6</td>
<td>G &amp; V 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D M 4.7</td>
<td>D M 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 4.8</td>
<td>P 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I C 4.7</td>
<td>I C 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEAN</strong> 4.7</td>
<td><strong>MEAN</strong> 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIFFERENCE</strong></td>
<td><strong>DIFFERENCE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Speaker B**        | **Speaker D**       |
| **TEACHER’S GRADE**  | **TEACHER’S GRADE** |
| G & V 3              | G & V 3.5           |
| D M 3               | D M 4              |
| P 3.5               | P 3.5              |
| I C 3.5             | I C 4              |
| **MEAN** 3.4         | **MEAN** 3.9        |
| **MEAN GRADE GIVEN BY STUDENTS** | **MEAN GRADE GIVEN BY STUDENTS** |
| G & V 4.1            | G & V 3.7           |
| D M 4.2             | D M 3.7             |
| P 4.3                | P 3.8              |
| I C 4.2             | I C 3.8             |
| **MEAN** 4.2         | **MEAN** 3.7        |
| **DIFFERENCE**       | **DIFFERENCE**      |
| 1.1                  | 0.2                 |
| 1.2                  | 0.2                 |

Regarding self-assessment data collection, the students were asked to assess their performance on the videos they produced. Table 3 below shows the comparison of the
mean grade provided by the teacher with the mean grade of the students’ self-assessment of the first and last video of this process.

Table 3

*Comparison of the mean students’ self-assessment vs teacher’s assessment results at the beginning and at the end of the process.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>G&amp;V</th>
<th>D M</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>I C</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SELF-ASSESSMENT VIDEO 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN STUDENTS' ASSESSMENT</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN TEACHER'S ASSESSMENT</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>G&amp;V</th>
<th>D M</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>I C</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SELF-ASSESSMENT VIDEO 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN STUDENTS' ASSESSMENT</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN TEACHER'S ASSESSMENT</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows a minimum difference between the mean of the grades the students produced when assessing their own performance on the videos and the mean of the grades awarded by the teacher for the same video. Self-assessment video 1 was actually the third video they made; and self-assessment video 3 was the last video they made through the innovation process, thus students did learn how to assess themselves using the pertinent rubric.
What were the students’ perspectives on the innovation at the end of the study? This question required a qualitative approach. From general observation, the students looked engaged in all the activities they were asked to develop. Field notes during the process included observations such as “some groups are laughing while watching the video they recorded…they are proposing to remake it and suggesting to each other ideas for improvement”. Another interesting note affirmed, “Some students proposed new topics for future videos (...) they even proposed bringing costumes to impersonate characters”.

Making their own improvement plan and following it was something that apparently they did not take so seriously. As the classes developed, when they were asked if they were applying the strategies they had chosen, they would say they were not doing it regularly, especially at home. There was a slight improvement in this area after week four when they wrote their reflection on the partial grade they had given themselves.

During the final interview, the eight students in the selected sample were asked five questions:

1. **How did you enjoy this process?**

In general, all the students said they had enjoyed using their mobile devices in order to make videos. One student affirmed, “*It was fun to use our cell phones, we had never recorded ourselves speaking in English*” (S17). When hearing this, at least two more students agreed (S19 & S21). In a part of the interview, student 21 said, “*at first we were short of ideas and it was difficult to speak for a long time, but after some time we felt more confident and developed interaction in a more natural way*”. This was supported by students 17 and 19.

Regarding the training process to be able to use the rubric accurately, some
statements from the students were: “we tried our best to grade the candidates identifying the key features of language from the videos. It was interesting to compete among ourselves in order to see whose grades were closer to the teacher’s” (S3).

They also talked about the experience of assessing themselves; “It was weird at the beginning, but afterward I felt more confident” (S22); “I learned I have a lot to improve” (S4). “In the last videos it was easy to talk with my partner” (S17).

2. Do you believe you have learned how to assess your oral skills?

In relation to their skills in self-assessment, some students commented, “we saw our mistakes” (S10); “I felt I could speak more in the last videos” (S11). They also said they enjoyed being in the position of the teacher temporarily (S3, S10). Two students added that, “watching the video of the B2 candidates at the beginning made us realize how much we had to improve” (S17) (S19).

3. To what extent did you follow your improvement plan?

Most students agreed that especially at home they had not followed it, but in the classroom they had. “I pushed myself to participate in class in English” (S17). “At home I don’t have the environment to practice English” (S10). “I tried, but then I forgot to read in English” (S4). “In the class I used English at all times, even when I didn’t know vocabulary I tried to explain with other words” (S11).

4. What self-regulation strategies did you actually use?

They referred to some of their own strategies and the ones in the SILL, especially in the classroom. “I was more concentrated in class” (S10); “I paid more attention” (S4); “I tried to speak in English all the time” (S17); “When I didn’t know a word, I didn’t use Spanish, I found words in English to replace the words I didn’t know” (S21) (S11). At least six of the students said they tried to relax in order to speak more even if they made mistakes, (S3), (S4), (S11), (S20), (S21), and (S22).
5. Do you feel you have improved your speaking skills?

At first they said yes, but when asked for evidence or specific details, one said: “I felt more confident to interact better in English” (S4). This statement was agreed to by other students: (S17), (S21.)

Discussion

Pre and posttest results showed no significant improvement in Grammar and Vocabulary, Discourse Management, and Pronunciation after the six weeks of application of the innovation. The reasons could be for example, the fact that the time was not long enough for the students to demonstrate more evident improvement, since this innovation was only thirty hours. This seemed to be in accordance with what Cambridge English Support Site affirms that it takes approximately two hundred hours for a language learner to progress from one level to another of the CEFR (Cambridge, 2019).

The sub-skill in which some progress occurred was Interactive Communication (IC), since the calculated effect size was found to be medium according to the provided scale. However, Lantolf, Thorne, and Poehner (2015) stated that traditional tests seemed to be confined to assess progress achieved and might leave aside linguistic development in terms of the decrease in the frequency and the quality of mediation needed to prompt the students’ performance. They also claimed that although development surely occurs over long periods of time, it may also occur over relatively short lapses of time.

In addition, in the interviews at the end of the six-week period, the students reported that IC was the sub-skill they felt they were more able during and after this innovation. The researcher field notes confirmed noticeable enthusiasm and positive attitude that the students showed during each of the activities, particularly while planning and making the videos and assessing their own performance in them.
According to Miangah and Nezarat (2012), motivation increased when students used mobile devices in their learning process, since they were part of their everyday life.

In addition, the fact that the students became aware of the expected level by watching sample videos and made their own improvement plan using self-regulation strategies most likely helped them develop autonomy for the future. The social cognitive theory of self-regulation stated that the perspective of the future could help set goals and plan courses of action that are likely to produce desired outcomes (Bandura, 1991). Thus, self-regulation may have helped students become autonomous learners, since as they foresaw how much they could grow academically in the future, they could be motivated to improve. In relation to this aspect, Lantolf, Thorne, and Poehner (2015) affirmed that as learners became more responsible for making their performances appropriate, it could be concluded that they had developed.

Regarding self-assessment, results showed that the students acquired a good level of reliability when using the adapted Cambridge B1 Analytical Scale. As Brown and Harris (2014) stated, this could be attributed to the amount of training they received. This innovation included class time devoted to watching sample videos of the expected level, training students to use the rubric effectively, and providing students with feedback that helped them improve assessment skills before they actually assessed themselves. Hence the positive outcome of the training process shown previously on Table 2, where the divergence between the mean grade provided by the students and the grade provided by the teacher was significantly reduced. This was evidence of the students’ acquisition of assessment skills. This first process appeared to have been of great importance before moving on to self-assessment, thus students were comfortable with the assessment process and with the accurate use of the rubric. This coincided with Lantolf, Thorne, and Poehner (2015) as they claimed that linguistic development was
evidenced through independent performance. The fact that the students’ accuracy in the use of the rubric increased and consequently feedback required diminished could also be considered as linguistic progress. They also affirmed that in contrast to traditional tests that only indicated the level of development already attained, the Zone of Proximal Development aimed at showing development achieved and developmental potential.

Regarding this theme Brown and Harris (2014) declared that the teacher’s feedback would make the students’ judgment more realistic. They stated that self-assessment was a key aspect of self-regulation. Moreover, self-assessment was seen as a necessary competence for self-regulation. They stated that consistent with self-regulation theory, self-assessment contributed to greater meta-cognitive skills associated with greater achievement.

Pathak (2018) stated the need to choose suitable assessment criteria and to use effective ways of communicating them to students so that they could carry out self-assessment reliably. In a way, by using video-recorded presentations, the present study contributed with more data to Pathak’s experience, particularly in the field of training students to self-assess.

Another possible influential factor may have been the great attitude towards this type of exercise. A certain degree of competition arose in the class environment as they had to grade sample videos and compare their grades to the official ones provided by the teacher. This fact increased motivation in the students and as a result they were more focused and ready to receive and apply feedback from the teacher.

In their written reflection in week four of the study, the students acknowledged Interactive Communication as the sub-skill they felt they were improving; they recognized they were not applying their improvement plan to the fullest, particularly after school; and they spontaneously referred to how they had enjoyed the activities
during the innovation. Regarding the students’ perspective on the whole innovation, their responses were positive towards their motivation, their sense of security when speaking in English, and their learning of self-assessment. This goes in line with what Miangah and Nezarat (2012) concluded by stating that today students feel the use of technology in learning is more effective and interesting than in the past.

**Conclusions**

This study was designed to improve speaking skills through self-regulation facilitated by mobile devices. Self-assessment was an essential tool to foster self-regulation. Results of pre and posttests showed a medium effect size in Interactive Communication, which leads to the idea that students gained motivation or self-confidence, which enabled them to initiate, respond to, and develop verbal interaction in English, even though their Grammar and Vocabulary, Discourse Management, and Pronunciation did not show significant improvements.

In addition, through the application of the innovation, results showed that by means of training, practice, and feedback, the students learned how to assess their own speaking performance using an adaptation of the Cambridge B1 Analytical Scale. Moreover, the use of mobile devices both facilitated self-assessment and motivated the students to do it with a high degree of commitment and accuracy. Brown and Harris (2014) referred to the role of self-assessment when they said that it was not a robust assessment practice and that its real place in schooling was as a teachable and learnable component of self-regulated learning. This study confirmed that self-assessment is both teachable and learnable since results showed a remarkable accuracy in the students’ scores through practice guided with the teacher’s feedback. As stated by Lantolf, Thorne, and Poehner (2015), this was evidence of linguistic development; learning to self-assess using international criteria was an important progress since the students will
probably transfer to the future as they have acquired meta-cognition and an ability to learn to learn.

Finally, the students’ reflections at the end of the study confirmed that from their own perspective motivation increased and confidence was acquired; awareness of the value of self-regulation strategies became evident; and self-assessment helped them see their weaknesses and improvements.

Limitations

Limitations of the present study included the fact that the sample was small, only twenty-four students; and, due to the fact that this research aimed at finding solutions in order to overcome or improve a problem in one specific group of students, there was no control group, and results might neither be generalized nor applied to other contexts. Nevertheless, the action research nature of this study will benefit the specific group of students, due to the fact that they are expected to identify their opportunities for improvement and set their personal action plan which they may keep for the future. Consequently, the teacher and the institution also benefitted.

The results of this study were confined to the characteristics and dynamics of this particular group of students and the design and objectives of the study, therefore generalization to other contexts may not be recommended. Some limiting factors have been identified. The first one is the amount of time allocated to the application of the innovation. It appeared not to have been long enough to promote more solid improvement of speaking skills. Finally, the lack of a control group does not allow for comparison and limits the future replication of this methodology.

Recommendations

This study may prompt further research in the field of self-regulation strategies over a longer period of time. A full school year may open more possibilities to better
assess results and implement measurements aiming at reinforcing and fixing habits in students.

Under favorable circumstances it might be worth trying to involve parents in the initial stages of self-regulation strategies acquisition, in order to guarantee that students work on their own out of the regular school time.

Teachers interested in helping students become more autonomous learners, should seek training opportunities so that they are capable of using assessment instruments confidently and effectively. Once they master this capability, they should carefully train their students in self-assessment and improvement strategies.

Also, during training it was important for students to gain a vision of the target level by using the rubric to assess videos of students on that level. This practice is highly recommended and could become part of regular class routines.
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Appendix A: Cambridge B1 Level Speaking Analytical Scale used as pretest

### Appendix B: Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)

Version for Speakers of Other Languages Learning English
Korean version prepared by Park Bun-seon, Kwon Mi-jeong, Hwang Jung-hwa, 1998

Background Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Name</th>
<th>2. Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Mother tongue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Language you speak at home.

7. Language you are now learning.

8. How long have you been learning the language in #7?

9. How do you rate your proficiency in the language in #7, compared with other students in your class?
   (Circle one of these options):
   - Excellent
   - Good
   - Fair
   - Poor

10. How do you rate your proficiency in the language in #7, compared with native speakers?
    (Circle one of these options):
    - Excellent
    - Good
    - Fair
    - Poor

11. How important is it for you to become proficient in the language in #7?
    (Circle one of these options):
    - Very important
    - Important
    - Not important

12. Why do you want to learn the language in #7?
    - ...... interested in the language.
    - ...... interested in the culture.
    - ...... have friends who speak the language
    - ...... required to take a language course to graduate.
    - ...... need it for my future career.
    - ...... need it for travel.
    - ...... other (explain) ..........................................................
    - ..................................................................................................................

13. Do you enjoy language learning? (Circle one of these options):  
    - Yes
    - No

14. What other languages have you studied?

15. What has been your favorite experience in language learning?
    - ..................................................................................................................
Directions

This form of the STRATEGY INVENTORY FOR LANGUAGE LEARNING (SILL) is for students of English as a second or foreign language. You will find statements about learning English. Please read each statement. On the worksheet, write the response (1, 2, 3, 4, or 5) that tells HOW TRUE OF YOU THE STATEMENT IS.

1. Never or almost never true of me.
2. Usually not true of me.
3. Somewhat true of me.
4. Usually true of me.
5. Always or almost always true of me.

NEVER OR ALMOST NEVER TRUE OF ME means that the statement is very rarely true of you.

USUALLY NOT TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true less than half the time.

SOMETHAT TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true about half the time.

USUALLY TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true more than half the time.

ALWAYS OR ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true of you almost always.

Answer in terms of how well the statement describes you. Do not answer how you think you should be, or what other people do. There are no right or wrong answers to these statements. Put your answers on the Worksheet. Please make no marks on the items. Work as quickly as you can without being careless. This usually takes 20 – 30 minutes to complete. If you have any questions, let the teacher know immediately.

EXAMPLE:

1. Never or almost never true of me.
2. Usually not true of me.
3. Somewhat true of me.
4. Usually true of me.
5. Always or almost always true of me.

Read the item, and choose a response (1 through 5, as above). And write it in the space after the item.

I actively seek out opportunities to talk with native speakers of English. ..............

You have just completed the example item. Answer the rest of the items on the Worksheet.
Strategy Inventory for Language Learning
Version for Speakers of Other Languages Learning English
Korean version prepared by Park Bun-seon, Kwon Mi-jeong, Hwang Jung-hwa, 1998

1. Never or almost never true of me.
2. Usually not true of me.
3. Somewhat true of me.
4. Usually true of me.
5. Always or almost always true of me.

Part A

1. I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English.
2. I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them.
3. I connect the sound of a new English word and an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word.
4. I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.
5. I use rhymes to remember new English words.
6. I use flashcards to remember new English words.
7. I physically act out new English words.
8. I review English lessons often.
9. I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign.

Part B

10. I say or write new English words several times.
11. I try to talk like native English speakers.
12. I practice the sounds of English.
13. I use the English words I know in different ways.
15. I watch English language TV shows or go to movies spoken in English.
16. I read for pleasure in English.
17. I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in English.
18. I first skim an English passage (read it quickly) then go back and read carefully.
19. I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.
20. I try to find patterns in English.
21. I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.
22. I try not to translate word-for-word.
23. I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.

Part C

24. To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses.
25. When I can’t think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures.
26. I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English.
27. I read English without looking up every new word.
28. I try to guess what the other person will say next in English.
29. If I can’t think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.

**Part D**

30. I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.
31. I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.
32. I pay attention when someone is speaking English.
33. I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.
34. I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.
35. I look for people I can talk to in English.
36. I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.
37. I have clear goals for improving my English skills.
38. I think about my progress in learning English.

**Part E**

39. I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.
40. I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.
41. I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.
42. I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English.
43. I write down my feelings in a language learning diary.
44. I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.

**Part F**

45. If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or to say it again.
46. I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.
47. I practice English with other students.
48. I ask for help from English speakers.
49. I ask questions in English.
50. I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.

**Worksheet for Answering and Scoring the SILL**

1. The blanks (………..) are numbered for each item on the SILL.
2. Write your response to each item (write 1,2,3,4, or 5) in each of the blanks.
3. Add up each column. Put the result on the line marked SUM.
4. Divide by the number under SUM to get the average for each column. Round this average off to the nearest tenth, as in 3.4.
5. Figure out your overall average. To do this, add up all the SUMS for the different parts of the SILL. Then divide by 50.
6. When you have finished, look at the Profile of Results. Copy your averages from the Worksheet onto the Profile.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part A</th>
<th>Part B</th>
<th>Part C</th>
<th>Part D</th>
<th>Part E</th>
<th>Part F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>Q24</td>
<td>Q30</td>
<td>Q39</td>
<td>Q45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>Q25</td>
<td>Q31</td>
<td>Q40</td>
<td>Q46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.</td>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>Q26</td>
<td>Q32</td>
<td>Q41</td>
<td>Q47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4.</td>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>Q27</td>
<td>Q33</td>
<td>Q42</td>
<td>Q48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>Q28</td>
<td>Q34</td>
<td>Q43</td>
<td>Q49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6.</td>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>Q29</td>
<td>Q35</td>
<td>Q44</td>
<td>Q50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7.</td>
<td>Q16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8.</td>
<td>Q17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>Q18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUM Part A: SUM Part B: SUM Part C: SUM Part D: SUM Part E: SUM Part F:

A+B+C+D

E+F =

SUM ÷ 9 (Average) SUM ÷ 14 (Average) SUM ÷ 6 (Average) SUM ÷ 9 (Average) SUM ÷ 6 (Average) SUM ÷ 6 (Average) A+B+C+D

E+F ÷ 50 =
Profile of Results

This Profile shows your SILL results. These results will tell you the kinds of strategies you use in learning English. There are no right or wrong answers. To complete this profile, transfer your averages for each part of the SILL, and your overall average for the whole SILL. These averages are found on the Worksheet, at the bottom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Which strategies are covered</th>
<th>Your Average on this part</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Remembering more effectively.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Using all your mental processes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Compensating for missing knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Organizing and evaluating your learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Managing your emotions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Learning with others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to understanding your averages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Always or almost always used.</td>
<td>4.5 to 5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usually used.</td>
<td>3.5 to 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Sometimes used.</td>
<td>2.5 to 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generally not used.</td>
<td>1.5 to 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Never or almost never used.</td>
<td>1.0 to 1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall average tells you how often you use strategies for learning English. Each part of the SILL represents a group of learning strategies. The averages for each part of the SILL show which groups of strategies you use most for learning English.
Appendix C: CALENDAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week Date</th>
<th>Unit title</th>
<th>Research Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DIAGNOSTIC TEST (pretest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VIDEO INTERVIEWS: Uses. Pros &amp; cons. Comparison with the past.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The importance of renewable energy sources: pros &amp; cons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROGRESS TEST/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2 – 4</td>
<td>Communication &amp; media: Global communication.</td>
<td>VIDEO INTERVIEWS/INTERACTION: Global communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 7–11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Semi-structured interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: BREAKDOWN OF THE TRANSFER GOAL

A. Aimed standards:

B1

SPEAKING PRODUCTION: The students sustain a straightforward description of a subject or a variety of matters within the personal, educational, public, and vocational domains rather fluently presenting it as a linear sequence of events.

SPEAKING INTERACTION: The students exchange, check, and confirm information to deal with less routine situations and explain why a problem has occurred. They enter unprepared into conversations on topics that are familiar, of interest, or pertinent to everyday life within the personal, educational, public, and vocational domain.

Adapted from: Estándares Inglés 2012.pdf

B2

The students can give, clear, systematically developed descriptions and presentations, with appropriate highlighting of significant points, and relevant supporting details. The students can give clear, detailed descriptions and presentations on a wide range of subjects related to their field of interest, expanding and supporting ideas.

Adapted from: CEFR- Companion volume with new descriptors-2018.docx.pdf

INNOVATION-

TEXTBOOK: Oxford IB Diploma Programme English B Course Companion, OXFORD.

UNITS Science & Technology 1 and 2; Communication & media

TRANSFER GOAL

I want my students to develop speaking skills so that, in the long run and on their own, they can fluently, confidently and accurately communicate without much prompting and with minimal hesitation in social and academic contexts referring to past, present, and future events, including technology as a core topic.
**SELF-REGULATION TO IMPROVE SPEAKING**

Breakdown of the transfer goal Sections A, B, and C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. If we see &amp; hear them do this, they <strong>can</strong> transfer this learning:</th>
<th>B. If we see &amp; hear them do this, then they <strong>cannot</strong> yet transfer:</th>
<th>C. What I will commit to doing differently in my classrooms to ensure my results look like column A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *Confidently USE vocabulary in conversations that refer to past, present and future events.*  
*USE/APPLY grammatical structures that allow them to convey the message effectively in past, present, and future.*  
*USE body language to enhance communication.*  
*USE intonation to create/enhance meaning.*  
*USE appropriate language patterns in order to ask meaningful & contextualized questions during a conversation on familiar topics.*  
*USE linguistic resources to provide responses that don’t bring communication to a halt.*  
*USE colloquial patterns to make communication meaningful in an informal setting.*  
*WRITE UP the script of dialogues and MAKE short videos using vocabulary of the topic: TECHNOLOGY as stated in the annual plan.* | *Need a lot of prompting.*  
*Use language structures that obscure meaning.*  
*Struggle to find the words.*  
*Are unable to maintain conversation.*  
*Are afraid to start conversation.*  
*Are hesitant when switching from one topic to another.*  
*Do not know when to use formal or informal register.* | *Establish a confident environment where communication is encouraged and accuracy is developing.*  
*Guide students to become more aware of their own learning, become more autonomous, and more active learners via self-regulation.*  
*Design activities in which they will use the video recorder of their cell phones in order to produce videos that later they will upload to a digital blog using the vocabulary and structures of their course books.*  
*Use these videos to facilitate self-assessment.* |
## Summative Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL</th>
<th>Students will effectively and fluently use the language of questions, answers, and reports in present, past and future, using technology as their core topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROLE</td>
<td>INTERVIEWER – REPORTER - DOCUMENTARY PRESENTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUDIENCE</td>
<td>Anybody watching the videos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITUATION</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| PERFORMANCE     | 1. You are a reporter/journalist. Your task is to interview two of your classrooms asking them about their past (anecdotes, happy, and tragic moments) with technological devices.  
                      2. You will use the video recorder of your cellphones.                                                                                 |
                      Standards: The project calls for the application of knowledge and skills, the assessment is open-ended, the assessment will yield more than one answer, the task is either a replica or analogous to the kind of problems faced by adult citizens and consumers or professionals in the field, the project provides evidence of understanding via transfer. The project is multi-faceted and it offers choice for the student. |

### Essential questions

1. How can I improve my fluency in order to engage in conversations with other English learners or speakers about different topics with ease?

2. How can I use my knowledge of the topics in order to plan out an interview or a dialogue that can be acted out and recorded?
Formative assessment using the Facets of Understanding.

You are participating in a video-making contest with the following topic:

a. Technology and how young people view it.

YOUR TASK:

To design the video including topic, setting, characters and dialogues; write out a draft script and impersonate a reporter/journalist interviewing young people, asking them about the way they use social media and smartphones. You will use the video recorder of your cellphones so that later you can assess your own speaking performance.

- In the script, the interviewer will ask questions that elicit the narration of past experiences, opinions, present and future trends in technology; and, will interact with the interviewee by commenting, showing empathy, surprise, and picking up from previous utterances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facets of Understanding</th>
<th>Formative Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>They will explain how technology is part of their everyday lives, their possible risks, and their advantages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>They will compare what their everyday life could be like without the technological devices that they currently have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>They will use all the information to produce an engaging and effective video.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective</td>
<td>They will analyze the possible scenarios of their current life with/without technological devices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>They will put themselves in their roles, understand them, and fulfill them with commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-knowledge</td>
<td>They will reflect on the best way to approach the tasks, to develop the interaction with the people to be interviewed without being/looking rude, how to improve skills to complete the task effectively.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACQUISITION, MEANING-MAKING, AND TRANSFER (A-M-T) to ensure students are moving towards transfer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. What will be your hook?</th>
<th>A short video of an interview to a famous singer: ADELLIE. <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0V03avIcYc8">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0V03avIcYc8</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. By the end of the lesson, what will students learn that they had not learned before?</td>
<td>How to carry out an interview about past events with generating questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How will students know when they have learned the material taught other than by taking a test?</td>
<td>By presenting their interviews to their peers and through teacher/peer feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4. How will you move the lesson along without frontloading with acquisition? | The students will be given different roles to design quick interviews and will be guided with specific motivation step by step, this is in order to stimulate and exercise impersonating: e.g. 
* Interview their teacher about technology used in the past and at present.
* Interview people coming right out of a concert (by a singer that is famous and well known to them).
* Interview the singer right after the concert.
* Interview customers coming out of a new store/mall/shopping center.
* Interview students coming right out of an exam.
* Interview a person coming right out of a job interview.
* Interview a firefighter right after putting out a fire.
* Interview a doctor right after a complex surgery.
* Interview a tourist right after arriving back to their hometown from a holiday in Ecuador. |
| 5. How will students make their own meaning? Get to transfer? | By being able to produce the right questions and right answers during the role-play activity according to the character provided and the setting established. |
| 6. How is the learning connected to something students already know? | It is connected to structures of past tense, present, and future. |
| 7. How will the students know what they will do with what they are learning? | They will use it whenever they have to ask/answer about past, present, and future events. In order to get to know a new friend. In order to start conversation with somebody they know or they want to get to know. |
8. How will students know that what they are learning is important? What will the new learning help them do that they could not do before?

| By realizing with how much ease they can interact in an unfamiliar environment. By comparing their fluency at the beginning and at later stages. By comparing their use of vocabulary and reduction of hesitation when struggling looking for words to convey meaning. |

9. How do you make the task engaging so that students persist?

| By providing encouraging comments and setting new challenges. |

---

**Learning Activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEEK 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**DAY 1**

1. Watch the video: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0V03av1cYc8](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0V03av1cYc8) (6 minutes)
2. What went wrong? Pair activity (4 minutes)
   In pairs, the students answer the question from their own perspective.
3. Watch the second video: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c0A41LIIOtE](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c0A41LIIOtE) (4 minutes)
   How was this different?
4. Watch a sample video of an FCE Speaking Test with two strong candidates. [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EdeZp0n0JHW](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EdeZp0n0JHW) Comment on their fluency, their pronunciation, their use of grammar and vocabulary, their pronunciation and their interaction.
5. Then the students are shown a B2 Cambridge Analytical Scale (Appendix G) and the teacher states the grade the candidates on video would get.
6. Ss comment on the grade and get familiar with the B2 level.

**DAY 2**

1. Tt explains that Ss are going to be assessed on their speaking skills using Cambridge B1 Scale as it has the same aspects as B2 but at a lower
level of demand. Tt explains that reaching top 
grade in B1 grants Ss a B2 level 
2. Ss are pretested in pairs as stated by Cambridge 
B1 Analytical Scale 

DAY 3 
1. Ss are shown their results 
2. Ss are encouraged to reflect on their own current 
speaking skills. They talk about setting goals and 
attempt to think of and write their personal goals. 
3. In groups students make a list of some possible 
learning strategies they could use in order to 
reach their goals. 
4. They are given the SILL survey to complete. 

WEEK 2 

DAY 1 
1. Students use some of the strategies on the SILL 
survey in order to complete their improvement plan. 
2. They are encouraged to include timing to their plan. 
3. In groups of three and with a jigsaw activity they 
read the first text associated to their study Unit 
(page 71, Oxford IB English B HL Book). They 
work out meaning and vocabulary. They list new 
words and infer meaning from context, peers, 
and the teacher. 

DAY 2 
1. Ss are instructed to produce their first video. In 
pairs, when possible a more able Ss with less 
able ones, they write up their script, rehearse and 
videotape themselves interviewing a person 
coming out of show/a famous singer or footballer 
right after the show or match. 
2. They watch each other’s videos and comment on 
their performance. 
3. Tt shows three sample videos of B1 candidates. 
Tt uses the Cambridge B1 Scale to explain Ss the 
aspects and descriptors. Tt assesses the 
candidates on video and shows Ss how to do it. 
SAMPLE VIDEO 1 
https://fronter.com/cambridge/main.phtml 
4. Ss practice assessing two more candidates on 
video. In pairs they check the grades they 
produce. They compare with Tt.
### SAMPLE VIDEO 2
https://fronter.com/cambridge/main.phtml

### SAMPLE VIDEO 3
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kZTMUha3RpE

#### DAY 3

1. Ss are guided to assess their own video using B1 scale. They discuss their grade with each other and with Tt. They reflect on their improvement plan.
2. In pairs and they read the second text associated to their study Unit (page 72, Oxford IB English B HL Book). They develop activities collaboratively and discuss the topic of the use of smart phones by students. Vocabulary and use of English.

#### WEEK 3

#### DAY 1

1. In the same previous pairs, they produce their second video: an interview to a friend on their use smartphones/social media. They are encouraged to make a draft recording, check, see possible improvements, and then make a final product.
2. Ss are made aware that the B1 Scale is too general to assess their videos. Alongside with Tt, Ss help adapt the B1 scale so as to better assess their language acquisition.
3. With the adapted scale Ss are asked to assess their own video. Discuss in pairs. Identify aspects of improvement.

#### DAY 2

1. Tt provides the grades of Ss’ videos. They compare with the grades they produced and ask questions.
2. Tt shows sample videos in order to standardize the best use of the rubric
3. As homework, Ss are asked to read page 73, Oxford IB English B HL Book, and prepare a short presentation in groups of four.

#### DAY 3

1. Oral presentation day. They develop the activities collaboratively and discuss the topic of the risks of social media. Vocabulary and use of English.
WEEK 4

DAY 1
1. Ss make the third video. They can choose their partners. They are to prepare a short TV talk taking different roles: a student, a teacher, a school director, an authority from the Ministry of Education, a parent, etc., stating their concerns/position on the use of smartphones and social media by teenagers. They are asked to use language studied throughout the content unit.
2. Ss watch their videos and the ones of their partners and provide each other with ideas to improve.

DAY 2
1. Ss go to the computer laboratory where they download their videos. They watch each of the videos and then assess them using the B1 adapted rubric. After self-assessment has been completed, Ss write a reflection of their personal scores, what aspect of the rubric they are stronger at, and what aspect they think they need to improve.

DAY 3
1. Ss relate their previous reflection with their improvement plan. They add strategies to it as they think they need.
2. In groups of four, Ss complete activities on page 74 of their textbook. They read and discuss for meaning.

WEEK 5

DAY 1
1. In pairs, Ss talk to each other telling anecdotes related with cellphones that they have lived. The conversation includes questions such as when? Where? Who were you with? How did you feel?
2. Ss switch pairs so that get to hear as many anecdotes from their peers as time allows.

DAY 2
1. Ss prepare for the production of their fourth video.
2. The video shows a spontaneous conversation between two students sharing anecdotes involving cellphones.

DAY 3
1. Debate preparation. The class will be divided in four groups to prepare a debate against and in
favor of the following topics: Topic 1: should students be allowed to bring cellphones to school? Topic 2: should parents buy cellphones to their sons at very young age? Students research for reliable resources.

**WEEK 6**

**DAY 1**
1. Debate day

**DAY 2**
1. Students prepare and make their fifth video on any of the two topics of the debate.

**DAY 3**
1. Students present their videos and reflect on their experience and achievements.
### Appendix E: PROGRESS TEST RUBRIC

(Adapted from Cambridge B1 Level according to the CEFR). Used as progress test and posttest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4.5</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grammar &amp; Vocabulary Control Range Appropriacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance does not satisfy the Band One descriptor.</td>
<td>Shows sufficient control of past, present and future tenses with errors. Struggles to find appropriate vocabulary when talking about technology.</td>
<td>Shows good control of past, present and future tenses. Occasional error don’t obscure meaning. Uses appropriate vocabulary when talking about technology.</td>
<td>Some features of 1 and some features of 3 in approximately equal measure.</td>
<td>More features of 3 than of 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>More features of 1 and some features of 3 in approximately equal measure.</td>
<td>More features of 3 than of 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>More features of 3 than of 5</td>
<td>Shows good control of past, present and future tenses, and attempts to use more complex structures. Occasional errors don’t obscure meaning. Uses a wide range of appropriate vocabulary when talking about technology.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Discourse Management Extent Relevance Coherence Cohesion** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Performance does not satisfy the Band One descriptor. | Responses are short phrases with frequent hesitation. Repeats information, digresses from topic. | Responses are extended beyond short phrases with some hesitation. Some repetition occurs. Simple cohesive devices, such as and, but, so, are used to keep the pace of the interaction. | Responses are extended beyond short phrases with minimal hesitation. Simple cohesive devices are used to keep the pace of the interaction. | | | | | | |

| **Pronunciation Intonation Stress Individual sounds** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Performance does not satisfy the Band One descriptor. | Is mostly intelligible despite limited control of phonological features. | Is mostly intelligible and has some control of phonological features at both utterance and word level. | Is intelligible with clear sound articulation, appropriate intonation, and clearly articulated individual sounds. | | | | | | |

| **Interactive communication Initiating Responding Development** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Performance does not satisfy the Band One descriptor. | Maintains exchange with difficulty. Does not pick up from partner’s input. | Initiates and responds appropriately. Keeps the interaction going with very little support. | Initiates and responds appropriately. Maintains and develops the interaction and negotiates to an outcome. | | | | | | |
Appendix F: Cambridge Scale compared with the CEFR

Retrieved on July 30th, from:

## Appendix G: Cambridge B2 Level Speaking Analytical Scale

### FCE (B2 level)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analytical Scales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Grammar and Vocabulary</strong></th>
<th><strong>Control</strong></th>
<th><strong>Range</strong></th>
<th><strong>Appropriacy</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Performance relates well with the level's description.**
- **Performance shows a good degree of control of simple grammatical forms.**
- **Performance demonstrates a range of appropriate vocabulary when talking about everyday situations.**
- **Performance shows a good degree of control of simple grammatical forms and attempts some complex grammatical forms.**
- **Performance demonstrates a range of appropriate vocabulary to give and exchange views on a range of familiar topics.**
- **Performance shows a good degree of control of a range of simple and some complex grammatical forms.**
- **Performance demonstrates a range of appropriate vocabulary to give and exchange views on a wide range of familiar topics.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Discourse Management</strong></th>
<th><strong>Excerpts</strong></th>
<th><strong>Relevance</strong></th>
<th><strong>Coherence</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Performance demonstrates good control of appropriate sentence patterns, topic development, and coherence.**
- **Performance produces responses which are extended beyond simple sentence patterns, contains a degree of complexity.**
- **Performance demonstrates good control of appropriate sentence patterns, topic development, and coherence.**
- **Performance demonstrates good control of appropriate sentence patterns, topic development, and coherence.**
- **Performance demonstrates good control of appropriate sentence patterns, topic development, and coherence.**
- **Performance demonstrates good control of appropriate sentence patterns, topic development, and coherence.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Pronunciation</strong></th>
<th><strong>Intonation</strong></th>
<th><strong>Stress</strong></th>
<th><strong>Individual sounds</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Performance demonstrates good control of intonation, stress, and individual sounds.**
- **Performance demonstrates good control of intonation, stress, and individual sounds.**
- **Performance demonstrates good control of intonation, stress, and individual sounds.**
- **Performance demonstrates good control of intonation, stress, and individual sounds.**
- **Performance demonstrates good control of intonation, stress, and individual sounds.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Interactive Communication</strong></th>
<th><strong>Initiating</strong></th>
<th><strong>Responding</strong></th>
<th><strong>Managing</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Performance demonstrates good control of intonation, stress, and individual sounds.**
- **Performance demonstrates good control of intonation, stress, and individual sounds.**
- **Performance demonstrates good control of intonation, stress, and individual sounds.**
- **Performance demonstrates good control of intonation, stress, and individual sounds.**
- **Performance demonstrates good control of intonation, stress, and individual sounds.**

---