Universidad Casa Grande

**Peer Feedback to Improve Speaking Facilitated with Mobile Devices**

Fernando Patricio Riera Hermida

Guide: Rossana Ramírez

Presented as Partial Fulfillment for the Degree of Magíster en Pedagogía de los Idiomas Nacionales y Extranjeros con Mención en la Enseñanza de Inglés. CES: CES: RPC-SO-25-N˚. 416-2016. Cohort 2019 – 2021. Author's mail: fernando.riera@casagrande.edu.ec Guayaquil, October 4th, 2020.

**Proyectos de Investigación**

Certifico que FERNANDO PATRICIO RIERA HERMIDA ha cumplido satisfactoriamente su investigación acción como pre-requisito de graduación de Magíster en Pedagogía de los Idiomas Nacionales y Extranjeros con Mención en la Enseñanza de Inglés.

Su investigación es parte del proyecto PEER FEEDBACK TO IMPROVE SPEAKING cuyo objetivo general es mejorar la producción oral a través de la evaluación de pares.

El proyecto se implementa en diez contextos y niveles de eficiencia en inglés diferentes. En este proyecto, cada participante desarrolla la investigación-acción en un contexto educativo diferente. Las secciones de literatura y metodología (instrumentos y análisis de datos) son las mismas.

Particular que comunico para los fines consiguientes.

**María Rossana Ramírez Avila**
**Coordinadora de Titulación**

**Abstract**

This action research was developed in a private school in Milagro, Guayas, Ecuador. The participants were 10th grade students, and their average age was 14. This innovation was implemented during the Pandemic caused by Covid-19. For that reason, all the process was online. All of the learners had Internet access and technological gadgets at home because it was part of the supplies they use in their classes. The students' level was A1 according to the diagnostic test they took at the beginning of the school year. Also, they sent a speaking video to the English coordinator to confirm their English level. The data collected through the surveys and rubrics had a Cohen's d= 0.5337 which indicates a high impact for learning. As a result, they improved their speaking skill in vocabulary, accuracy, fluency, and interaction. The participants expressed how this action research helped them to increase their intrinsic motivation to learn English and how working in pairs changed their perspective about getting feedback to enhance their learning process.

*Keywords:* high school, peer feedback, pair work, speaking, EFL

## Resumen

Esta investigación se desarrolló en un colegio privado de Milagro, Guayas, Ecuador. Los participantes eran estudiantes de décimo grado y su edad promedio era de 14 años. Esta innovación se implementó durante la pandemia causada por el Covid-19. Por esa razón, todo el proceso fue en línea. Todos los alumnos tenían acceso a Internet y dispositivos tecnológicos en casa porque formaban parte de los suministros que utilizan en sus clases. El nivel de los alumnos era A1 según la prueba diagnóstica que realizaron al inicio del curso escolar. Además, enviaron un video hablando en inglés al coordinador de área para confirmar su nivel. Los datos recolectados a través de las encuestas y rúbricas tuvieron un Cohen's d= 0,5337 lo que demostró la confiabilidad de este estudio. Durante este proceso, hubo sesiones en línea en las que los estudiantes expresaron el impacto positivo que la innovación tuvo en ellos. Como resultado de ello, mejoraron su habilidad para hablar inglés tanto en vocabulario, exactitud, fluidez e interacción. Los participantes también expresaron cómo esta investigación les ayudó a aumentar su motivación intrínseca para aprender inglés y cómo trabajar en parejas cambió su perspectiva sobre cómo recibir retroalimentación mejorar su proceso de aprendizaje.

*Palabras claves*: colegio, trabajo en pareja, retroalimentación en pareja, habla, EFL

**Peer Feedback to Improve Speaking Facilitated with Mobile Devices**

Barnawi (2011) said that English is dominant in science, technology, and business. Learning English in an educational institution in Ecuador has been part of the curriculum since 2016 (Ministerio de Educación de Ecuador, 2016). Learning English became an essential part of life. Moreover, the British Council (2015) claimed that there is a strong correlation between this foreign language, and getting better jobs' opportunities, and salaries.

Ecuadorian policies require university students to meet a B1 level before their graduation (Consejo de Educación Superior, 2013). For this reason, the private school where this study was implemented, tries that its students reach the A2-B1 English level when they finish their last scholar year. Participants of this research held A1 level according to the book they are studying and to an online test they took when the school year started. That test assessed all the four English skills. The learners had to record their voices and sent it to the English department. So, the coordinator suggested their communicative skills´ level.

Roeders (1997) claimed that to improve education, active learning techniques should be applied. The school where the study took part promotes cooperative learning through meaningful activities that allow students to transfer their learning in their daily lives. This study proposed the use of a lesson plan that included dialogs, video recording, and pair-work which help students to practice their speaking skills in their EFL classes.

Studies report that students have many reasons for not developing speaking skills (Al-Eiadeh, et. al, 2016; Derakhshan, et. al, 2016). Some of those are: confusion, embarrassment, deficiencies of English learning in prior educational levels, difficulties in pronunciation, limited vocabulary, fossilization, lack of confidence, anxiety due to inaccurate utterances, misunderstanding questions, the use of incorrect grammar, lack of practice, mixing classes (males and females), among others. Those are problems that EFL students face when they

have to practice speaking in their classes. The authors mentioned also talked about the benefits of changing the syllabus, techniques, adding teaching principles, and how to assess students effectively.

The Council of Europe (2018) considered conversation as a macro-functional basis of the Common European Framework of References. Ecuadorian schools still do not reach their English level according to the syllabus created by the authorities, and one of the problems is the lack of a communicative approach in their lessons. Ecuador ranks 81 with the lowest English language proficiency level of 100 countries. Ecuador has declined the score from the previous year (Ministerio de Educación, 2019).

As this study was applied during the pandemic caused by COVID-19, the use of TICs was essential for working with the students. "The digitalization of processes allows the public sectors to achieve a greater degree of efficiency, expand its coverage, and improve their communication systems, encourage the development of knowledge." (Ministerio de Telecomunicaciones y de la Sociedad de la Información, 2016, p.38). Thus, students used computers, cameras, and cellphones. The sample also used a digital platform to record and upload videos, gave and read the feedback given from the partners assigned.

The private institution that participated in this research use the European Framework to state goals in their lesson plans and try to achieve all of them using the most appropriated tests and books. Because of the situation that schools are facing all over the world, it was forced to change its methodology and look for new ways of assessing focusing more in their communicative skill. The next section introduces the literature review that helped to conduct this research.

## Literature Review

This section is a review of theories and similar research that has been conducted to explore the efficiency of dialogues to improve oral skills. Besides, the pedagogical practices included the Communicative Language Teaching approach, so there is some description of this approach and the principles that were applied in the innovation.

**Communicative Language Teaching**

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in its core has communicative competences as a priority rather than grammar (Richards, 2006). It asks teachers to re-think classroom practices, the type of materials they use for specific activities as well as the design of the lesson plan (Thornbury, 2016). According to Humphries and Burns (2015), CLT puts learners at the center. It focuses on meaning rather than form. Students are expected to negotiate meaning with almost no control from the teacher.

However, most studies show that this approach has not been implemented in the majority of schools and traditional ones are still prevalent (Jabeen, 2014). One of these issues is that there is not one constant definition which lead to multiple interpretations and an increasingly array of teaching practices.

This innovation was based on the principles of Communicative Language Teaching. Jacobs and Farrell (2003) made a list of this approach components and remarked the following:

- Focusing on the role of the learner as a key component in the process.

- Teaching is based on process rather than product.

- Connecting the school to the context of the world.

- Considering individual differences of learners and the importance of social nature of learning.

- Emphasizing in meaning and lifelong process.

**Pair Work**

Oprandy (as cited in Jacobs & Farrel, 2003) highlighted the critical role of teachers in the design of pair work activities. When they plan pair work, they should include meaningful tasks. Moreover, teachers have to tolerate messiness because of the organization of the tasks while identifying students' needs to meet them accordingly.

Authors coincide that pair work enhances learner's autonomy (Harris et. al, as cited in Jacobs & Farrel, 2003). They explain that the collaboration among peers raises independence from the teacher, as it happened in other approaches. They also highlight the role of meaningful tasks to retain more information. In this regard, it is important to consider student's preferences of topics.

**Speaking**

Speaking involves fluency and accuracy. The first refers to the ability to speak spontaneously and without many pauses. The later to construct grammatically correct ideas, phrases, or chunks (Derakhshan, et. al, 2015). For other authors like Bygate, speaking also involves interaction and production. Bygate defined production as the ability to speak without time limitations; and, interaction is produced when pairs negotiate the conversation (as cited in Derakhshan, et. al, 2015). Burns and Joyce (as cited in Al-Eiadeh, et al, 2016) shared similar points of view. They considered speaking involves interaction to construct meaning. This interaction means not only receiving and processing information but also producing it.

Hence, students require extended, authentic, and meaningful practice (Celce-Murcia, 2001; Jacobs & Farrel, 2003). Celce-Murcia (2001) added that speaking tasks need structure and planning. This author suggested to use short dialogues, and a structure of question-answers to start with. However, students' proficiency level required that the structure and planning were preceded by vocabulary introduction.

**Technical Vocabulary**

The use of technical vocabulary is getting part of the participants of this research because they belong to the 2.0 community. Mahraj (2018) and Wanpen, et al., (2013) sustained that learning technical vocabulary is an important factor to students of technical areas of study. Students like to be familiar with the type of English used in their career (Mahraj, 2018). They also need to communicate effectively and convey meaning of that communication in their fields (Wanpen et al., 2013). Mahraj (2018) classified vocabulary into two main categories. The first refers to the ones found in academic texts. The second, to the lexicon that is associated with specific areas of study.

To the previous classification, Wanpen et al. (2013) added that sometimes the meaning of words vary or they can be unique if they are used in specific areas. For Mahraj, vocabulary raises students' proficiency in the four skills of the language. The study of this author promoted grammar rules to raise students' knowledge of technical vocabulary.

**Peer Feedback**

Collaboration is a feature of peer feedback. Talking about collaboration, Spies and Xu (2018) highlighted that it aids in real communication. For Sardareh (2018), it enhances student's oral production, it provides information that students need which results in knowledge acquisition. When students apply peer feedback their work becomes more objective, gain ideas to improve in subsequent practices. Authors recommend constant practice, though (Colthorpe, et al., 2014). Smith (2017) added that the teachers' time is limited to provided individual feedback, thus peer feedback may be a solution for that difficulty. Besides it can improve students' comprehension of any topic.

**Scaffolding**

Scaffolding refers to the different ways teachers facilitate learning, starting from an initial mental structure to a complicated content or skill by organizing learners new

knowledge (Reiser & Tabak, 2014). Providing organization while teaching content will allow learners to better understand and apply this new knowledge.

Smit, et al. (2017) claimed that scaffolding has three stages. The first one is the support provided in the classroom. The second stage is the withdrawal of support, and thirdly which is the transfer of responsibility, where students take charge of their learning.

**Technology**

Technology is updating and changing human's lives constantly. It has become a tool for development and provided many benefits. In education, it has contributed to change of paradigms. It motivates students to participate and become autonomous. Students are learning to deal with self-directed activities. Technology provides opportunities to share information, interact with others, and establish environments to make learning more efficient. Thus, it can also serve as a tool to provide feedback (Bahadorfar & Omidvar, 2014). Richards (2006) stated that the practice students carry out using technology make tasks authentic.

Yeh et al. (2015) pointed out that Voki helps student that are shy to speak in class. Yona and Marlina (2014) researched the use of this tool to improve oral descriptive texts. They focused on reducing anxiety and raise confidence in students. Ni (2012) added that through this took students do not worry about making mistakes and were willing to participate with their peers.

Regarding the use of technology, there are some limitations like connectivity, time management, organization, energy problems, and lack of concentration due to external noise. Having identified students' poor oral participation due to several reasons, this study implemented the use of dialogues where students had to plan and organize their ideas before interacting. After this literature review, this study explored the following research questions:

1. To what extent does peer feedback improve speaking?

2. What are students' perspectives towards the innovation?

**Innovation**

During this process, the participants were studying a unit about the 2.0 community, technology, and common routines during a day. Besides, the participants were told about the things they would be evaluated: fluency, accuracy, vocabulary, and interaction (Appendix A).

Once they had recorded themselves, they had to send the videos to the partner who was assigned randomly by the teacher, they should get as well as give feedback to their peers. After that, they had to record themselves again taking into consideration all the comments gotten and upload the final video to be assessed by the teacher.

The lesson plan was designed for 6 weeks. The students conducted interviews (Appendix F) in which they had the opportunity to practice their speaking skills and give their comments about how the innovation was helping them to improve the skill mentioned before. For the post-test, the participants had to create a Live Show situation in which they had to interview a famous YouTuber (Appendix B). They wrote the dialog applying the vocabulary learned during the unit, designed the scenario, and practiced as much as they could by getting and providing feedback among themselves. Finally, they submitted the video on the platform, and the teacher assessed it by applying the same rubric used for grading the pre-test.

The main standard used to evaluate learners describes that students "can understand everyday expressions aimed at the satisfaction of simple needs" (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 84). Also, there were times where students record videos talking about random topics they felt comfortable with or practice dialogs between each other with the use of technology.

**Methodology**

This was an action research. It is described by Ravid (2015) as a cycle that starts with the identification of problems that need to be improved, search for research-based practices, implement them, and report the results. This action research included quantitative instruments to answer the research questions. Data were collected at the beginning, during,

and at the end of the innovation for a period of six weeks.

The first task students did was to take a survey in which the expressed the activities they liked doing in class, what skills they had, and how clear they were about the content they were studying within the unit. As a part of their pre-test, the students were asked to record themselves talking about the things they do during a normal day, what their favorite social pages are, and what technological gadgets they use at home. After that, they had to send the video to a peer get feedback and record them again applying their peers' comments, and send it to the teacher.

When students finished sending the video, they took another pre-survey (Appendix D) in which they claimed how peer feedback had helped them to improve their speaking skills, some common problems they had while doing the activity, and how they felt about working with a peer while recording themselves speaking in English. It is important to mention that between the pre and the post-test, students were sent to do some speaking tasks related to the previous vocabulary they had in which they also got feedback from their peers. Besides, students had the opportunity to create dialogs or speaking scenarios using common situations that people of the 2.0 community would have.

At the end of the process, the students took a post-survey (Appendix E), in which they mentioned how this process was beneficial for them. The survey provided information about how peer feedback and technology increased their motivation to learn and to improve their speaking skill. Once they had recorded themselves, they had the videos to the partner who was assigned randomly by the teacher, they should get as well as give feedback to their peers. After that, they had to record themselves again taking into consideration all the comments gotten and upload the final video to be assessed by the teacher

**Participants Description**

Fourteen students from a private school in Milagro, Guayas, Ecuador participated in this action research .The sample consisted on 10 male and 4 female teenagers. Their English proficiency was A1 according to the online test they took when the school year started and the video they sent to the school's coordinator. They ages ranged from 13 to 15 years old. The average age was 14. They were in tenth grade and belonged to the same class. The school coordinator recommended to use this group because of their English level and their lack of speaking skills. All the students lived in Milagro almost near each other.

The demographic survey indicates that six students have studied English at private institutions in their free time, and two of them were still taking English online classes after school. Two students reported that they could handle a basic conversation in English. Seven students claimed that they enjoyed posting in English using social media. All of the students agreed that they have technological gadgets at home and internet connection. Twelve of the participants added that they feel comfortable working online because they spend some of their free time on online apps creating content for their social platforms. Two students said that they have basic knowledge of technology because their parents control their time spent on the internet.

## Instruments

**Demographic survey:** The students took the surveys by an online platform in which they had to download it, printed it, solved it, and the teacher collected them to analyze the results.

**Proficiency test:** The participants took a Pearson mock test in the platform they use to study English, and it indicated that they have an A1 level. Also, the coordinator has made the students sent a video in which they had to answers random questions to confirm their English proficiency level.

**Speaking survey.** This was completed before and after the innovation based on the Likert scale. These surveys were useful to realize how the students developed their speaking skills during the innovation.

**Rubric:** It was used to grade fluency, accuracy, vocabulary, and interaction. The rubric was modified with an extra criteria which was "Insufficient" which allowed to grade all the process during the innovation

**Pre- and posttest:** The first video or the first recording (pre-test) was consider to identify the problems they have while speaking in English. The last video or the last recording the participants made was considered as a posttest. They created an interview with the use of technology.

**Interview:** This process was done during the tutoring classes students had to take as a part of their schedule. The questions were open-ended, and the interview was recorded by zoom. Using a qualitative technique, all the answers the students claimed during the interview were analyzed and transcribed in there.

**Field notes**: The interaction the students have during their online classes were also taken into consideration to describe their improvement.

## Data Analysis

The data was collected using the speaking survey and tabulated on the SPSS program. The main items of the survey were presented in the results. The pre and posttest data were also analyzed using descriptive statistics. The rubric allowed the researcher to obtain the mean, standard deviation, and effect size to consider the impact the innovation had on the participants.

The interview was recorded during all the online sessions the students had with the researcher. All the comments students gave or had about the innovation were considered to

answer what was their perspectives toward the innovation. All the extra information or comments the students gave were inside the field notes format used for this study.

**Ethical Standards**

The institution authorized the innovation through a consent letter. Also, the institution gave all the facilities to conduct the study. The only thing they did not agree was to show the students' grades or personal information.

All the participants in this study were minors, so their parents signed a permission letter to let them be part of this innovation. The parents knew in detail the process followed before, during, and after the action research. However, all the parents conditioned the researcher not to use their children's grades or personal information such as Full names, IDs, or their platforms' passwords.

## Results

The data in this innovation were considered to analyze the impact that peer feedback had on improving the speaking skill. The results obtained during the innovation was based on the two research questions.

The results to answer the first question

*To what extent does peer feedback improve speaking?*

Table 1.

|            | N  | Pre-test |       | Post-test |       |             |
|------------|----|----------|-------|-----------|-------|-------------|
|            |    | Mean     | SD    | Mean      | SD    | Effect size |
| Fluency    | 14 | 2.07     | 0.730 | 3.79      | 0.975 | 0.921       |
| Accuracy   | 14 | 1.71     | 0.726 | 3.21      | 0.975 | 0.891       |
| Vocabulary | 14 | 2.14     | 0.770 | 3.57      | 1.016 | 0.869       |

| Interaction | 14 | 2.00 | 0.679 | 4.00 | 0.877 | 0.964 |

*Rubric*

Table 1 demonstrates the students' performance and improvement in speaking by being assessed with a rubric that included fluency, accuracy, vocabulary, and interaction. It is evident that the mayor improvement was in interaction with 0.964 followed fluency with 0.921 which was beneficial for their learning process and the innovation.

The results to answer the second question

*What are students' perspectives towards the innovation?*

Table 2 analyzed some of the most important aspects of the rubric. It shows the means of the pre and post-survey. There was a positive impact after the innovation. The values in the table of pre and post-survey show the average in which students were before and after the innovation .The results proved the significant effect that this study had on the participants changing their oral peer work activities when they practiced dialogs about general ideas.

Table 2.

*Pre-survey and Post-survey*

|  | *Pre-survey* | *Post-survey* |
|---|---|---|
| Fill in the space with correct grammar | 2.07 | 4.14 |
| Practice specific vocabulary orally of an activity | 2.21 | 4.07 |
| Oral practice with vocabulary of personal interests | 2.00 | 4.43 |
| Oral pair work activities in the classroom | 2.21 | 4.29 |
| Pair work in general outside the classroom | 1.93 | 4.36 |
| You have Created a short speech | 1.93 | 4.14 |
| You have Made an oral presentation | 2.14 | 4.43 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| You have Commented on a general topic | 2.14 | 4.43 |
| You have Created dialogues to practice with peers | 2.07 | 4.29 |
| You have Practice a dialogue about general ideas | 2.21 | 4.43 |
| Pair work is useful to practice speaking | 1.93 | 4.07 |

Table 3.

Table 3 shows that the post-survey has a positive impact compared to the pre-survey on the sample because there were some aspects they improved, and they were beneficial during their learning process. One of the most relevant indicators was that students enhanced their interaction with others while speaking English.

*The pre-survey and post-survey results*

| *Indicators* | *Pre-survey* | *Post-survey* |
|---|---|---|
| Feel confused about the topic | 2.14 | 3.57 |
| Feel confused for not knowing what to say | 2.36 | 3.86 |
| Feel anxious trying to look for words to respond correctly | 1.86 | 4.21 |
| Feel afraid of making mistakes in pronunciation | 2.29 | 3.79 |
| Cannot structure a sentence | 1.93 | 3.93 |
| Cannot continue the conversation because of lack of vocabulary | 2.21 | 3.93 |
| Feel embarrassed of making mistakes | 2.36 | 4.14 |
| Can interact with the interlocutor | 2.57 | 4.36 |

Table 4.

*Interview*

| Questions | Answers |
|---|---|
| 1. What problems did you have with speaking? | During the interview, almost all students claimed that the lack of vocabulary was the principal problem they had to communicate in English. Two students claimed that they can understand English, but they could not speak due to the basic knowledge of words they have in English. Another student reported that he enhanced his speaking skill when he traveled abroad and had to learn words to communicate. |
| 2. Did you improve them? To what extent? What helped you improve? | All the students claimed that they improved their speaking skills by working with a peer using technology. One student said the innovation helped him to be more confident about accepting that it is normal to make mistakes for learning a new language. Another student reported that working with technology was a fun way to learn how to speak English. |
| 3. Have you used peer feedback before? What are the advantages of peer feedback? Are there disadvantages? | Almost all students agreed they were familiar with peer work. Some students believed collaborative work help them to learn better because they could realize other's mistakes and learn by them every time the teachers correct them. However, a few students thought that peer feedback could be |

| | distracting at the moment of studying because there were times they did other activities and forgot the purpose of working in peers, but they still enjoyed it. One student reported that working in peers helped him to know more about his classmates and build relationships with them. |
|---|---|
| 4. What problems did you have with speaking? | All students mentioned that one problem they had was to use the appropriated verbs and context according to the tenses they are studying. One student said that the most difficult part was to improve his accuracy, but he learned a lot of vocabulary. Another student reported that he had fluency problems before, but thanks to the dialogs he created and practiced, he improved, and now is more confident to talk to with someone in English. |

Table 4 evidenced the students' feelings and comments about the innovation. According to their quotes, there is a clear improvement in the oral skill. Also, how peer work help them to be more conscious about their learning process.

**Discussion**

***Question 1. To what extent does peer feedback improve speaking?***

Learning to speak English was one of the most relevant problems the participants had in the institution. It seemed that the lack of interaction among themselves as one of the issues

they had.  Authors coincide that pair work enhances learner's autonomy (Harris & Noyau; Macaro, as cited in Jacobs & Farrel, 2003). Once the students were assigned to work with a peer, they started to improve their speaking skills, not only because of the feedback they got, it was due to the interaction they had without worrying of being assessed. Bygate defined production as the ability to speak without time limitations; and, interaction is produced when pairs negotiate the conversation (as cited in Derakhshan, et al., 2015).

Spies and Xu (2018) emphasized that collaboration is correlated to real communication.  There were sessions where students had to work in pairs and talk about the things they usually enjoy doing during their quarantine, and the results were satisfactory because when one participant did not remember a word or did not pronounce a word correctly, his partner told him how to say it in English or correct the pronunciation.

Once the participants noticed their speaking skill was getting better, they strived to enhance their pronunciation because they wanted to get positive feedback from their peers. The group was very competitive. According to Sardareh (2018), peer work aids to enhance students' learning, providing useful information while acquiring the necessary knowledge. This innovation made students acquire more vocabulary because they were very critical and wanted to correct everything between themselves. The teacher played a passive role because he realized that students were improving their speaking by being criticized by among them. Smith (2017) agreed that the feedback a teacher provides is not enough. It was clear that students started to participate more in classes because working in peers made them analyze and comprehend new topics. Also, they learned a lot of English words to communicate in classes.

This study was applied during the pandemic Covid-19. Throughout the innovation, there were some exercises the students had to do to practice. For that reason, the use of

technological tools was required for this process. Students used Apps such as "Speaky" to practice English in their free time. The participants also enjoyed working with Voki in which they recorded their voices and presented their avatars during their online classes.  In the case of Voki, et al. (2015) emphasized that this Web 2.0 tool enables students to express their opinions when they are not confident to talk in front of the class because they are afraid of mispronouncing words. This tool was helpful because while the participants were using apps like this, they acquired more vocabulary to create dialogs and improved their pronunciation.

The students were exposed to technology all the time because they were studying online. According to Bahadorfar and Omidvar, (2014) through technology, students get opportunities to interact and provide feedback. In all the English classes students had the opportunity to interact and correct their mistakes by collaborative learning. In conclusion, peer feedback helped students to improve their speaking, and now almost all of them can handle a basic conversation in English.

### Question 2. What are students' perspectives towards the innovation?

The participants had been always working with approaches that focus their lessons on grammar. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in its core has communicative competences as a priority rather than grammar (Richards, 2006).
When the study started, the methodology changed. It was used CLT. According to Humphries and Burns (2015), CLT puts learners at the center. It focuses on meaning rather than form. At first, students were nervous with the use of this methodology because they had not experienced a communicative approach during their lessons, especially for the online classes which they were taking due to the pandemic. Most studies show that this approach has not been implemented in the majority of schools and traditional ones are still prevalent (Jabeen, 2014).

The students claimed that during this process they learned a lot of English words, and

they started to understand more English words while practicing dialogs or speaking with the teacher. The topics used in class were chosen according to the students' interests. Jacobs and Farrell (2003) made a list of this approach components and remarked the following:  Focusing on the role of the learner as a key component in the process, connecting the school to the context of the world. The participants always talked about how they learned to speak English while they were having fun acquiring English words that they could use in their social media sites Also, they commented that this study allowed them to know many interesting things that they were interested in, and for this reason, they were always interacting and trying to do their best while speaking in English during their classes.

      Wanpen et al. (2013) added that sometimes the meaning of words varies or they can be unique if they are used in specific areas. The sample were teenagers who were enrolled in the world of technology and social media. Consequently, the content of the unit chosen let students experience how a word could have different meanings in English.

     Even though the participants were familiarized with the use of peer feedback, this study allowed them to apply this technique to improve a skill they had problems. According to the interview, surveys, and online sessions with the students, there were positive aspects the students reach. For example, they felt more confident in expressing themselves in English because they could understand and interact in a new language. During this process, the sample had some changes with the use of technology. They realized they could take advantage of technology to learn a new language.

     Due to the situation about the pandemic, face to face classes were replaced by online classes.  Students claimed that at first, they were not optimistic about learning English online because they thought they were going to be sitting down in front of the computer listening to the teacher about grammar rules. However, thanks to this innovation, they enjoyed improving their speaking skill through the use of technology which they consider beneficial in their

learning process.  Scaffolding refers to the different ways teachers facilitate learning, starting from an initial mental structure to a complicated content or skill by organizing learners' new knowledge (Reiser & Tabak, 2014). The use of this strategy was demanding because all the exercises the students did at the beginning of the study, the researcher showed them how to do them first, and gave support to all the participants until they were ready to work by themselves. Besides, the application of this action research helped them to become autonomous learners and learn from their mistakes.

## Conclusions

During this action research, it was demonstrated the positive impact that peer feedback had on teenagers to improve their speaking skill. The students who participated in this action research were studying English since they were kids. The participants had prior knowledge on the subject, but they could not show their speaking abilities according to the grade they were coursing.

At the beginning of the project, it was evident the lack of speaking skills the students had, but as time passes by, they were improving their ability to communicate in English with each other. They improve their fluency and accuracy, they also gained vocabulary that helped them to be more participative and express their ideas during online classes.

When comparing the pre and post-survey, it was evidenced that students improved their speaking skills. Also, increased their intrinsic motivation to learn the target language. The pre and posttests taken by the school authorities demonstrated that the sample increased their knowledge on the subject.

Throughout the project, the methodology applied indicates that students increase their gains to participate in class without doubting of any mistakes because they incorporated feedback as a part of their learning process. They also improved their listening skill because

they understood almost all the questions the teacher asked during the online classes. Finally, this innovation is useful to develop students' communication and their confidence to participate in class, especially on these days that classes were taken online.

The participants understood the importance of getting and giving positive feedback to their partners to improve their speaking skills, and they showed their interest because they like working with everything related to technology

Finally, collaborative learning maintained students' relationships with each other, and this helped them to be more mature to learn by getting feedback from their classmates.

**Limitations**

When working in this action research some limitations should be taken into consideration for future studies. One of them was the problem with the internet because the classes were taken online and almost all students in the country were connected at the same time. This caused students to have a slow internet connection or not to be able to connect to some classes. Also at the beginning, it affected the students' assignments because they could not upload or send videos on time to receive feedback from their peers. In addition to this problem, some students could not provide their feedback on time because of the poor internet connection.

Another limitation was that at the beginning of the project, the sample did not feel comfortable with the feedback they got from their peers. It took them a couple of days to realize the importance of doing that exercise and how helpful it was during their learning process. One aspect to take into consideration while using this kind of methodology was the students sometimes misunderstood the purpose of using technology to practice a new skill. There were times when few participants focused more on making creative videos more than demonstrating their speaking skills.

**Recommendations**

After concluding the application of this innovation, the researcher recommends future researchers to explain to students that the main purpose of getting and giving feedback is to improve their speaking skills rather than being graded by the teacher or peers. Another recommendation would be to explain the use of rubrics since the very beginning and make some previous exercises using them. So, when the participants have to give feedback to their peers, they are already familiarized with the use of rubrics.

It is also recommended to apply this methodology for the whole school year. Another suggestion is to negotiate with the students the use technological apps to create videos for some assignments.

**References**

Al-Eiadeh, A., Al.Sobh, M., Al-Zoubi, S., Al-Khasawneh, F. (2016). Improving English

language speaking skills of Ajloun National university students. *International Journal

of English and Education, 5*(3), 181-195. Retrieved from

https://www.researchgate.net/project/Article-Low-Academic-Achievement-Causes-and-

Results

Bahadorfar, M., & Omidvar, R. (2014). Technology in teaching speaking skills. *International

Journal of Multidisciplinary Research Review, 2*(4), 9-13. Retrieved from

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/315790125_TECHNOLOGY_IN_TEACHI

NG_SPEAKING_SKILL/citations

Barnawi, Osman. (2011). *Examining Formative Evaluation of an English for Specific

Purposes Program.* (Master's Thesis). Retrieved from

https://search.proquest.com/docview/867369327/7BFD87DD91074940PQ/1?accounti

d=174323

British Council. (2015). *English in Argentina*. Retrieved from

https://englishagenda.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/attachments/english_in_argen

tina.pdf

Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). *Teaching English as a Second Language or Foreign Language* (2nd.

Ed.). New York: Newbury House.

Colthorpe, K., Chen. X., & Zimbardi, K. (2014). Peer feedback enhances a "Journal Club" for

undergraduate science students that develop oral communication and critical evaluation

skills. *Journal of Learning Design, 7*(2), 106-119.

Consejo de Educación Superior. (2013). *Reglamento de Régimen Académico*. Retrieved from

http://www.ces.gob.ec/lotaip/2017/Diciembre/Anexos%20Procu/An-lit-a2-

Reglamento%20de%20R%C3%A9gimen%20Acad%C3%A9mico.pdf

Council of Europe. (2018). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages:*

    *Learning, Teaching, Assessment.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press

Derakhshan, A., Khalili, A., & Beheshti, F. (2016). Developing EFL learner's speaking

    ability, accuracy and fluency. *English Language and Literature Studies, 6*(2), 177-186.

    Retrieved from

    https://www.researchgate.net/publication/303498787_Developing_EFL_Learner's_Spea

    king_Ability_Accuracy_and_Fluency

Derakhshan, A., Tahery, F., & Mirarab, N. (2015). Helping adult and young learner to

    communicate in speaking classes with confidence. *Mediterranean Journal of Social*

    *Science, 6*(2), 520-525. Doi: 10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n2p520

Humphries, C., & Burns, A. (2015). In reality it's almost impossible: CLT-oriented

    curriculum change. *ELT Journal, 69*(3), 239-248. Doi: 10.1093/elt/ccu081

Jabeen, S. (2014). Implementaiton of communicative approach. *English Language Teaching,*

    *7*(8), 68-74. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1075982

Jacobs, G., & Farrell, T. (2003). Understanding and Implementing the CLT (Communicative

    Language Teaching) Paradigm. *RELC Journal, 35*(5), 5-30. doi:

    https://doi.org/10.1177/003368820303400102

Mahraj, M. (2018). Teaching technical vocabulary through word formation rules. *ESP*

    *International Arab Journal of English for Specific Purposes, 1*(1), 37-44. Retrieved

    from

    https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327449200_Teaching_Technical_Vocabulary

    _through_Word_Formation_technRules

Ministerio de Educación de Ecuador. (2016). Lengua Extranjera [Foreign Language].

    Retrieved from https://educacion.gob.ec/curriculo-lengua-extranjera/

Ministerio de Telecomunicaciones y de la Sociedad de la Información. (2016) *Plan Nacional*

    *de Telecomunicaciones y Tecnologías de Información del Ecuador 2016-2021.*

    [National Plan of Telecommunications and Information Technologies of Ecuador 2016-

    2021] Retrieved from https://www.telecomunicaciones.gob.ec/wp-

    content/uploads/2016/08/Plan-de-Telecomunicaciones-y-TI..pdf

Ni, H. (2012). The effects of affective factors in SLA and pedagogical implications. Theory &

    *Practice in Language Studies, 2*(7), 1508-1513.

Ravid, R. (2015). *Practical Statistics for Educators*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

Reiser, B., & Tabak, I. (2014). Scaffolding. *The Cambridge Handbook of the Learning*

    *Sciences, 3*(29), 44–62. doi:10.1017/cbo9781139519526.005

Richards, J. (2006). *Communicative language teaching today.* New York: Cambridge.

Roeders, P. (1997). *Learning together*. Lima: WALKIRIA Cultural Society.

Sardareh, S. (2018). *Assessment for learning in Malaysian primary schools: A case study*.

    Sociolinguistics Symposium: The University of Auckland. Retrieved from

    https://www.researchgate.net/publication/326148123_Assessment_for_Learning_in_Ma

    laysian_Primary_Schools_A_Case_Study

Smit, N., van de Grift, W., de Bot, K., & Jansen, E. (2017). A classroom observation tool for

    scaffolding reading comprehension. *Elsevier, 65*(2), 117–129.

    doi:10.1016/j.system.2016.12.014

Smith, A., McCarthey, S., & Magnifico, A. (2017). Recursive feedback: Evaluative

    dimensions of e-learning. In. B. Cope & M. Kalantzis, *e-Learning Ecologies*. (pp. 118-

    142). Doi: 10.4324/9781315639215-5

Spies, T., & Xu, Y. (2018). Scaffolded academic conversations: Access to 21st-Century

    collaboration and communication skills. *SAGE Journals, 54*(1), 22-30. Doi:

    https://doi.org/10.1177/1053451218762478

Wanpen, S., Sonkoontod, K., & Nonkukhetkhong, K. (2013). Technical vocabulary

proficiencies and vocabulary learning strategies of engineering students. *Procedia -*

*Social and Behavioral Sciences, 88*, 312-320. Retrieved from

https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/82380139.pdf

Yeh, H., Tseng, S., & Chen, Y. (2019). Using online peer feedback through blogs to promote

speaking performance. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society, 22*(1), 1-14.

Retrieved from

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/332540194_Using_online_peer_feedback_thr

ough_blogs_to_promote_speaking_performance

Yona, S., & Marlina, L. (2014). The use of voki website in teaching speaking on oral

descriptive text for junior high school students. *Journal of English Language Teaching,*

*3*(1), 235-242.

## Appendix A

## Rubric

Available upon request.


## Appendix B

## Design from Your Goals

Available upon request

## Appendix C

## Demographic Survey

## Students' Demographics

Available upon request.

**Appendix D**

**Student's Demographic Information (Pre-survey)**

Available upon request.

**Appendix E**

**Student's Perspectives (post-survey)**

Available upon request.

**Appendix F**

**INTERVIEW**

Available upon request.

**FIELD NOTES**

Available upon request.