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SELF EVALUATION SCALES TO FOSTER THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNICATIVE ABILITIES IN THE CLIL CLASS.

1. INTRODUCTION

The present study has grown out of the need to develop students’ communicative and academic abilities when making an Oral Presentation.

It is part of the research started by the group ArtICLE “Avaluació de tasques col·laboratives i assoliment d’objectius d’aprenentatge en aules AICLE de Ciències en llengua estrangera” (ARIE 2004-00058), which investigates different types of tasks and guidelines in order to help students to:

1. develop the communicative abilities needed to acquire significant learning,
2. develop their capacity for reflection on learning,
3. increase their self confidence and
4. become more autonomous.

The results of the ArtICLE research proved that students managed to achieve a higher degree of cognitive abilities, better fluency and richer vocabulary on the whole, as they were being exposed to a good number of authentic materials. However, after analysing their performance of the final Oral Presentation we discovered that some of them had not mastered the presentation skills needed in a good Oral Presentation. They were able to convey the content they had memorised, their formal language had enriched, especially the lexis, but they were lacking communicative competence. Their paralinguistic resources were either weak or non-existent and the visual aids were quite poor. They had little visual contact with the audience or none at all in some cases, as they were reading from their texts. They did not show a good turn taking, their discourse was not well organised and they were not relating to the audience in terms of greeting the audience, introducing themselves, encouraging questions, closing the speech, etc.,

Therefore we decided to dedicate time to work on the Oral Presentation in order to practise those procedures related to the discourse the students needed to master. This has been the core of the Research that I have been carrying out during this school year of Llicència d’Estudis 2005/2006.

When we say working on the Oral Presentation, what do we mean? In Vilà i Santasusana’s words: “the Oral Presentation can be taught and can be learnt. (…) The ability to speak is not necessarily a natural gift. (…) Not everyone learns to speak by speaking (…) Mastering the oral skill lies on the creation of communicative situations during the process of planning and in such situations we aim at striking a balance between the activities of language use and those of discourse reflection” (Vilà I Santasusana 2001).

So, with this aim in mind, we prepared some short and specific activities during the planning process that would somehow guide the students from the Negotiation of
Criteria of Quality to the Oral Presentation and learner’s Self-Assessment. In that way we could see the real competence of the students in each of the activities. Additionally, this allowed us to diversify the help according to the needs of the individual students. The tasks were carried out in pairs and a group of three.

Before the Oral Presentation each pair had the opportunity to rehearse their speech in front of another pair in order to get some feedback. This, we think, is important because rehearsal gives a certain degree of security to both the pair performing and the pair listening. Also, it generates a meta-discourse reflection on the oral production which is proved to be very useful for all the participants. During the meta-discourse reflection the students can modify or integrate linguistic procedures. “Preparing a speech provokes a ‘cognitive overcharge’ at the time of production as learners have to control different variables at the same time. But if time for reflection is introduced in the planning process, these variables can be isolated and worked on slowly and independently, which will show much better results during the final oral production” (Vilà I Santasusana 2001).

1.1. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Let’s start from a theoretical standpoint: if teaching and learning is thought of as “a process of social communication, as a cooperative work which requires negotiation of meaning and the progressive transfer of control and responsibility of the learning process from teacher to student” (Jorba et al. 1998), then communication has a very important role to play because it allows the negotiation that leads to pacts. Therefore, we should consider the language use in a learning situation as one of the core factors of significant learning.

However, if we analyse the classroom situation we can see that communicative abilities are not very well developed among our students. On the contrary, the students’ communicative competence in the foreign language is quite poor, probably due to the lack of work on the oral production (Bain, 1994; Vilà 1994, Cross y Vilà, 1997) for reasons, among others, such as: the noise created, the difficulty the teacher has to control the production of different pairs working at the same time, the fact that the spoken word is non-reversible and non-resourceful, in other words, one cannot go back on what has been said or change it, which makes it difficult to observe and reflect on. Also, the very attitude of the students who take oral activities as a game and, last but not least, the difficulty to evaluate the oral production. Consequently, oral production has been neglected in favour of the practice of other skills in the class.

So, the question at the base of my research was: How can we help students develop their communicative strategies, achieve an all-embracing linguistic education and, at the same time, take control of their own learning?

Studies in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) show that successful language learning can be achieved when people have the opportunity to receive instruction, and at the same time experience real-life situations in which they can acquire the language. It is the naturalness of the environment around them which fosters learning. However, our students are taught languages in language classrooms, where they go through the often
difficult process of sorting out sounds, structures, grammar or vocabulary in an unnatural environment.

Taking all this into account, the answer to the question, could lie in:

- the programs which foster Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) and
- The Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) and The European Language Portfolio (ELP).

CLIL is an approach in which curricular subjects such as Natural Sciences, History, Geography, etc., or part of subjects, can be taught in a foreign language. The learner is dealing with content matter in the foreign language. He is working certain abilities which are at the base of cognitive operations with a treatment of the communicative strategies, necessary to process information and deliver it in the foreign language (Carmela Perez, 2004).

The content learned through a different language allows for a deeper approach to learning which is at the base of learner’s autonomy development.

**Why use a CLIL Approach?**

We could give several reasons:
- It is a dynamic, motivating and integrative approach.
- It is based on Communicative Language Learning that is to say: focus on meaning, group work interaction, genuine questions, opportunities to use language creatively, opportunities to participate in task negotiations.
- By combining Content and Language learning studying strategies improve.
- It can offer a more natural situation for language development which builds on other forms of learning.
- Working with CLIL is more cognitively demanding and triggers creative thinking.
- The language is the means to learn not the object of learning. There is a higher quality and quantity of input and output.
- This natural use of language can boost the learner’s motivation towards learning languages. (Marsh & Langé, Using Languages to Learn and Learning to Use Languages. TIE-CLIL:Milan)
- Finally, socially speaking, it enforces multilingualism and multiculturalism and promotes European citizenship, which are some of the concerns of the Council of Europe.

As we are trying to investigate the different communicative strategies that the students should master when giving an academic Oral Presentation, this kind of learning has proved a high degree of efficiency in the development of communicative competence.
Its success lies at the base of a conjunction of cognitive, emotional, psychological and sociological factors that:
› allow an increase of contact with the foreign language,
› introduce a real world in the class,
› foster the use of texts and authentic materials,
› help interaction,
› help meta-linguistic reflection within a context as the problems with understanding and production arise,
› foster the practice of linguistic strategies such as understanding and production in oral situations or discourse strategies like description, argument, oral presentation, etc.,

The Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) and The European Language Portfolio (ELP), are two instruments designed by the Council of Europe to promote language learning. The ELP is specifically aimed at the development of the learner’s autonomy by means of bringing awareness of the learning process. It has three components defined in the Principles and Guidelines approved by the Council of Europe (DGIV/EDU/LANG 2000) as follows:

- The Language Passport, which provides an overview of the individual’s proficiency in different languages at a given point in time; this overview is defined in terms of skills and the common reference levels in the Common European Framework.
- The Language Biography which facilitates the learner’s involvement in planning, reflecting upon and assessing his/her learning process and progress.
- The Dossier which offers the learner the opportunity to file those materials that document and illustrate his learning experiences and achievements.

With reference to our research it is the concern for learner’s autonomy the one we would like to highlight as we can see in the following principles taken from The ELP Principles and Guidelines:

- The development of the language learner (1.5)
- The development of the capacity for independent language learning (1.6)
- The promotion of learner autonomy (2.4)
- The encouraging of learner self-assessment (2.7) An example of this is the Language Passport which provides overview of the individual’s proficiency in different languages at a given point in time; It is the learner the one who assesses his/her language proficiency.
- The learner’s involvement in planning, reflecting on and assessing his learning process (3.2).

The Council of Europe’s concern to promote autonomous lifelong learning coincides with the emphasis ELP has on self-assessment. Self-assessment is based on the learner’s developed capacity to reflect on his/her own knowledge, skills and achievement.

There are two different approaches to assessment:

 › The norm-referenced approach, used by public examinations, is based on the belief that achievement is distributed. That is to say: in every group there is a small group of very good learners, a larger number of good learners, a lot of average learners, some weak learners and a few very weak learners. According to this philosophy some learners always fail. This approach has a negative attitude to failure.

 › The criterion-referenced approach, i.e. the ELP approach (can do) is based on the belief that assessment is a matter of determining the extent to which learners have mastered the criterion in question. Even the weakest learners might succeed. It has a positive attitude to failure. (D. Little and R Perclová).

Our research follows the latter. The students negotiate the criteria of quality and then assess themselves according to those criteria.

Why use the ELP descriptors and the CEFR illustrative scales to help students learn to assess themselves?

We know that learning to assess oneself is very difficult. Our students have a very difficult task when asked to assess the accuracy of their language skills: “How, after all, can learners assess themselves with any degree of accuracy unless they already possess the same degree of linguistic knowledge as the person who set the examination paper or devised the assessment task?” (David Little, 1999, 3)

However, they are more likely to know what they can do communicatively in the target language and the general level of proficiency with which they can do it. The functional “can do” statements (developed by the Swiss ELP project) can be more natural to start with.

Let’s see a model of self-assessment guidelines designed for the students to use after an Oral Presentation following the Can Do Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I can greet people.</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I can introduce myself and my partner to the class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can introduce the topic I am going to talk about.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can use semiformal/formal language to give recommendations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can speak clearly and slowly so that everybody can understand.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can defend my point if questioned.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can use convincing language to defend the importance of my recommendations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can show that I understand what other students ask me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can agree/disagree with people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can thank people at the end of my talk.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Self-assessment activities require the learner’s involvement in the process. They help students comprehend the educational objectives. And if we succeed at involving the students, we will enable them gradually to assume more responsibility for their own learning.

Based on these principles our hypothesis would try to prove that:

a) thorough planning of the Oral Presentation with activities designed to help students develop their communicative competence and
b) guidance in the process of reflection and self-assessment by means of tasks based on the ELP descriptors we should be able to:
   • Improve the students’ communicative competence in the foreign language in an Oral Presentation.
   • Attain the Oral Presentation objectives.
   • Develop the students’ responsibility towards their own learning.

1.2. OBJECTIVES

Our objectives were the following:

1. Design activities and self-assessment scales using the ELP descriptors and the illustrative scales of the CEFR which could help the students develop their communicative competence in the Oral Presentation in the CLIL class.
   1.1. Deepen in the study of the subject reflected in the Common European Framework of Reference and The European Language Portfolio to help students achieve communicative abilities in academic contexts.
   1.2. Select those speaking descriptors which refer to communicative abilities in academic contexts.
   1.3. Develop materials using the descriptors in order to make students aware of the criteria of quality in the context of an oral presentation.

2. Describe the effect that these activities cause on the process of learning, the outcome and the cognitive-linguistic abilities of the students.
   2.1. Implement the pedagogical actions designed and collect ethnographic data like (recordings, informal interviews with the teacher and the students, field notes, etc.).
   2.2. Process and analyse the results.
   2.3. Draw temporary conclusions

3. Design a new proposal.
   3.1. Make the changes necessary to the new proposal.
   3.2. Identify areas for new research.
   3.3. Draw definite conclusions.
2. THE RESEARCH
   2.1. METHODOLOGY

   Our research lies within the scope of Action Research, defined as: "(...) a form of self-reflective enquiry undertaken by participants in social situations in order to improve the rationality and justice of their own practices, their understanding of these practices, and the situations in which the practices are carried out". Carr and Kemmis,(1986:162).

   For Stenhouse (1983) Action Research is “a systematic, planned and self-critical investigation where the teacher observes what is going on in the class; he is surrounded by multiple opportunities that he must interpret and investigate if he really wants to get to know them and understand them”. Elliot (1980) Carr and Kemmis (1983) and Schön (1983,1988). In words of Hopkins it is "(...) an informal, qualitative, formative, subjective, interpretative, reflective and experiential model of inquiry in which all individuals involved in the study are knowing and contributing participants” (Hopkins, 1993).

   Our investigation is a qualitative, interpretative and ethnographic research, that is to say, we have applied participative observation, recordings and informal interviews (Stenhouse (1978 1985) Elliot and Adelman (1976). This research breaks away with the positivist tradition of Comte (1875 /1968) and with the technical rationalism of van Manen (1977) and develops a much more subjective and idealist philosophy (Cohen and Manion 1989:34-35). It is more patronising, cooperative and consensus based, contrary to the process-result research which is more dogmatic and authoritarian.

   It has been carried out in a natural context. We are basically trying to explain what is happening in the classroom at a given time in relation to the context. As we cannot observe everything that happens in the classroom, we are trying to analyse some of the variables that play a role in the classroom. Therefore, our theory is subjective and personal. Ours is a qualitative study of cases without any experimental objective. We explain individual actions, which we hope will help us extract conclusions of common interest that could be transferred to similar situations.

   As we said before, we have been using participative observation, informal talks to the teacher, and transcriptions from video and audio recordings.

   Both of us, the participant teacher and the researcher have been mediators in the process of learning. Our role was:
   › to encourage individual and collective learning,
   › to stimulate diversity of opinion while keeping a neutral position,
   › to build on the students’ opinions and beliefs.

   It has not been our objective to make the students achieve academic excellence. We have been more interested in stimulating critical reflection and developing procedures and abilities. We have tried to get the students to participate actively in the negotiation of meaning and cooperative learning.
2.2. RESOURCES

In the Action phase:

- Materials adapted from the descriptors of the ELP
- Assessment sheets and checklists for co-evaluation and self evaluation.
- Materials developed by the researcher: video of a model speech on the topic of Bullying, listening tasks to bring awareness and reinforce the use of communicative strategies; negotiation of quality criteria cards to help the students develop a better understanding of the criteria of excellence and become acquainted with the criterion evaluation, model power point to enhance the model Presentation on video, etc.,
- Materials developed by the students: mind mapping to use as a guide for their presentation, posters and maps to illustrate their speeches, etc.,
- I.T. equipment: PC, Internet, canon, ppt.

For the data analysis:

- Audio recorder to record the different tasks carried out by the students.
- Digital video camera to record on video the students performance in all the different tasks.
- Digital camera.

2.3. STAGES IN THE RESEARCH

The protocol is cyclical and is intended to foster deeper understanding of a given situation, starting with conceptualising and particularising the problem and moving through several interventions and evaluations until the final conclusion is reached which can lead to a new intervention.

These are the stages we followed in our research:

2.3.1. Detecting a problem related to the acquisition and internalisation of communicative abilities in the Oral Performance. What Elliott (1990) calls ‘the Reconnaissance & General Plan’.

As it has been mentioned before in the introduction of this study, one of the tasks our students had to perform at the end of the ArtICLE project: “Avaluació de tasques col·laboratives i assoliment d’objectius d’aprenentatge en aules AICLE de Ciències en llengua estrangera”(ARIE 2004-00058) was to give a short academic Oral Presentation on one of the topics of Rainforests that we had been working on.

After analysing their performance, we discovered that most students were able to convey the content they had memorised and their vocabulary seemed to have enriched in some cases. However, they were lacking communicative competence. Only those with a higher command of the language had the resources to communicate their
message in a natural way. On the whole though, their paralinguistic resources were rather weak, the visual aids poor, they had little visual contact with the audience or none in some cases, as they were hiding behind their texts. Their discourse was not well organised and they were not using communicative strategies like greeting the audience, introducing the topic, encouraging questions, etc.,. In other words, they had not mastered the presentation skills needed in a good Oral Presentation.

Therefore my research would be to investigate those weak areas in order to:

› help the students develop communicative abilities and
› encourage them to become involved in their own learning process in order to become more autonomous.

2.3.2. Search of background theoretical information:

With these two aims in mind I dedicated the first term of my Llicencia d'Estudis to deepen in the literature of the subject. I studied the philosophy and guidelines of the two instruments designed by the Council of Europe: the Common European Framework of Reference with the illustrative scales, and the European Language Portfolio. I had already had the opportunity to experiment with the latter in the year 2002-2003 while working on the validation project coordinated by Daniel Cassany. I also read a good number of articles on oral performance, learner’s autonomy, motivation, evaluation, the CLIL approach, etc.,

2.3.3. Action plan:

Parallel to the study of this theoretical background I started designing a series of activities addressed to Secondary School students (mainly 2nd cycle of the Compulsory Secondary Education, ESO). The task was not an easy one to start with as the question of my research was quite an all-embracing one. Designing activities towards the development of communicative abilities was somehow more feasible, but dealing with self-assessment and autonomy took a bigger strain. I am very grateful to my mentor Cristina Escobar who was guiding me and bringing light into those areas I found more difficult.

The following is a description of the materials and activities designed:

▪► Cards for the negotiation of descriptors of quality

“(…) a negotiation of descriptors is a class activity which invites the learner to prioritise, select the descriptors which define a performance of quality in a specific communication task” (Escobar 2006).

This kind of activities help students to:

› develop a better comprehension of the criteria of excellence,
› get used to criterion evaluation and finally,
overcome a possible resistance to activities of co-evaluation and self-evaluation.

We all know that in traditional schooling the student has been object of evaluation but never a subject. In a way it is easier for the students to leave all the burden of the evaluation in the hands of the teacher, blaming him/her for their low marks and accepting the good ones as their own merit. Students feel lazy when faced with such a big cognitive effort. They are not prepared to assume so much responsibility. However, if we want to help students become autonomous learners we have to help them share the responsibility of assessing themselves and their peers.

So we wanted to involve the students in the selection of evaluation criteria by giving them a few cards with some descriptors of quality. They had to select those descriptors which showed the qualities of a good speaker, the ones of a bad speaker and the ones that referred neither to one or the other. For example:

A Good speaker…..

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Speaks clearly.</th>
<th>2. Hesitates. (Stops constantly)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does not read.</td>
<td>4. Uses the appropriate gestures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Looks at the audience when he/she speaks.</td>
<td>6. Speaks very softly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Shows off.</td>
<td>8. Is not arrogant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from Escobar’s negotiation of criteria 2006. For complete task see Annex 1)

Our main objective was:

› to make students reflect on what for them is a good speaker and learn to negotiate with their peers.  
› to overcome the students’ reticence towards evaluation.
The criteria of excellence selected by the students in this activity would serve as co-evaluation of the Oral Presentations. (see Co-evaluation grid, Annex 1)

“Activities such as this and similar ones show that students improve their degree of understanding of the communicative situation and their degree of awareness of the resources they already have or can incorporate. They are capable of adopting some of the ideas that have come up in the negotiation to enrich their own Oral Productions, which clearly improve. (…) Besides, the meta-communicative consciousness develops progressively as long as the students carry out self-evaluation and co-evaluation tasks in a systematic way” (Escobar 2006).

▪► Model Video “Bullying”

As our main objective was to help students make a good Oral Presentation which embraced linguistic procedures, presentation strategies, communicative efficiency, etc, within an academic context, we started by designing a video which would serve as a model for the students.

First we wrote the script of the Speech on the topic of Bullying, accompanied by a power point, which contained the most relevant points, as a visual aid. Then we trained two 1st Batxillerat students from IES Marti Dot, to make a good speech and then we recorded them.

I must thank Antonio Sanchez for his positive and enthusiastic help when offering his 1st Bat students for the training and further production of the model Oral Presentation and Cristina Escobar for the time she dedicated to the actual training and recording of the three pairs who eventually made their Speeches. Many thanks too to Dolors Masats for providing the video resources.

Our objective was two sided:

›› On the one hand, we wanted it to be a model for the students with a lower command of the language. By working with the video the participant teacher could help the students recognise some discourse features, could emphasize some of the communicative exchanges needed in a Speech, could encourage the students to imitate the speakers performance, etc,. And because the students had the script, they could always internalise those linguistic features they needed to master before their own Speech.

›› On the other hand, the video would serve as an evaluation tool for the students. In an informal way they would assess the speakers and their performance and they would lay out the criteria of quality. Their meta-discourse reflections would help them integrate Presentation skills which would be useful later on.
We also designed two very undemanding listening tasks for the students to do while watching the video.

► **The first task**: Choose the Correct Option, was simply a multiple choice task which consisted in identifying the correct discourse feature the speakers were using. At that time students were not asked to produce anything, hey were just applying their listening skills. For example:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (3) | a) We are here to talk  
     b) We would like to talk about BULLYING, |   |
| (7) | a) To conclude,  
     b) In conclusion, we must all work together to stop bullying. |   |

(for complete task see Annex 1)

► **The second task**: Match A to B, demanded slightly more from the students. They had to match the communicative exchange to its function. At this stage the students were reinforcing input on the communicative exchanges used in a speech. See the example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Match to</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good morning/afternoon.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Introducing the topic. A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many thanks for sharing my concerns with me.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Explaining why it is important. B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We think it is important because….</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Giving recommendations. C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are here talk about….</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Concluding the talk. D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Here! Please.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a nutshell,</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you very much for listening to me.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Thanking the audience. E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(for the complete task, see Annex 1)

► **Checklist**

The third task was a checklist to help students:

› become aware of the structure of a Speech.
› revise the communication strategies needed when preparing their speech.

See the example:
Look at this chart and tick the correct answer

Example: greets the audience YES √

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Speaker:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* greets the audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* introduces the topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* explains why it is important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main body</td>
<td>Speaker:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* gives examples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* gives recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the content is interesting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(for the complete checklist see Annex 1)

The students would work in pairs or groups of three to check whether a number of discourse features had been used by the speakers in the model video. In that way, the students would achieve significant learning by taking part in communicative situations (De la Mata, 1993).

By working cooperatively the students would be sharing objectives, reflection on the process and assessment, which would in turn stimulate learning. The ELP’s pedagogical function suggests reflection as its core: “(...) making the language learning process more transparent to learners, helping them develop their capacity for reflection and self-assessment, and thus enabling them gradually to assume more responsibility for their own learning” Chapter 1. As a result, students would be on the path towards a progressive control of their own learning process. In other words, they would be learning to develop their autonomy and to become responsible learners.

Pair work facilitates mutual help without the control of the teacher. On many occasions, students with a better command of the language can help with problems of understanding or conveying meaning much more easily that the teacher himself, as they can identify the obstacles his/her partner might come across. Furthermore, “we learn to recognise our own errors when we have the opportunity to compare our productions with those of our peers” (Mauri,T. and Sanmartí, N).

The same checklist would serve as a tool to control the structure and linguistic features of their speech, and as a reminder of the communicative strategies to be used.

Also for the purpose of data analysis this activity would be recorded to identify negotiation of meaning, problematisation and cooperative work.
**Co-Evaluation grid**

We then designed a co-evaluation grid where the students could assess their partners and their Presentations. The descriptors used in this evaluation were the ones the students had selected in the negotiation of criteria of quality. (See the example)

Evaluate the Presentations from 3 (very interesting) to 1 (not so interesting).

**Example:** The content is interesting 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. The content is interesting.</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. The presentation is well organised into different parts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The message is clear.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The speakers behave in a natural way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The speakers look at the audience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(for the complete grid see Annex 1)

**Self-evaluation grid**

The final evaluation grid was adapted from the ELP descriptors in conjunction with some other descriptors from the Bergen Cando Project: Speaking and Conversation, and the Illustrative Scales from the Common European Framework of Reference.

Generally speaking, students, particularly in lower levels of proficiency, find it very difficult to understand the ELP descriptors for reasons we could identify as:

1. The length of the statements.
2. The different requirements that each descriptor includes.
3. The academicism of the language used.
4. The degree of abstraction shown in the descriptors related to competence as they are referring to general behaviour. (See the following example):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conversation:</th>
<th>Me</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>I can communicate quite effectively in a simple manner, although I need the message to be slow, with repetitions, reformulations and I also need help to construct my own message.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, we tried to design descriptors in a simpler language closer to that of the learner, where there was only one requirement per descriptor. Also we subdivided the proficiency levels, particularly those where our students might fit in, like A2 or B1. For example: A2 became A2-1 and A2-2. We also used other descriptors, as I have mentioned before, like the ones in the Bergen Cando Project or the Illustrative Scales from the Common European Framework of Reference. We found that he latter did not provide descriptors for Spoken Production in level A1.
Here is an example of the self-assessment grid we gave the students at the end of their Speech:

### Can you usually do these things?

**use these symbols:**  
\( √ \) = I think I can  
\( √√ \) = I know I can

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A1.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I can use simple expressions to be friendly and polite like <strong>good morning, hello, goodbye, thank you, OK.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I can speak in simple sentences but I have to think what I want to say.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I can answer some guided questions if they refer to learned topics.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A2-1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I can give a very short talk about a topic I have prepared well if I get help with the language and I use pictures and diagrams.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I can understand simple questions if the person speaks slowly and clearly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I can answer questions in simple sentences, I do not need to think what I am going to say.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A2-2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I can give a short talk about a topic I know well if I have Practiced the language.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I can understand what the other person is asking if I listen carefully.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I can answer a few simple questions in interconnected sentences without prompting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(for complete grid see Annex 1)

I must say at this point, that we also designed other self evaluation scales adapted from the Common European Framework’s illustrative scales which, after an initial implementation, were discarded or adapted to accommodate new proposals: (see Annex 1)

› self-assessment scales to be used after the Oral Presentation.

› co-evaluation scales based on Escobar’s evaluation criteria.

### 2.3.4. INTERVENTION: MATERIALS IMPLEMENTATION

In May 2006 we implemented the materials in class. We chose a group of 3rd year ESO, studying at the IES Icaria in Barcelona. I am most grateful to Azucena Pe, their teacher and my most dedicated collaborator in the research. She undertook the whole implementation stage with great professionalism and total dedication. And her comments were of great help. I must add that Azucena is also a member of the ArtICLE Project and an experienced teacher in the CLIL approach.

The 3rd ESO group is a mix-ability group of 19 students, 12 boys and 7 girls between 14 and 15 years of age. Three of them were retaking the year but they were perfectly integrated in the group. They were bilingual (Catalan /Spanish) and some of them studied French or German as a second foreign language. Most of them had some experience in CLIL from previous years working with the same teacher. (see teacher’s
diagnostics of the group in Annex 2). Some of them also had a very good command of the language, which made things easier when preparing and making their speeches.

We carried out the implementation over a period of 3 weeks, three hours a week. From May 9th to May 22nd. There was a final session later on, on June 8th when we watched the final video of their performance and said farewell.

During this time we collected observations in various forms: Field notes, audio and video transcriptions and informal talks to the teacher, which we shall present in the analysis stage.

The following is a table with all the sessions and their main focus. Later on, in the analysis of the implementation stage we shall give a more detailed session by session account.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sessions</th>
<th>Main focus</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Negotiation of criteria of quality</td>
<td>Cards</td>
<td>Pair work negotiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Video show “Bullying” + 2 listening tasks: Task 1: Multiple choice Task 2: Matching exercise</td>
<td>Model Video, Written tables</td>
<td>Watching a video. Recognising and working with communicative strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Checklist</td>
<td>Grid</td>
<td>Pair work negotiation. Checking communicative strategies in a speech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Information retrieval</td>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>Retrieving information about a given topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>Rehearsal of the Oral Presentation</td>
<td>Students’ written essays</td>
<td>Rehearsing speeches in pairs with another pair as audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>Reflections after Oral Presentations</td>
<td>Co-evaluation sheets</td>
<td>Individual co-evaluation of the speakers and general comments with teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>Self-evaluation</td>
<td>Self-evaluation grid</td>
<td>Individual work on self-evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>Final video viewing of the students’ performances.</td>
<td>Video</td>
<td>Watching the video of their performances.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.5. DATA ANALYSIS:

As it has been said before in this study, within the framework of Action Research we were carrying out the double task of implementing the materials and doing the observation and further reflection.

We were carrying out a qualitative research so we collected two kinds of data:

- Primary Data from:
  - field notes
  - transcriptions of the students’ conversations
- Complementary Data from:
  - teacher’s reports on the students,
- students’ written essays
- video recordings of different tasks: checklist, rehearsal and speech.
- participative observations

Once the data were collected they were dealt with by means of:
- transcriptions of the recordings, isolating the important information for the research, and
- application of different procedures of analysis.

The data were analysed from different perspectives (methodological triangulation Denzing, 1970) in order to contrast them:
- informal observations and field notes to analyse the process. These notes reflect the impressions of an external observer with a thorough experience on secondary education and a considerable knowledge of the context in which the experience was being carried out.
- transcriptions of the students performances from audio and video recordings,
- teacher’s comments.
- the researcher’s mentor who supervised the whole process.
- the students’ written essays.

We used three different procedures:
- Narrative of the events throughout the implementation.
- Analysis of the degree of problematisation in the students’ interactions during their work with the checklist.
- Comparison between the Rehearsal and the Oral Presentation to see whether the students had mastered the learning objectives.

**Decisions taken before the analysis:**

1. The data collected constituted such an abundant material that we decided to reduce the analysis to three pairs. The selection of pairs did not involve proficiency of the language. The selection responded to the pair’s completion of the activities subject to analysis as not all the pairs managed to accomplish all the tasks in the 9 sessions.
2. The data to be selected for systematic analysis were:
   - transcriptions of the pairs’ interactions in the Checklist.
   - transcriptions of the rehearsals prior to the oral Presentation.
   - transcriptions of the Oral Presentations.
3. We would analyse the three pairs independently in each of the tasks selected.
4. The names of the students would be changed to maintain their privacy.

**The main objective** of the analysis of the transcriptions was:
- to confirm or reject our hypothesis: that thorough planning of appropriate activities can affect oral production.

If this objective was confirmed then, our next objectives were to explore:
- the degree of argument and autonomy in the pairs’ interactions, and
- how the practice of a Rehearsal prior to the Oral Presentation had helped the students to improve performance.
For the transcriptions we used GREIP’s adaptation of Payrató’s symbols. (see model in Annex 2)

We have applied an ethnographic methodology in our analysis, which allows:
› obtaining data by means of ethnographic techniques such as video and audio recordings, participative observation, informal talks to the teacher and transcriptions.
› the data reflect interactive moments between teacher/students and students/students.
› the cooperation between researcher and participant teacher.
› an interactive analysis.
3. ANALYSIS

3.1. INTERPRETATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE MATERIALS IMPLEMENTATION BASED ON FIELD NOTES.

We shall now proceed to give a session by session description of the implementation of materials with observations, based on our field notes, and fragments of the transcriptions to illustrate what was happening in the class. This first analysis, as said before, shows the impressions reflected by an external observer with ample experience in secondary education and quite knowledgeable of the context in which the experience was being carried out.

▪► 1st Session: Negotiation of Criteria of Quality.

This first session consisted in getting to know the students, negotiating the whole experience with them and helping them become familiar with the use of audio recorders and video camera. We gave them a short introduction to explain the 1st task: the negotiation of criteria of quality.

Procedure:

First, we gave the students some cards with simple descriptors so that they could negotiate criteria of quality (see annex 1, page….). In pairs they had to decide which descriptors reflected the qualities of a good speaker, which showed low quality performance and finally, those which, in their opinion, reflected neither one nor the other.

Once they had come to an agreement, each pair joined another pair and discussed their options. In the observation it showed that they were not so interested this time, they worked faster and there was no discussion on any of the descriptors.

Finally, the whole class came together to discuss the descriptors, particularly those which had caused some argument, and reflected on the qualities of a good speaker. The teacher acted as a moderator eliciting answers from the students, highlighting possible contradictions, providing the meta-language the students needed while trying to elaborate concepts, etc. The discussion ended with a task to select some criteria of quality which would have a further double purpose:

- to assess the Speech and the speakers in the video they were going to watch, and
- to evaluate their own Oral Presentations. (see Annex 1, co-evaluation)

While they were working, we collected observations in various forms: Video and audio recordings and field notes on their comments and teacher’s comments.

Here are some samples of transcriptions of their negotiations. We have used other names to protect their anonymity. In the analysis stage we shall develop other aspects at length. These are mainly examples of cooperative work when negotiating meaning and reaching agreement on the descriptor. For example descriptor (4):
They also show a certain degree of controversy (problematisation). Let’s see number (9).

Rub does not agree with Ale’s criterion and explains why trying to be funny is not a bad quality. Alex seems to have a very clear idea of the formality of a good presentation. Rub finally agrees.

In number 13, both students are defending their different points of view and they do not come to a final verbal negotiation. However, they still think that memorising, at least the way they understand it, is a good thing, as they say in the final session with the whole class. I would like to add that these two students in the triangulation of data showed that memorising difficult language was one of their strengths.

In all cases students were using the foreign language to communicate. There was code switching too when negotiating meaning or wanting to make sure their point was understood.

Tasks of this kind show that students “improve their understanding of the communicative situation. They bring awareness of the resources each of them has and those they need to incorporate” (Escobar 2006).

Furthermore, they put the students in a position to take decisions. How many times we have heard that the teachers are tired because it is the teacher the one who plans the activities, designs and assesses them. Meanwhile the students either let themselves be pushed along in the best of cases or on the contrary, develop a certain resistance, mostly because they do not understand the objective of the tasks and they do not feel involved.
And in fact, the best way to involve the students is sharing objectives and discussing with them the means to achieve them. This is why self-assessment tasks particularly those which imply a negotiation of evaluation criteria, like the one we have shown, help the learner in the path towards autonomy - one of the Council of Europe’s commitments: “the development of learner autonomy as one of the cornerstones of education for democratic citizenship and lifelong learning”. Using Perrenoud’s words “the success in the classroom depends more on the capacity of the learners to assess themselves than on the methodology used” (Perrenoud 1989).

**2nd Session: Video show: “Bullying”**

At this stage we showed a video of an Oral Presentation made by two students on the topic of Bullying. The objective was to give students a model, to make them aware of some of the skills that intervene in a good presentation, and to develop their evaluation strategies.

**Procedure:**

The session started with a short warming activity on the topic of Bullying to make sure all the students understood the meaning of Bullying. The teacher elicited their previous knowledge by asking them questions like:

- What do you know about bullying?
- Why do people bully?
- Have you ever known anybody who has been a victim of bullying? etc.

**1st viewing:**

The students watched the video in order to assess the speakers. They were applying the criteria they had selected in the previous session.

The following are some comments from the observer taken down while the students were watching: “The students in general show a lot of interest on the subject, they are very attentive. They say they feel identified with them because they are young people like them”.

Afterwards, there was a short interaction between the teacher, the observer and the class in general. The following are some of the comments the students made, taken by the observer as field notes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| “I find them too serious and they don’t move at all”.
| “Sí, la noia feia gestos”.
| “Sembla que s’hagin aprèn el treball de memòria”.
| Yes, they are not natural
| “They do not move”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visual aids</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| “There wasn’t any visual aids”
| “Si que hi ha i les fotos que?”
| El ppt no es veu massa bé. Hauria d’estar mes centrat.
| “the audio visuals are not efficient”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(positive criticism)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| “They are good”.
| “Ho fan bastant bé”
| “A mi m’agraden, jo no podria fer ho tant bé”.
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2nd viewing:

The students were given the **Task 1: Multiple Choice**, with a short explanation about what to do while watching the video this second time. The aim was to recognise the appropriate communicative exchanges used by the speakers. This task did not offer any problems of understanding, there was little negotiation and no argument.

**Task 2: Match A to B.** The aim of this task was to make the students familiar with the communicative language used in the discourse. Once the students had recognised the functions then the matching with the notion should be easy. Again, there were no difficulties.

*► 3rd Session: Checklist*

**The aim** was:

› to help students become aware of the structure of a speech.
› to provide them with a useful tool when preparing their Oral Presentation both as a reminder of the communicative strategies to apply and as a checklist.
› to foster assessment of content and delivery in a Speech.

**Procedure:**

The students were given the checklist and were asked to sit in pairs to negotiate whether the speakers in the video had used the communicative strategies appropriately or not. They were discussing the different aspects of the content and the delivery and reflecting on the video.

During this task they were being recorded both in audio and video as our objective was to analyse the degrees of problematisation in their interactions.

The use of recording equipment is very positive because:

› the students make an effort to speak in the target language, as they know they are going to be listened to by the teacher or the researcher, in the case of our research.
› they pay much more attention to do the task properly. For example, one of the pairs decided to rehearse first what they wanted to say and then started the recording.
› their use of the cassette recorder gives them a certain autonomy. They can stop it whenever they want without the teacher’s implication, as in the example below.
The fact that the voice is being recorded helps change the irreversibility of the oral production. The students can go back on their recordings, listen to them and change them when necessary. Therefore they can give the oral performance a certain degree of reversibility and resourcefulness too, which is essential in order to achieve a meta-discourse reflection needed to the improvement of the oral production.

The teacher became a monitor and a helper when needed, which was usually in cases of problems with vocabulary.

In the analysis of the transcriptions, further on in this study, we shall explain in detail some of the most interesting aspects of the pairs’ negotiations.

**4th session: Information Retrieval**

The group had to find out information about Ancient Greece or Ancient Egypt. Together with the teacher they decided the objectives and agreed on the content to work on:

- to find information on Egypt/ Greece,
- to write short paragraphs on the geography, way of life, religion, art of the country chosen,
- to prepare an essay to hand in to the teacher and
- to make a short Oral Presentation on the subject.

This session took place in the computer room and all the students were working in pairs. The teacher was monitoring their progress and helping whenever she was needed, mainly with difficult language.

**5th session: Rehearsal of the Oral Presentations**

The students had to rehearse their Speeches before giving their final Oral Presentation.

As we have mentioned before in this study, it is during the rehearsal of the Oral Production that the students really develop their strategies to internalise the content, the linguistic procedures and the communicative abilities. In other words, it is during the rehearsal that we are fostering meta-discourse reflection.
The students were working in groups of four. Two pairs together, taking it in turns to perform and listen to each other’s rehearsal. The fact that they were working in such small groups was very useful because the students could:

› exteriorise the process of incorporating the linguistic procedures and the content.
› check the degree of achievement of their learning objectives and improve whatever needed improvement.
› ask each other questions in a totally natural scenario without the pressure of the big group.
› give each other feedback on their performances.
› feel more self-assured and involved.

Their rehearsals were also recorded on video and audio and we took some field notes. The following are some general observations:

- Most of them were using their scripts and were reading some paragraphs which we found hindered pronunciation slightly.
- They had a more academic use of language as they had not internalised the content yet.
- They had a more monotonous tone because they were reading.
- They were using the target language mostly. They only changed to L1 to get attention or when they did not manage to ask the questions properly. For example:

  MIK
  Eva ...red land where was situated in the Egyptian | of the Egyptian | er | no me sale\]\[we detect a certain degree of frustration in the tone]\]

- All of them clearly showed signs of having incorporated the communicative strategies we had been working on (greeting audience, introducing topic, asking and answering questions, thanking audience, etc.).
- Most rehearsals were quite well structured.
- Turn taking was good.
- The students looked quite confident and relaxed.
- The listeners asked questions at the end of the talk. As we have mentioned before they were working in a natural scenario.
- One of the pairs was totally unawares of the audience and only wanted to rehearse without interference from the others.
- They all looked very motivated and involved in the activity.
- Even one of the groups who did not feel confident enough to do the final Oral Presentation took the rehearsal very seriously. They had looked for the relevant information about Egypt and showed a lot of cooperative learning and negotiation of meaning during their interaction i.e.

  MIK
  er... we'll talk about the pharaoh \]| Josep what do you have /||

  JOS
  yes| the pharaoh was the most important powerful and important person in ancient Egypt| he was the political and religious leader of the Egyptian peoples\]| [READING FROM TEXT]
In the analysis of the transcriptions we shall go deeper into some of the aspects observed.

6th session: Oral Presentations.

Five pairs made the final Oral Presentation. Each pair stood in front of their colleagues and delivered their Speech with the help, in some cases, of visual aids. Four pairs had chosen Ancient Egypt and one pair Ancient Greece. As in other activities they were recorded on video and audio.

From our observations we can say that:

- All of them managed to make very good presentations, considering they were 3rd year ESO students.
- They looked confident and in command, even though this kind of activity is very demanding and quite threatening. One student clearly showed symptoms of anxiety. Later on, the teacher brought up the subject in a very natural way, as we can see in the reflection stage further down.
- They showed that they had mastered, to a certain degree, the content, the linguistic procedures and the communicative abilities they had worked on in the planning stages.
- Two pairs used visual aids (mind maps, maps, photographs, drawings on the blackboard).
- Four pairs showed a real improvement from the rehearsal stage to the actual Speech.
- Two pairs gave a very good pedagogical Speech, using the blackboard to enhance their explanations.
- Two of them had memorised the content so their delivery sounded and looked more artificial whilst others showed signs of having internalised the content and the linguistic procedures and their production was much more natural. They did not feel conscripted to the written essay they have prepared and added their own explanations and comments to make their presentation more clear.
- They all used the target language.
- The audience was very attentive in all the presentations. They said they had understood the messages and they had learned.
- The group who did not feel confident to make the presentation said they would make the effort next time.
- Only one question was asked, which proves that in a natural context students feel more relaxed and are more keen to participate without the fear of making mistakes whilst under the pressure from the whole class they might feel self-conscious and do not dare speak in public. That’s why it is so important the practice of pair and small group work.
7th Session: Reflection after the Oral Presentations

This session consisted in a reflection on the process and the product at the end of the Oral Presentation. The teacher conducted the class in the analysis of the whole activity from the negotiation of criteria of quality, the video, the rehearsal and the final Oral Presentation.

From the observer’s field notes we can read that:

› The students seemed very pleased with the whole sequence of activities.
› They liked some tasks more than others but on the whole they had learned a lot.
› Most of them had felt very involved and were willing to embark on new Oral Presentations in the future.
› The pairs who had made the Oral Presentations felt confident that they had done a good job and so they said:

5 Teacher how do you feel about your presentation (addressing Jen & Sus)
6 SUS & JEN good

› Their only reservation was related to the final marks. The teacher reassured them that the whole three weeks and all the work done together with their self-evaluations and co-evaluations would be an important part of the final mark.

1 Teacher ok let’s talk about it
2 Students they’ll get the best marks (referring to Sus and Jen)
3 Teacher they’ve done a good presentation but we are not talking about marking or examining here just about the presentation if it was interesting clear their English is better their gestures are good and make the presentation clear
4 Students ah! ah! [raising their tone like singing] it’s not the same

At the end the teacher tried to elicit suggestions from the students for future Oral Productions and their availability. Then, in a very natural way she referred to Oscar’s anxiety during his speech.

7 teacher do you have any suggestions do you think you won’t be so shy in the future if you have to do have to make another presentation in Spanish French English
8 students what is shy
9 teacher what does shy mean timid nervous what about you Oscar what do you think
10 OSC (silence)
11 teacher is it the normal way you are
12 OSC no
13 teacher how did you feel
14 OSC nervous
15 teacher Why were you afraid of something
16 OSC no (the bell goes)
8th session: Self- Evaluation

This was the last task of the implementation. The students were given the self-evaluation sheet based on the illustrative scales from the CEFR, the ELP and the Cando Project. In the section of material development we gave the reasons why we could not design self-evaluation scales from the ELP alone (see page 17).

The students were completing the grid individually. On occasions a student would ask another student or the teacher for help, particularly with vocabulary.

This is an example of the self-evaluation grid.

Can you usually do these things?
use these symbols:  √ = I think I can  √√ = I know I can

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>1. I can use simple expressions to be friendly and polite like good morning, hello, goodbye, thank you, OK.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. I can speak in simple sentences but I have to think what I want to say.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. I can answer some guided questions if they refer to learned topics.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2-1</td>
<td>5. I can give a very short talk about a topic I have prepared well if I get help with the language and I use pictures and diagrams.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. I can understand simple questions if the person speaks slowly and clearly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. I can answer questions in simple sentences. I do not need to think what I am going to say.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2-2</td>
<td>8. I can give a short talk about a topic I know well if I have Practised the language.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. I can understand what the other person is asking if I listen carefully.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. I can answer a few simple questions in interconnected sentences without prompting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(For complete grid see Annex 2)

While they were doing the task the teacher and observer walked around helping them with whatever difficulties they might have. We took some notes during this time to add to the analysis of the results of their self evaluations. From our observations we could see that the students in general were quite optimistic in their self-evaluation. Some of them even replied with two ticks “I know I can” to some of the descriptors in levels of proficiency B1 and B2. When we know that most of our students at the higher level of the secondary education perform adequately up to level B1 (the threshold level - Van EK 1976). This showed that we had not worked with self-evaluation scales in depth and further revision might be needed.

9th session: Watching the final video of the students’ performances and farewell.

This was an informal session when we showed the students the video of their Oral Presentations. They were quite interested, particularly the ones who had made the speech. They made comments on their delivery mainly and at times they even laughed at some situation they might find amusing.
3.2 ANALYSIS OF THE TRANSCRIPTIONS.

3.2.1. CHECKLISTS

The main objective of this analysis was to verify whether there were any situations of disagreement or discussion (problematisation) and to which degree, during the communicative interactions each of the pairs were carrying out.

At this point, we would like to explain what we understand by degrees of problematisation, that is to say, those levels of interaction in the pairs which show a low, medium or high level of controversy in their communication.

This classification comes partly from Van Lier’s degrees of awareness (1996).

So we are going to speak about three degrees:

The 1st degree responds to an absence of discussion. When one student says something and the other immediately agrees with the statement. Such statement tends to appear followed by a yes/no answer. For example:

2   SUS    A ver speaker greets the audience
3   IRI    yes

Or:

19  IRI    the topic the topic is convincing =yes=||
20  SUS    =yes= ||

We speak about 2nd degree when there is some reasoning, some explanation which is normally accepted by the other partner without much discussion. For example, in the same pair:

21  IRI    =the content is interesting=||
22  SUS    =the content.= yes||
23  IRI    because er talk about a ... very important problem||
24  SUS    yes er.. conclusion the me.. the message is short and clear||

SUS agrees with IRI’s statement. IRIS tries to explain why the content is interesting and SUS agrees again but is already moving on to another statement.

Finally we talk about 3rd degree of problematisation when there is some kind of argument around the topic being discussed. For example:

4   SUS    este ya está hecho introduce the topic||
5   IRI    yes er yes||
SUS uses L1 as marker of conversation. They also refer to the script to reinforce what they are talking about. Even though there is some overlapping in their interaction, in fact they are constructing content together.

Analysis of the three pairs

1st pair: SUSANA and IRINA

In the conversation between SUS and IRI we can see some examples to illustrate the three degrees of problematisation (see page ...):

1st degree:

| SUS   | A ver | speaker greets the audience
| IRI   | yes   |

Or

| SUS   | yes   | er.. | conclusion | the message is short and clear
| IRI   | yes   |
| SUS   | yes   | =because= | [Interruption ]

Even in this case there is an interest to move on to a higher degree of discussion when IRI tries to explain why the message is short but SUS interrupts her to talk about a new item of the checklist.
2\textsuperscript{nd} degree:

29  IRI  =the content is interesting=||
30  SUS  =the content...= yes||
31  IRI  because er talk about a ... very important problem||

Or in the following interaction (turns 12 to 16)

12  SUS  er gives examples =no=||
13  IRI  =yes=||
14  SUS  Ah calling them names || [Reading from the script ]
15  IRI  saying nasty things about them||
16  SUS  breaking their things making them do things they don’t want to do || vale yes||

What is interesting to see here is how IRI defends her point saying “yes, there are examples”, then SUS agrees quoting from the script. Both of them are so involved that each, in turns, is reading an example.

Or for example :

32  SUS  the time taken is right||
33  IRI  eso que quiere decir/ [They stop the cassette to explain.]
34  SUS  the time taken is right [ restarting the item]
35  IRI  yes || because the time is correct||
36  SUS  yes but only 3 minutes || bueno speaking yes pero estaba bien||
37  IRI  xxx [ ending unclear]

In this exchange we can see some cooperative learning when SUS stops the tape and explains the meaning of “the time taken is right” to IRI. Once IRI has understood, she is the one to reason why the time taken is right while SUS moves on to question the length of the talk. It is interesting how each pair adapts the activity to their own needs.

3\textsuperscript{rd} degree:

We could also argue that this pair gets to a 3\textsuperscript{rd} degree of problematisation. Let’s see the following interaction:

4  SUS  este ya está hecho || introduce the topic||
5  IRI  yes er yes|| why||
6  SUS  I think that she introduce the topic||
7  IRI  why||
8  SUS  mm er I think that she introduce the topic because she er explains a little bit of the bullying em bueno explains why it is important a ver she explains why bullying is important in the ||
9  IRI  = because it make it can make people feel very unhappy and frightened= || [reading from the script]
10  SUS  pues eso osea yes||
11  IRI  yes||

IRI realising she has said ‘yes’ very quickly asks ‘why’ on two occasions. SUS tries to reply, and reinforces what she is trying to say by referring to the written script: ‘is al principio de la desto’. Then IRI takes over and reads. Both are happy with the result.
As a conclusion, we would like to say that in the analysis of this pair we have seen:

› cooperative work,
› referencing from text,
› interruptions at times, that are, in fact, mere consensus about the message they are transmitting,
› a total involvement in the activity,
› use of L1, mostly as discourse markers, and at times as a tool for conveying meaning.

(for whole transcription see Annex 2)

The chart below shows the three degrees of problematisation with reference to all the items in the checklist. As we can see, this pair comments on all the items. They obviously find items two, three, five and fourteen more challenging as they are the ones that show a line of argument and a higher number of turns.

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}
\text{SUS/IRI} & \text{Gre et audience} & \text{Introduc etopic} & \text{Explain why it's important} & \text{Give examples} & \text{Give recom mendations} & \text{The content is interesting} & \text{The speakers encourage people to ask questions} & \text{People ask questions} & \text{Speaker thank audience} & \text{Presentation is clear} & \text{The topic is convincing} & \text{The speakers make a good team} & \text{The visual aids are effective} & \text{The time taken is right} \\
\text{√} & \text{√√} & \text{√√√} & \text{√√} & \text{√√} & \text{√} & \text{√} & \text{√} & \text{√} & \text{√} & \text{√} & \text{√} & \text{√√} & \text{√√√} \\
\text{N. of turns} & 2 & 8 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 3 & 3 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 3 & 2 & 4 & 6 \\
\end{array}
\]
2nd pair: CESC and JORDI

This pair shows a very high level of discussion. Besides, they are not just reading the items, they are using their own language e.g.

2 CESC hi Jordi | do you think that the girl of the video of the last day introduces the topic ?||
3 JOR Yes | of course ||

We can also see some examples of problematisation. Let’s look at some of them in depth.

1st degree:

8 CESC And | do you think that the speaker gives examples/?||
9 JOR Er...| no|| [Quick “no” said with determination]
10 CESC I think that the speaker didn’t give examples||

Or

11 JOR ok || and < 3 > do you think that the speaker gives recommendations ||
12 CESC er .. | yes | of course | she was giving recommendations | in the video||

In this last interaction even though we are speaking about a 1st degree we can see how CESC after his reply, adds an explanation quoting the scene on the video.

2nd Degree

In this exchange there is an explanation of why the time taken was right.

38 JOR vale | er | you think that the time taken by the er…| presentators are good||
39 CESC the time taken is right because the presentation was not so long and not so short||
The following is an example when the students get into a much longer interaction and there is much more argument in their comments. Cesc is interested in Jordi’s reasons for not liking the topic.

13 JOR | the content was interesting/||
14 CESC | er... yes||
15 JOR | er... not for me/|
16 CESC | why not/||
17 JOR | because is a... topic that she don’t [he don’t] I don’t like [the topic/]
18 CESC | why you don’t [why don’t you [self rectification] like the topic / ?
19 JOR | because the topic is very boring
20 CESC | ah | interesting | interesting | em | the message er... was short and clear/ in the video/|
21 JOR | Er... | yes = short but ...=
22 CESC | =I think it was= long but clear/|
23 JOR | long and clear/ [showing agreement]
24 CESC | yes | but no... so short /|

Or when they talk about the topic being convincing they give reasons

40 JOR | er | do you think that the topic is convincing/||
41 CESC | no/|
42 JOR | because ...[self rectification] why/|
43 CESC | I don’t know | er... they don’t convince me that | er... of anything | in that video/|
44 JOR | mm | interesting point of view/|

In the following exchange Cesc has added his own questions. He is asking Jordi how many people have asked questions and corrects him when he only remembers one girl asking questions. They have clearly moved a step further in their conversation, freeing themselves from the checklist.

45 CESC | and do you remember if the people ask questions/||
46 JOR | er... yes | she asks if anybody has questions/||
47 CESC | how many people ask questions/||
48 JOR | er... | only one girl/|
49 CESC | false | tan tan tan tan [with some rhythm their conversation has become a quizz ]
50 JOR | what/|
51 CESC | er... they answer | they make three questions | three different people/|

3rd Degree

Here they have reached total involvement in the conversation and there is a higher level of problematisation of the language. There is also cooperative learning. Jordi is trying to explain to Cesc what visual aids are and both of them are building language as they go along. At the same time they interrupt each other to try and put in their arguments. They resort to Spanish, even to philosophy, until they decide to move on to another item.
The following chart shows the three degrees of problematisation with reference to all the items in the checklist. As we can see this pair comments on all the items but one (give recommendations. Greeting the audience was already ticked as an example). They obviously find items six, ten, twelve and thirteen (visual aids with 27 turns) more challenging as they lead to deeper discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>1st degree</th>
<th>2nd degree</th>
<th>3rd degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. of turns</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Their interaction started by greeting one another and Oscar more than discussing the checklist gave a summary of the activity.

We can see two degrees 1st and 2nd but there isn’t much argument. In fact we could say that they agree immediately with the partner’s answers and they do not cover all the items in the checklist. They seem to be giving a summary of the checklist.

What is interesting to see though, is the way they get carried away by the activity. They sound as if they were carrying out an interview so they free themselves from the task and start talking about different things. For example, in this interaction at the end of their conversation they end up talking about something that has nothing to do with the task.

Let’s now see their argument in detail:

1st Degree

7 OSC I think they don’t give good | I think they don’t give good recommendations | but in general | their con | their content is interesting and in conclusion the message is short and clear | and <4> the people ask questions of the bullying / Joana? /|

8 JOA yes | @ |

Or

9 OSC and | do you think the speakers | do you feel the speakers | grats the audience for her | her | her | audience? yes or no | [Oscar invents “grats” from the Spanish “gracias”. He has difficulty in finding words for “listening” or “attention” so he repeats “her, her, her” while thinking of it. Finally he makes up “audience”]

10 JOA yes |

In both interactions we can see Joa agreeing without any argument.
2nd Degree

Even though there is not much discussion we can see an attempt to move away from the constrictions of the text. They show their independent thinking and autonomy. They have summarised the whole checklist.

Their lack or discussion can be seen in the chart below. They have touched on some of the items without much discussion and some others have not even been dealt with.

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
\text{JOA} & \text{Great audience} & \text{Introduce topic} & \text{Explain why it's important} & \text{Give examples} & \text{Give recommendations} & \text{The content is interesting} & \text{The speakers encourage people to ask questions} & \text{Speaker is clear} & \text{The presentation is convincing} & \text{The speakers make a good team} & \text{The visual aids are effective} & \text{The time taken is right} \\
\hline
\text{Degrees} & \checkmark & \checkmark & \checkmark & \checkmark & \checkmark & \checkmark & \checkmark & \checkmark & \checkmark & \checkmark & \checkmark & \checkmark \\
\text{Turns} & 3 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 \\
\end{array}
\]

As a conclusion of the degrees of discussion seen in the three pairs, I would like to show the general chart of the checklist items to compare the performance of the three pairs.
DEGREES OF PROBLEMATISATION SEEN IN THE THREE PAIRS WHILE WORKING WITH THE CHECKLIST

$\sqrt{\;} = 1^{\text{st}}$ degree (d)
$\sqrt[2]{\;} = 2^{\text{nd}}$ degree (d)
$\sqrt[3]{\;} = 3^{\text{rd}}$ degree (d)

$\text{turns} = (t)$

Note: Even though we have not done the analysis of the last group figuring in the chart as we have not been able to collect the necessary data, we have decided to include them in the general chart because they were quite argumentative in their approach to dealing with the different items in the checklist (see the transcription in Annex 2).

We would like to highlight some aspects shown in the chart:

- None of the pairs discusses the first item as it is the one given as an example, except for the first pair who confirm in Spanish “este ya está hecho”. However, in all the interactions they greet one another. This could be analysed on two levels. One, there were told to give their names at the beginning of the recording so they did it by greeting their partners. The other could very well be the influence of the video they had just seen when the pair making the presentation introduced themselves and greeted the audience.

- There is quite a good balance between the different degrees of problematisation. Obviously there are some items that create more discussion than others like for example: the topic is convincing, the speakers make a good team or the visual aids are effective.

- Some pairs maintain a medium degree of argument like the 4$^{\text{th}}$ pair. While others clearly show different degrees of commitment towards the discussion, like for example the 1$^{\text{st}}$ pair.

- The 3$^{\text{rd}}$ pair does not follow the pattern of question/answer covering the checklist. They have summarised it without discussing each of the items. And there is little argument.
• Considering the language competence of the different pairs, we can say that there is no relation between the students’ competence and their degree of discussion. In fact one of the pairs with a lower language competence went into much more discussion than others with a higher level. We can argue that interest and commitment help students much more in communication than just a good level of language and little involvement.

• This activity might be more interesting for students with a low or average level of competence than for those with a high command of the language.

3.2.2. REHEARSAL vs ORAL PRESENTATION

In order to show a contrastive analysis between the rehearsal and the Oral Presentation we established some categories which would stress the differences and the similarities between the two:

› General differences
› Language use
› Content
› Delivery : the communication strategies worked on during the planning stage)
› Other survival skills not focussed on.

1st pair: SUS and JEN

CODE/TAPE (2) Oral Presentacion – English secondary education – IES Icaria
TOPIC: Ancient Greece
Susana- SUS. Student; 14 years old. 3rd year ESO
Jenny – JEN Student; 14 years old. 3rd year ESO
Ana - AN . Teacher
Mar – MAR. Teacher - Researcher- External Observer
English classroom
Date: 18/05/06.
Length of talk : 5’12”
Last reviewed : August 10th

› General differences:

There are quite a few general differences between this pair’s Rehearsal and the Oral Presentation. To start with, we can see the length of one and the other is different: The rehearsal took 5’48” and the Speech 5’12”.
Generally speaking they sounded more relaxed during the rehearsal. Whilst in the Speech there is the normal tension at the beginning with some self-reparations and repetitions: (see the example below)

JEN (…about the history of the greek er...| it was difficult to live in Greece because Greece have | have the land was not good to culture food and there was there was.. no water er.. so people didn’t come to Greece until the year 35000 [sounds unsure of the date] er.. before Christ || er..

They read most of it, which sometimes hinders their pronunciation. However, during the Speech their rhythm is more natural and slower.

They take the whole activity more light-heartedly while rehearsing.

Usually during the rehearsal the other pair asks more questions as they feel less threatened by the other students in the class. Whilst during the Oral Presentation students in general feel more self-conscious and threatened. In spite of that, though, this pair managed to encourage their audience to ask one question.

The following table summarises the general differences between one activity and the other:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Differences</th>
<th>Rehearsal</th>
<th>Oral Presentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time taken</td>
<td>5’48’’</td>
<td>5’12’’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading from text</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Slight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards activity</td>
<td>Light-hearted</td>
<td>Serious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Visual Aids</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience awareness</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions from the audience</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Language use:

In our analysis we are not concerned with the accuracy of students’ utterances. We have tried to identify the differences between the linguistic resources displayed in the rehearsal and in the final presentation, such as explicative devices, communicative strategies, register, etc. For example, as they were reading some passages during the rehearsal, their language sounded more academic and formal, less audience aware. There were fewer repetitions or self repairs.

During the Speech:

- the language used was much more natural, probably because they were more audience aware and they wanted to be understood. They used more explicative strategies. As we can see in the example below when SUS is talking about Aristotle and explains why he was more interested in science than Plato or Socrates:

SUS and Aristotle/ he was not er…| original from Athens and..| there is not| he is not |from a very rich family like Plato| and he is more interested in science| than Plato and Socrates|| [ADDS EXPLANATION ] maybe| because his father was a doctor|| and they are especially interested in biology |in classifying plants and animals| in a way that makes sense||
Another example when talking about Socrates’ character and Plato:

She shows that she has internalised the content and tries to explain it with her own words.

While in the rehearsal:

Or when SUS talks about painted pottery:

In the extract from the rehearsal below we can see there is no explanation about painted pottery.

• We can see more repetitions in the Oral Presentation probably because they are trying to make time while thinking, for example when Jenny is talking about the history of Greece:

Or when Sus repeats the word ‘three’ referring to the philosophers, while trying to get confirmation from partner. This could be contrasted with the video of this sequence:

• There is also some evidence of self-repairs as in the example below referring to Plato:
Or when SUS talks about Aristotle:

SUS (…) and Aristotle / there is not | he is not | from a very rich family like Plato |

- As for the use of the communicative strategies worked on at the beginning of the implementation, we can say that they appear in both the rehearsal and the oral Presentation. So we could anticipate that the checklist has been a useful tool when preparing their speeches.

**Content:**

- In the rehearsal and their written essay they included food which is not mentioned in the Oral Presentation.

**Delivery:**

The delivery, that is to say, the use of the communication strategies we had worked on during the planning stage, was perhaps the most interesting aspect to analyse because this pair showed that they had clearly internalised the different criteria of a good delivery. As we can see from the observer’s field notes, and from the video and audio transcriptions.

- They spoke clearly
- did not read,
- looked at the audience,
- used the appropriate gestures,
- behaved in a totally natural way,
- looked well prepared,
- took the presentation seriously and
- showed confidence.
- used blackboard to guide the audience (mind map).
- used pictures to illustrate their Speech.

JEN (…) well || we have pictures of the three ages ||

During the analysis of the Rehearsal we could see that they were using some of these criteria but they were less aware of the audience, therefore, they did not pay much attention to applying them.
Other survival skills:

There is a clear improvement on the use of other survival strategies during the oral presentation, which is not so obvious during the rehearsal. For example:

- **Strategies to bypass a risky situation:**
  - Abandoning topic when they find they have forgotten something.

  3 JEN  
  (...) and teach the people to make him ask him questions [about philosophy to] to be more [(p)different] well the he makes sometimes people angry...

- **Strategies to enhance the didactic approach to the audience:**
  - Didactic and clear tone: They speak slowly and clearly. Their manner of explaining things is very pedagogical as we could see in the video sequence.

- **Strategies to respond to questions from the audience:**
  - When they are asked questions they are able to improvise an answer:

| Student from audience | 1 | would you like to go to Greece/|| |
|-----------------------|---|---------------------------|
| JEN                   | yes | yes/|| |
| SUS                   | yes/|| |
| Student               | ([p] why)/|| Why/|| |
| JEN                   | because it’s a beau... it’s a beau... [(P) que has preguntado /] [she is so surprised by the question she asks in Spanish to reconfirm what she has heard] |
| Another student       | si t'agradaria anar a Grecia/|| |
| JEN                   | Ah /|| yes/|| it’s a beautiful =... = place and a very interesting culture/|| [gives her opinion of Greece] yes/|| |
We would now like to relate both the Rehearsal and the final Oral Presentation to the checklist, the students were working on at the beginning of the implementation, to see how most of the items have been covered. This clearly reflects that planning Oral Presentations allows for the practice of language procedures that otherwise wouldn’t be practised. We must remember that oral production is irreversible and by doing a well planned sequence before the actual final Oral Presentation we are allowing for metadiscourse reflection which will in the end improve the oral use of the language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>REHEARSAL</th>
<th>ORAL PRESENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greet audience</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce topic</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain why it’s important</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give examples</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give recommendations</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The content is interesting</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The speakers encourage people to ask questions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People ask questions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers thank audience</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The presentation is clear</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The topic is convincing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The speakers make a good team</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The visual aids are effective</td>
<td>✓ 5’48</td>
<td>✓ mind mapping + pictures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The time taken is right</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ 5’12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion:

We have seen some very clear differences in favour of the Oral Presentation.

- This pair has monitored most of the communicative strategies that had been worked on in previous sessions and even though there are moments in which they make some mistakes we can see that these are a product of the improvisation during the speech.
- At the beginning of their speech there are some self-repetitions which do not appear later on. Probably, after the first few minutes of anxiety they are much more in control.
- They also show some self-repairs.
- The use quite a lot of explicative strategies no doubt to help make their presentation more accessible to the audience.
- Finally, there is an important difference between their delivery during the rehearsal and the final Presentation. In the latter they show the characteristics of a good speaker. We can see that the negotiation of criteria at the beginning of the implementation of materials proved beneficial.
If we now look at the triangulation of data we must add that the written essay they presented to the teacher is closer in content and language to the rehearsal. However, neither the paragraph on Greek people nor the one on Greek clothes which are part of their written essay, appear in either the rehearsal or the Oral Presentation. The paragraph about food only appears in the rehearsal phase but not in the Speech.

Finally we would like to have a look at the co-evaluation carried out by their peers which shows the degree of proficiency shown by this pair in their opinion.

### COEVALUATION

**MARKS AWARDED BY THE AUDIENCE**
(16 classmates.)

**Evaluate the presentation from 3 (very interesting) to 1 (not so interesting).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPEAKERS:</th>
<th>Susana and Jenny</th>
<th>Date: 18/05/06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOPIC:</td>
<td>Ancient Greece</td>
<td>GROUP: 3rd year ESO B.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Marks given)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Marks given)</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The content is interesting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The presentation is well organised into different parts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The message is clear.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The speakers behave in a natural way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The speakers look at the audience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The speakers make a good team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The time taken is right.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The visual aids are effective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. What I liked best was ............</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• the mind map was very good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. You could improve....</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• the clarity of the message</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we analyse the results of the co-evaluation we can see that:

In most criteria their marks are very high (2, 3), which reflects the students comments at the end of the presentations. They all thought that this pair had made a very good presentation and had a very good command of the language. They even commented on the high marks the teacher would give them. To which the teacher replied: ‘we are not talking about marking or examining here’ trying to raise the students’ awareness on what it is a good presentation. This is the transcription of their comments:

| teacher                      | ok|| let’s talk about it|| |
| Students                     | They’ll get the best marks (referring to Sus and Jen) |
| teacher                      | They’ve done a good presentation but | just about the presentation|| if it was interesting|| clear|| |
| Students                     | if their English is better | [their gestures are good | and make the presentation clear|| |
| Students                     | Ah! ah! [raising their tone like singing] it’s not the same|| |
**2nd Pair: JOR and PAU**

CODE/TAPE ( 2) Oral Presentation – English Secondary education – IES Icaria

TOPIC: Ancient Egypt

Jordi – JOR student; 14 years old. 3rd year ESO

Pau - PAU student; 14 years old. 3rd year ESO

Ana – AN teacher

Mar – MAR teacher - researcher - observer

English classroom

Date: 18/05/06.

Length of talk : 3’13”

Last reviewed : August 30th

**General differences:**

There are quite a few general differences between this pairs’ Rehearsal and the Oral Presentation. To start with we can see the length of one and the other is different: The rehearsal took 4’11” and the Speech 3’13.

If we look at the **Rehearsal** we can see that:

- The content is more the dense and less structured.
- They do not want to be disturbed. They do not pay attention to the audience.

Let’s see their interaction: When they are talking about gods IRI asks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>IRI</td>
<td><em>que quiere decir Ra?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>JOR</td>
<td>Egyptians developed a method of preserving bodies so they would remain lifelike [reading from the text] the process included embalming the bodies enwrapping them in strips of linen one of the the most powerful persons in the ancient Egypt was the pharaoh he was a political and religious leader of the Egyptian people he was the ruler of upper and lower Egypt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

They continue talking totally unawares of the question. The same attitude is repeated when Cesc interrupts them to ask them a question:

From turn 4 to 19, when JOR has finished his talk and allows questions, they are both repeating the same.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td><em>may I ask a question</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>JOR</td>
<td>the god on earth the question at the end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>may I ask a question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>JOR</td>
<td>the question at the end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>can I ask a question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>JOR</td>
<td>(f) no the question at the end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td><em>yes I can what’s the name of the pharaoh</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>JOR</td>
<td>(f) the questions at the end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td><em>si no saps que volen dir...</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>PAU</td>
<td>the most famous of all ancient Egyptian scripts is the hieroglyphic there were also other scripts that were used to preserve their beliefs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
They read some paragraphs from the written text therefore their tone is more monotonous.

At the end they stop Cesc from asking more questions. They seem to be keen on finishing quickly.

As we can see there is no cooperative learning, no negotiation of meaning until the end. However, they are all involved in the activity, even one of the members of the listening pair joins in the explanation of mud brick houses:

Their Oral Presentation on the contrary is simpler in content. Obviously they have made it easier to convey and easier to receive. They are more audience aware.

we are here to talk about ancient Egypt\[Good rhythm\] we think that know about the ancient Egypt is important because it is a civilisation that lasted for 3000 years\[Good rhythm\]
Let’s now see the following table with the general differences observed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Differences</th>
<th>Rehearsal</th>
<th>Oral Presentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time taken</td>
<td>4’11’’</td>
<td>3’13’’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading from text</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tone</td>
<td>More monotonous</td>
<td>More lively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards activity</td>
<td>Positive but not much cooperation</td>
<td>Positive and involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Visual Aids</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience awareness</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions from the audience</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

> **Language:**

- In the rehearsal they used more academic language with longer subordinate clauses and richer vocabulary:

  3 JOR Egyptians developed a method of preserving bodies so they would remain lifelike [reading from the text] the process included embalming the bodies enwrapping them in strips of linen

  or

  1 JOR (...)[reading from the text] (...in Egypt were two types of land the black land was the fertile land on the banks of the Nile the ancient Egyptian used this land for growing their crops the red land was the barren desert that protected Egypt for from the two sides

- Whilst their Oral Presentation shows shorter and clearer sentences more easily to acquire and to convey:

  4 JOR yes|| er...geography|| Egypt | the ancient Egypt was divided in two parts || the black land and the red land|| the black land was the fertile land all over the the the Nile|| and the other land was the desert that protected Egypt in two sides||

- There are also more repetitions while thinking about the content.

  7 JOR The phar [the pharaoh was the most powerful person in ancient Egypt|| and he controls em || repetition while he is thinking about content]the the politic and the religion || and he was the representation of god on earth||

These repetitions do not seem to appear in the rehearsal as they are reading:

  3 JOR (…) the most powerful persons in the the ancient egypt was the pharaoh he was a political and religious leader of the Egyptian people he was the ruler of upper and lower egypt ||

- There are some self-rectifications too:

  In this example he is obviously repeating the word *different* to correct the mistake of the adjective in the plural:

  8 PAU The ancient Egyptians er... were | they have different er... different types of writing||self-rectification|

Also, Pau is probably trying to remember the text in the rehearsal but when he sees he is not successful he adds his own comment.
Let’s see the rehearsal:

The most famous of all ancient Egyptian scripts is the hieroglyphic. There were also other scripts that were used to preserve their beliefs.

**Content:**
- In the rehearsal, the different topics follow one another without pauses or any kind of markers.
- During the Oral Presentation, there was good turn-taking with shorter paragraphs each speaker.

**Delivery:**

It is in the delivery where this pair showed the results of the work done on the negotiation of criteria of quality.

During the rehearsal, they read, therefore their rhythm was slightly monotonous and more difficult to understand. Besides, as we have seen before, they were oblivious to their listeners. During the Oral Presentation, they:
- Did not read,
- Looked at the audience,
- Behaved in a natural way,
- Looked well prepared and in control and,
- Took the presentation seriously.

**Other survival skills:**

In the analysis of the oral presentation, we can observe some other survival skills, which are not noticeable during the rehearsal. For example:
- Time fills: When one of the speakers has a problem, the other takes over immediately.
- There isn’t word by word memorisation. They seem to have the main idea and develop the content as they go along as we can see in this passage about mummification:

| PAU | the ancient Egyptians built pyramids for the pharaohs and the queens in the pyramids the pharaohs were buried and there are pyramids of different sizes and it was utilised for the rich men in Egypt |
| JOR | and the ancient Egyptians believed in gods and goddesses, each one had their own role and there was Anubis, Horus, Isis, Osiris, Set, and Ra |

The mummification was an aid for preserving the body of the dead person and it was utilised for the rich men in Egypt.
Comparing to the rehearsal:

Which compared to the rehearsal:

Egyptians developed a method of preserving bodies so they would remain lifelike. The process included embalming the bodies and wrapping them in strips of linen.

Comparison between the rehearsal and the oral presentation with reference to the checklist

We would now like to relate the Rehearsal and the final Oral Presentation to the checklist the students were working on at the beginning of the implementation, to see whether the learning objectives have been achieved. Let’s see the chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rehearsal</th>
<th>Oral Presentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduce themselves</td>
<td>Greet the audience</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce topic</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain why it’s important</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give examples</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give recommendations</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The content is interesting</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ In the co-evaluation sheet most students give a high mark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The speakers encourage people to ask questions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People ask questions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers thank audience</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The presentation is clear</td>
<td>Not clear for the pair listening</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The topic is convincing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The speakers make a good team</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The visual aids are effective</td>
<td>No visual aids</td>
<td>No visual aids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The time taken is right</td>
<td>✓ 4’11’</td>
<td>✓ 3’13’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion:

We have seen some differences in favour of the Oral Presentation.

- This pair has monitored most of the communicative strategies that had been worked on in previous sessions. They are capable of self-rectifications and their repetitions are strategies to gain time while thinking.
- They have moved on from reading during the rehearsal, which showed dependence from the text, to applying their resources like improvisation during the speech.
- Finally, there is an important difference between their delivery during the rehearsal and the final Presentation. In the latter they show some characteristics of a good speaker. We can see that the negotiation of the criteria at the beginning of the pedagogical Unit proved beneficial.

Finally we would like to look at the co-evaluation carried out by their peers which shows the degree of proficiency shown by this pair in their opinion.
CO-EVALUATION
MARKS AWARDED BY THE AUDIENCE
(15 classmates.)

Evaluate the presentation from 3 (very interesting) to 1 (not so interesting).

| SPEAKERS: Adrià and Paolo | Date: 18/05/06 |
| TOPIC: Ancient Egypt      | GROUP: 3rd year ESO B. |

1. The content is interesting.  
2. The presentation is well organised into different parts.  
3. The message is clear.  
4. The speakers behave in a natural way.  
5. The speakers look at the audience.  
6. The speakers make a good team.  
7. The time taken is right.  
8. The visual aids are effective.  
9. What I liked best was ....  
   - the presentation  
10. You could improve....  
   - the difficult words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results:

If we look at the results of the audience’s co-evaluation of the speakers we can see that:

- Most students give quite a high mark (2 or 3) to the different items except for number 8: the visual aids are effective (100% of the students give a low mark as there were no visual aids).
- Item number 5 the speakers look at the audience is not valued too highly either (7 students give 1, 1.5). In fact from the video we can observe that at times they were not looking at the audience.
3rd Pair: OSC and JOA

CODE/TAPE (2) ORAL PRESENTATION – English - Secondary Education –
IES Icaria
TOPIC: Ancient Egypt
Oscar – OSC student; 14 years old; 3rd year ESO
Joana – JOA student; 14 years old; 3rd year ESO
Ana – AN teacher
Mar – MAR teacher – researcher – observer
Computer class
Date: 18/05/06.
Length of talk: 4'41''
Last reviewed: August 10th

› General Differences:

- On the whole they sound quite well organised during the Oral Presentation, even though a certain anxiety from one member provokes a bit of a confusion at the beginning. It was soon restored, though.
- Contrary to the other two pairs their Speech is slightly longer than the rehearsed one but it is clearer, better structured and with a very good turn taking.
- They have reduced the content for example when talking about the gods:

6 JOA the ancient Egyptians believed in a lot of gods and goddesses|| em.. || each one with his function || and is represented with many animals and plants| for example|| Ra Isis Horus| and others||

While in the rehearsal:

6 JOA the Egyptians [Reading from text] believe that adore this gods | mean culture and normal life | some gods and goddesses are| Amunis she guides the soul of the to paradise| Isis the mother of gods| Osiris the god of deads| Ka god of the creator| Ra god the soul| Set god of the sun| etc | and my partner Oscar | explain the mummification ||

- They have memorised quite a few difficult words which coincides with one of their comments while negotiating the criteria of quality: “learning by heart is a quality of a good speaker because when they have memorised something that means that they have absorbed it” (see Field Notes, Annex 2 page ……). See the following example:

9 OSC the temples were the homes of the gods and goddesses and every temple has one god || in every temple the servants of the gods prepare some rituals to complacent the gods || ah || [He seems to have remembered something ] in the civilization of ancient Egypt sometimes there were changes of culture and religion||

- They seem more aware of the audience.
- They give examples.

6 JOA the ancient Egyptians believed in a lot of gods and goddesses|| em.. || each one with his function || and is represented with many animals and plants| for example|| Ra Isis Horus| and others||

- No Visual Aids used.
While in the rehearsal:

- They read from the text which causes:
  A change of rhythm, which becomes more rapid.
  Some pronunciation mistakes which do not hinder understanding, though.
- There is a very good turn taking, each introducing the topic his or her partner is going to talk about. See the example below:

  OSC...
  the Egyptians live in two different zones of Egypt: the black land around the Nile and the red land around the desert. There are too many gods and goddesses, and Joana explains the gods. [Good interaction between speakers]

  JOA...
  the Egyptians believe that the gods mean culture and normal life. Some gods and goddesses are: Anubis, who guides the soul of the deceased to paradise; Isis, the mother of gods; Osiris, the god of the deads; and Ra, the god of the sun. My partner Oscar explains the mummification.

- Sometimes their turn taking takes the form of a question to the partner probably influenced by the speakers on the model video.

  OSC...
  the Egyptians had a...a person same as king who called pharaoh, lord of two lands, and he was the most powerful person in Egypt. Can you explain the pyramids, Joana?

  JOA...
  They invent new words from Spanish probably: durious, dediqued. Otherwise no use of L1.

- Like the other two pairs they encourage questions and manage to answer them with a certain degree of correctness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Differences</th>
<th>Rehearsal</th>
<th>Oral Presentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time taken</td>
<td>4′09″</td>
<td>4′41″</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading from text</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tone</td>
<td>rapid and unclear at times.</td>
<td>more lively and self contained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes, noticeable in one member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards activity</td>
<td>light-hearted</td>
<td>serious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair’s interaction</td>
<td>fine with dispersion at times.</td>
<td>very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Visual Aids</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience awareness</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions from the audience</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

› Language:

- Good use of formal language mainly in the oral Presentation. They have definitely worked on the language. They are using passive voice and rich lexis. See the example below:
the craftsmen in ancient Egypt were skilled labourers and very often well respected and had a good life style. The objects made by craftsmen are used in temples and in the normal life of Egyptians.

While in the rehearsal Joa does not sound in command.

every craftsmen’s life style and social depended of the quality of his skills and experience. For this some craftsmen had a more difficult life than others. [Some problems of pronunciation] [Content unclear]

• Some self-repairs:

and finally the ancient Egyptians think it’s so important to record this information in government and religion to the future. They use papyrus in hieroglyphic scripts.

• As they have relied on memory they use a richer vocabulary: Embalming, bury, craftsmen, skilled labourers, etc. While the other pairs have simplified the lexis to make it more understandable for the audience.

Content:

There is a clear difference between the content structure during the rehearsal and the Oral Presentation in favour of the latter.

• During the rehearsal Osc is reading and goes from one topic (mummification) to the next (pharaoh) without pause.

the ancient Egyptians [Reading from text] buried their dead bodies in coffins to protect their bodies from wild animals and insects. Later the Egyptian developed a method of preserving bodies so they would remain life like and the Egyptians had a person same as king who called pharao lord of two lands and he was the most powerful person in Egypt. Can you explain we the pyramids Joana?

While in the Oral presentation Osc talks about mummification and then Joa introduces the pharaoh:

the pharaoh has the most power on the Egypt. He is a political and religious leader and he recollected taxes and XXX he the pharaoh and the queens are buried in the pyramids.

• Obviously, learning has not happened yet during the rehearsal and sometimes the message is somewhat unclear. For example:

(... er... in the life of ancient Egypt the Nile and the fertile land are the most important elements because the floodings of Nile helped the soil and crops good surface. [F]corta corta [S] [she is having problems with complicated vocabulary]
Whilst in the oral presentation the same passage sounds much more coherent:

Their oral presentation sounds much more coherent:

JOA (…)

er… Egyptian life revolves around the Nile because the ancient Egyptians farmers plant er… plant

his food around the Nile

[good use of vocabulary revolves]

› Delivery:

During the rehearsal they read. They take the presentation seriously but they are more relaxed and behave in a light-hearted way. For example after two questions from the other pair Oscar says:

OSC any more questions /|| [Rising entonation with a tint of irony]

In their final Speech they:

- speak clearly,
- Anxiety is noticeable in one member while the other looks and sounds very calm and in control. We all know that giving a speech is a threatening experience for them and sometimes nerves can interfere in the course of the talk as we can appreciate in Oscar’s body language.
- do not read although Osc has his notes.
- behave in a natural way,
- look well prepared,
- take the presentation seriously,
- have good turn taking and
- make a good team.

› Other survival skills:

- During the Oral Presentation there is a very good interaction between them:

  Time fills: Joa helps when Osc gets a bit confused.

  She also looks at him when he is talking and seems very attentive to what he is explaining, as we can see in the video. She is probably trying to calm him down.

  In the rehearsal though, there are times when they lose attention while the other is reading:

OSC ok | the civi | the civilisation of ancient Egypt | lasted for over three thousand years | during this time | in Egypt were many change of culture religion and … etc < 3> and the trades Joana || Yo ya hablado del faraón |||the pair doesn’t sound well coordinated]

- Memory is their better skill. They have memorised complete passages. Which is quite interesting because while doing the negotiation of criteria of quality they defended that memorising is a good quality: “learning by heart is a quality of a good speaker because when they have memorised something that means that they have absorbed it”.
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COMPARISON BETWEEN THE REHEARSAL AND THE ORAL PRESENTATION WITH REFERENCE TO THE DESCRIPTORS ON THE CHECKLIST

If we now look at the descriptors applied in both performances we can say that learning has occurred.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>REHEARSAL</th>
<th>ORAL PRESENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greet the audience</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce themselves</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce topic</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain why it’s important</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give examples</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The content is interesting</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ See co-evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The speakers encourage people to ask questions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People ask questions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers thank audience</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The presentation is clear</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The topic is convincing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ see co-evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The speakers make a good team</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The visual aids are effective</td>
<td>No visual aids</td>
<td>No visual aids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The time taken is right</td>
<td>4’09”</td>
<td>4’41”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion:

We have seen some differences in favour of the Oral Presentation.

- This pair has monitored most of the communicative strategies that had been worked on in previous sessions.
- They have improved their rehearsal to a very high degree. They have moved away from reading and have shown they are capable of structuring a talk properly. Besides, the fact that they have memorised a fair amount of the content, they have kept the academic formality and the lexis of their written essay.
- Finally, there is an important difference between their delivery during the rehearsal and the final Presentation. In the latter they show some characteristics of a good speaker. We can see that the negotiation of the criteria at the beginning of the pedagogical Unit proved beneficial.
- This is the only pair that has delivered a talk longer than the rehearsal.

To finish I would like to show the co-evaluation carried out by their classmates which shows the degree of proficiency shown by this pair in their opinion.
CO-EVALUATION
MARKS AWARDED BY THE AUDIENCE (16 CLASSMATES)

Evaluate the presentation from 3 (very interesting) to 1 (not so interesting).

SPEAKERS: Oscar and Joana     Date: 18/05/06
TOPIC: Ancient Egypt     GROUP: 3rd year ESO B.

1. The content is interesting.  3 3 3 3 2 2 2 2 2 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 2 2 1 2
2. The presentation is well organised into different parts.  3 3 3 3 2 2 2 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 2 3 2 2 1
3. The message is clear.  3 3 3 3 2 1 1 3 3 2 3 3 2 2 2 1
4. The speakers behave in a natural way.  2 2 2 3 3 3 3 2 3 2 2 1 2 2 1 1
5. The speakers look at the audience.  3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 2 3 3 2 2 1
6. The speakers make a good team.  3 3 3 3 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 2 2 1
7. The time taken is right.  3 3 3 3 2 2 2 2 2 2 3 3 2 2 2 2 3 3 1 1
8. The visual aids are effective.  1 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 2 0 0 1 1 0 1 1
9. What I liked best was ..........  • the naturality that they speak, it was easy to understand
10. You could improve .......  • the content, Oscar’s gestures

Results:

If we look at the results of the audience’s co-evaluation of the speakers we can see that most students give quite a high mark (2 or 3) to the different items except for number 8: the visual aids are effective (most students give a low mark 1, 0; only one gives a 2 which probably shows lack of understanding from the co-evaluator. There were no visual aids). Item number 5 the speakers look at the audience is not valued too highly either (9 students give 1).
4. CONCLUSIONS

To conclude this study I would like to synthesise a few ideas:

- We have obtained exploratory results from three pairs in only one school, as this was a qualitative research. Therefore, the different aspects observed cannot be made general. However, we could assume that if we were to expand the scope of the research to more schools under similar conditions, we should be able to obtain similar results. In other words, the improvement on the use of discourse strategies observed during the Oral Presentation, the increase of audience awareness, the internalisation of the communication strategies etc., should also be evident in the new practice. Needless to say that totally successful results cannot be achieved unless there is a systematic exposure to this type of practice.

- There are some aspects which could be identified in all three pairs as we have seen in the individual conclusions:

  1. Good level of involvement. Higher interest when the tasks are productive.
  2. Adjustment of the activities to their own needs.
  3. Medium to high degree of discussion of the different topics selected.
  4. Lack of relationship between the students’ competence and their degree of discussion. We can argue that interest and commitment help students much more in communication than just a good level of language and little involvement.
  5. Good use of communication strategies and other survival skills during the Oral Presentation.
  6. In the rehearsal the students had not mastered the communicative situation completely. They mainly used it as an opportunity to internalise the cognitive content.

- Other aspects are specific of an individual pair and not of others, for example: The third pair memorised a fair amount of the content, which resulted in a more academic and formal Oral Presentation.

- The question at the base of this research “How can we help the students develop their communicative strategies, achieve an all-embracing linguistic education and, at the same time, take control of their own learning” has been answered, even though this is a very limited study. The results show that the pairs under analysis show:

  1. A clear development of the communication strategies needed for a good Oral Presentation, mainly because they were exposed to awareness raising activities and experimented with the communicative abilities needed.
  2. By working within the CLIL approach the students were immersed in an all-embracing linguistic education where the language was the
vehicle when dealing with content matter. The students were working abilities which are at the base of cognitive operations with a treatment of the communicative strategies, necessary to process information and deliver it in the foreign language.

3. With reference to the other aspect of our question i.e. the students’ control of their own learning, we could add that by guiding them in the process of reflection during the planning stages and self-assessment by means of tasks based on the ELP descriptors, we have helped them develop their responsibility as autonomous learners.

- We could also say that the main objectives of the research have been achieved:
  1. We have designed activities and self-assessment scales using the ELP descriptors and the illustrative scales of the CEFR to help the students develop their communicative competence in the Oral Presentation in the CLIL class.
  2. We have seen the effect that these activities cause on the process of learning, the outcome and the cognitive-linguistic abilities of the students.

- However, where the results show a need for improvement is in the self-evaluation. We think that the students need to be exposed to more self-evaluation tasks so that they internalise the process. So, we would like to suggest more practice done along these lines in the future.

- This research has provided us with a series of materials and activities which could be very useful not only in the development of our students’ communicative abilities but also in the assessment of their communicative and cognitive competence.

- To encourage oral production, especially pair work is of great importance. The students in pairs interact, negotiate, discuss, reflect on the learning, etc., in a natural and autonomous way with a much higher level of involvement.

- Academic Oral Presentations within CLIL programs are very useful in the improvement of oral production skills as they activate cognitive processing and communicative abilities.

- The ELP and the CEFR are two basic tools in the development of autonomous learning. Therefore, if we want students to become autonomous we must encourage them to share the teachers responsibility in the learning process: deciding on the objectives, reflecting on planning, monitoring and assessing their own learning process, and so on.

- Action Research has proved to be a very valuable tool to integrate stimulating critical reflection in our classes in order to develop students’ procedures and abilities by encouraging them to participate actively in the negotiation of cognitive and communicative processes.
To finish, I would like to add that we hope that this research becomes useful for those teachers who, like us, have been looking for ways to help the students to develop their linguistic, cognitive and communicative abilities and become autonomous learners.
5. MATERIALS INCLUDED IN THE APPENDIX

5.1. APPENDIX 1: MATERIALS DEVELOPED FOR CLASS IMPLEMENTATION:

♦ Negotiation of criteria
♦ Bullying (script)
♦ Task 1. Listen and choose the correct option
♦ Task 2. Communication exchanges. Match a to b
♦ Task 3. Checklist
♦ Co-evaluation
♦ Self-evaluation

5.2. APPENDIX 2: TRANSCRIPTIONS (THREE PAIRS) and TEACHER’S REPORTS

♦ Checklist
♦ Rehearsal
♦ Oral presentation
♦ Teacher’s Reports
♦ Field Notes
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APPENDIX

APPENDIX 1:
MATERIALS DEVELOPED FOR CLASS IMPLEMENTATION

NEGOTIATION OF CRITERIA

This task will help students become aware of evaluation criteria by negotiating the descriptors of an oral presentation.

In pairs look at these cards and decide which represent a good speaker, which a bad speaker and which are neutral.

A Good speaker.....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Speaks clearly.</th>
<th>6. Hesitates. (Stops constantly)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Does not read.</td>
<td>4. Uses the appropriate gestures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Looks at the audience when he/she speaks.</td>
<td>6. Speaks very softly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Shows off.</td>
<td>8. Is not arrogant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Tries to be funny</td>
<td>10. Dresses appropriately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Memorises the text</td>
<td>14. Uses the blackboard, ppt, posters, photographs and pictures, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Hides behind the others</td>
<td>16. Is monotonous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Takes the presentation seriously.</td>
<td>18. Shows confidence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Good afternoon everybody.
My name is Ana and this is Agustin.

We are here to talk about BULLYING, in other words, “violence” against young people.

We think this is a very important topic because bullying is DANGEROUS. Why? Because it can make people feel very unhappy and frightened. They may lose confidence and not want to go to school. They may even commit suicide.

Now… to begin with …. Agustin, WHAT IS BULLYING?
Bullying is when students use their power and strength to hurt or frighten other students. For example: calling them names, saying nasty things about them, breaking their things, making them do things they do not want to do…. and so on.

WHY DO PEOPLE BULLY?
Some students think that/ by bullying they look tough and become more popular. Some bullies do it to get attention or to make other people afraid of them. Others can be jealous of the person they are bullying.

So, WHAT CAN I DO IF I AM A VICTIM OF BULLYING?
If you are a victim, here is some advice:
- First, remember that you are not the problem, the bully is.
- Also, spend time with your friends because bullies pick on people who are not in a group.
- Finally, talk to an adult you trust.

And a very important question now: HOW CAN OTHER STUDENTS HELP?
We would like to make four recommendations:
1. We must always try to stop it. If we don’t, we are saying that bullying is OK.
2. We should help the victim to talk about the problem to an adult they trust.
3. We must show the bullies that we think they are stupid and mean.
4. And last but not least, we must show the victims that we are their friends and that they are not alone.

In conclusion, we must all work together to stop bullying.

Now, if you have any questions we’ll try to answer them.
- Excuse me, may I ask a question?
- Please, go ahead!

- Who are the victims of bullying?
- Anybody could be a victim. What’s your name?
- Raquel
- Well, Raquel, even YOU could be a victim. And you, and you, and you.

Any more questions?//
- Here! Do you think it is possible to make bullies change?
- Yes, of course, it is possible to make them change. There are programmes that help bullies understand how victims feel. If they understand that then, they may change.
- You know, it’s important to help them remember the golden rule: “Treat the others as you want to be treated!”

- One last question?
(silence from the audience)
Well, thank you very much for your attention.
TASK 1

Listen and choose the correct option

(1)   a) Good morning/afternoon everybody.
     b) Hi there!

My name is Ana and (2) a) this is Agustin
     b) this is my partner, Agustin

(3)   a) We are here to talk
     b) We would like to talk about BULLYING, in other words, “violence” against young people.

(4) a) We think this is
     b) We believe it is a very important topic because bullying is DANGEROUS. Why? Because it can make people feel very unhappy and frightened. They may lose confidence and not want to go to school. They may even commit suicide.

To begin with, Agustin, WHAT IS BULLYING? Bullying is when students use their power and strength to hurt or frighten another student. (5) a) for instance
     b) for example: calling them names, saying nasty things about them, breaking their things, making them scared or obliging them to do things they do not want to do.

WHY DO PEOPLE BULLY?

Some students think that by bullying they look tough and become more popular. Some bullies do it to get attention or to make other people afraid of them. Others can be jealous of the person they are bullying.

So, WHAT CAN I DO IF I AM A VICTIM OF BULLYING? If you are a victim, here is some advice:
- First, remember that you are not the problem, the bully is.
- Also, spend time a lot of with your friends because bullies pick on people who are not in a group.
- Finally, talk to an adult you trust.

And a very important question now: HOW CAN OTHER STUDENTS HELP?

(6) a) We would like to make
     b) We want to give you four recommendations:
     1. We must always try to stop it. If we don’t we are saying that bullying is OK.
     2. We should help the victim to talk about the problem to an adult they trust.
     3. We must show the bullies that we think they are stupid and mean.
     4. And last but not least, we must show the victims that we are their friends and that they are not alone.

(7) a) To conclude,
     b) In conclusion, we must all work together to stop bullying.
Now,  (8)  a) If you have any questions,  
           b) If you want to ask any questions,  we’ll try to answer them.

- (9)  a) Sorry, I have a question  
       b) Excuse me, may I ask a question

- Please, go ahead  
- Who are the victims of bullying?  
- Anybody could be a victim. What’s your name?  
- Raquel.  
- Well, Raquel, even YOU could be a victim. And you, and you, and you.

- Any more questions?  
- Here! Do you think it is possible to make bullies change?  
- Yes, of course, it is possible to make them change. There are programmes that help bullies understand how victims feel. If they understand that then, they may change.  
- You know, it’s important to help them remember the golden rule: “Treat the others as you want to be treated!”

- One last question?  
   (silence from the audience)

Well,  (10)  a) Many thanks  
           b) Thank you very much for your attention.
**TASK 2**

**COMMUNICATION EXCHANGES**

**Match a to b**

(Ex: Good morning/afternoon → greeting the audience)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>a</strong></th>
<th><strong>b</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good morning/afternoon.</td>
<td>Introducing the topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many thanks for sharing my concerns with me.</td>
<td>Explaining why it is important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We think it is important because....</td>
<td>Giving recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are here talk about....</td>
<td>Concluding the talk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Here! Please.</td>
<td>Thanking the audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a nutshell,</td>
<td>Encouraging people to ask questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We would like to present some recommendations in order to stop...</td>
<td>Greeting the audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In conclusion,</td>
<td>Giving reasons for talking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We must act together.</td>
<td>(audience)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you very much for listening to me.</td>
<td>Asking questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you have any questions we’ll try to answer them.</td>
<td>Encouraging people to act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excuse me. May I ask a question?</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanks for being here.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well, you see it is rather important because ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To finish our talk,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANSWERS**

1 → G ; 6 → E
2 → 7 → 12 →
3 → 8 → 13 →
4 → 9 → 14 →
5 → 10 → 15 →
**TASK 3**

**CHECKLIST**

Look at this chart and tick the correct answer
(Example: Speaker greets the audience YES √)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Yes</strong></th>
<th><strong>No</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
<td>Speaker:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ greets the audience.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ introduces the topic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ explains why it is important.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main body</strong></td>
<td>Speaker:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ gives examples.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ gives recommendations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the content is interesting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusion</strong></td>
<td>the message is short and clear.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questions</strong></td>
<td>Speaker encourages people to ask questions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People ask questions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End of talk</strong></td>
<td>Speaker thanks the audience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery</strong></td>
<td>The presentation is clear.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The topic is convincing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The speakers make a good team.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The visual aids are effective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The time taken is right.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CO-EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speakers:</th>
<th>Topics:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st pair:</td>
<td>Ancient Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd pair:</td>
<td>Ancient Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd pair:</td>
<td>Ancient Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th pair:</td>
<td>Ancient Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th pair:</td>
<td>Ancient Egypt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluate the Presentations from 3 (very interesting) to 1 (not so interesting). (Example: The content is interesting 3)

| 1. The content is interesting. |
| 7. The presentation is well organised into different parts. |
| 8. The message is clear. |
| 9. The speakers behave in a natural way. |
| 10. The speakers look at the audience. |
| 11. The speakers make a good team. |
| 12. The time taken is right. |
| 13. The visual aids are effective. |

| 9. What I liked best was (Add your comments) |
| 10. You could improve |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>5th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
## SELF EVALUATION

Name ............................................................ Date ......................

**Can you usually do these things?**

*use these symbols:  √ = I think I can   √√ = I know I can*

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A1.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I can use simple expressions to be friendly and polite like <em>good morning, hello, goodbye, thank you, OK.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I can speak in simple sentences but I have to think what I want to say.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I can answer some guided questions if they refer to learned topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A2-1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I can give a very short talk about a topic I have prepared well if I get help with the language and I use pictures and diagrams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I can understand simple questions if the person speaks slowly and clearly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I can answer questions in simple sentences. I do not need to think what I am going to say.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A2-2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I can give a short talk about a topic I know well if I have practiced the language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I can understand what the other person is asking if I listen carefully.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I can answer a few simple questions in interconnected sentences without prompting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B1-1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I can give a short prepared presentation without practising word for word.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I can make myself understood and understand others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I can answer clear questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B1-2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I can give a prepared presentation, without practising word for word.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>If I don’t know a word or expression I can find another way of saying what I mean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I can cope with most questions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(adapted from the illustrative scales of the CEFR, PEL and Cando Project: speaking and conversation)
TEACHER’S GUIDE

NEGOTIATION OF EVALUATION CRITERIA

Aim: to prepare students for self-evaluation
    to make students aware of the criteria of quality before an oral presentation.
Procedure:
1. Give 10 cards to each pair and ask them to decide which cards refer
to a good speaker, which to a bad speaker and which are neutral.
2. Then in groups of 4, students discuss their decisions. Walk around the
class in case help is required. Encourage the students to give reasons.
3. Discuss with whole class.
Answers: Good speaker: 1,3,4,5,8,12,14,17,18,
        Bad speaker: 2,7,16,
        Neutral :6,9,10,11,13,19,20. (these are meant to provoke different reactions). For
        example memorising a text is good but at the same time the speaker might sound like a
        parrot and does not communicate well. Remind the students that “a good speaker conveys
        his message to the audience”

BULLYING

TASK 1
Listen and choose the correct option

Aim: to recognise some discourse features.
Procedure:
1. Give students the passage with gaps “Bullying” + Multiple Choice
task.
2. Ask them to listen to the speech and complete the task.
3. In pairs students discuss the answers
4. Discuss with whole class.
Answers: See script in the students’ materials.

TASK 2
COMMUNICATION EXCHANGES

Match A to B

Aim: to practise functions (This will be quite useful when they come to the
    final evaluation)
Procedure:
1. Give students Task 2 “Match a to b”
2. Then in pairs students comment on their answers. (Go round the
    class while they are doing it and help with difficult vocabulary).
3. Check with whole class
Answers: 1 ➔ G ; 6 ➔ D 11 ➔ F
        2 ➔ E 7 ➔ C 12 ➔ I
        3 ➔ B 8 ➔ D 13 ➔ E
        4 ➔ H 9 ➔ C 14 ➔ B
        5 ➔ I 10 ➔ E 15 ➔ D
TASK 3
CHECKLIST

Aims
To become aware of the structure of a speech.

Procedure:
1. Give students the checklist and ask them to tick the correct answer after watching the video. (Example: speaker greets the audience YES √).
2. Ask them to write the outline of their speech and check the structure with the help of the checklist.

Answers: Students’ own answers.

OTHER MATERIALS WHICH WERE DISCARDED FOR THE RESEARCH BUT MIGHT BE USEFUL:

Self-assessment using the Council of Europe’s Illustrative scales.

(From Sustained Monologue A2: )

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I can describe something in a simple list of points.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I can give interesting facts about rainforests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can talk about plants and animals in rainforests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can talk about people in rainforests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can have a short conversation about a topic we are studying provided I have help with new vocabulary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can understand what my classmates explain about the topic we are studying provided they speak clearly and slowly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can use very simple vocabulary to describe what I like or dislike of an animal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can make brief statements about something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can compare objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can present the different steps of a project to the class if I get help with language and I use pictures and diagrams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can plan the different steps of a school project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

77
ORAL PRESENTATION

SELF EVALUATION and COMMUNICATION EXCHANGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I can greet people</th>
<th>“Good morning/afternoon...”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I can introduce myself and my partner to the class</td>
<td>“I am ..........and this is my ..........”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can introduce the topic I am going to talk about</td>
<td>“We are here to talk about .....”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can use semiformal/formal language to give recommendations to …governments / companies/collectors to help preserve … the fauna/ the flora/ .....</td>
<td>“We would like to present five recommendations in order to help preserve.....”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can speak clearly and slowly so that everybody can understand.</td>
<td>“Well, you see it is very important...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can defend my point if questioned</td>
<td>“We all must work together to preserve .../to promote....”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can use convincing language to defend the importance of my recommendations.</td>
<td>“Yes, I see what you want to know./ Yes, you are asking.../”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can show that I understand what other students ask me</td>
<td>“That’s right / Sorry I can’t agree with you/”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can agree/disagree with people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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6.2. APPENDIX 2:

TRANSCRIPTIONS:
GREIP’S ADAPTATION OF PAYRATO’S SYMBOLS

Secuencias tonales terminales:

Descenso: \n
Ascenso: /

Mantenimiento -

Pausas:

Pausa breve: |

Pausa media: ||

Sin pausa: <0>

Prolongación del sonido final: :

Solapamientos =texto hablante A=

Intensidad:

Débil (piano) [(p) texto]

Muy débil [(PP) texto]

Fuerte [(F) texto]

Muy fuerte [(FF) texto]

Riendo @

Lenguas:

Inglès : estándar

Catalan : negrita

Castellano: cursiva

Fragmentos incomprensibles: XXX

Fragmentos dudosos [(?) texto]

Comentarios del observador [texto en mayúsculas]

Comentarios del transcriptor [texto en minúsculas]
6.2.1. TRANSCRIPTIONS: CHECKLIST

1st Pair: Sus and Iri

- **CODE/Tape (0)**: Task 3 Checklist – English Secondary Education
- **IES Icaria**
- **Irina – IRI**: Student 14 years old 3rd ESO
- **Susana – SUS**: Student 14 years old 3rd ESO
- **Ana – AN**: Teacher
- **Mar – MAR**: Teacher- Researcher- observer

**English class**
15/05/06.
Length 4' 30

Last revision August 30th

---

### Turn 1

**Speaker:** IRI

**Transcript:**

1. **IRI**

   hello Sus

---

### Turn 2

**Speaker:** SUS

**Transcript:**

2. **SUS**

   A ver | speaker greets the audience

---

### Turn 3

**Speaker:** IRI

**Transcript:**

3. **IRI**

   yes

---

### Turn 4

**Speaker:** SUS

**Transcript:**

4. **SUS**

   este ya está hecho || introduce the topic

---

### Turn 5

**Speaker:** IRI

**Transcript:**

5. **IRI**

   yes | er | yes

---

### Turn 6

**Speaker:** SUS

**Transcript:**

6. **SUS**

   why || I think that she introduce the topic

---

### Turn 7

**Speaker:** IRI

**Transcript:**

7. **IRI**

   Why

---

### Turn 8

**Speaker:** SUS

**Transcript:**

8. **SUS**

   mm | er | I think that she introduce the topic because she | er | explain a little bit of the bullying | em | bueno | explains why it is important | a ver | she explains why bullying is important in the || al principio de la destra || = she says bullying is dangerous

---

### Turn 9

**Speaker:** IRI

**Transcript:**

9. **IRI**

   = because it make | it can make people feel very unhappy and frightened= || [reading from the script]

---

### Turn 10

**Speaker:** SUS

**Transcript:**

10. **SUS**

    Pues eso / osea | yes

---

### Turn 11

**Speaker:** IRI

**Transcript:**

11. **IRI**

    yes

---

### Turn 12

**Speaker:** SUS

**Transcript:**

12. **SUS**

    er | gives examples =no=\||

---

### Turn 13

**Speaker:** IRI

**Transcript:**

13. **IRI**

    =yes=\||

---

### Turn 14

**Speaker:** IRI

**Transcript:**

14. **IRI**

    gives recommendations\||

---

### Turn 15

**Speaker:** SUS

**Transcript:**

15. **SUS**

    = yes no\||= [interruptions]

---

### Turn 16

**Speaker:** IRI

**Transcript:**

16. **IRI**

    =yes= the boy... <3>

---

### Turn 17

**Speaker:** SUS

**Transcript:**

17. **SUS**

    she says that if you see something that they are bullying you | have to talk with | he ...= o r =

---

### Turn 18

**Speaker:** IRI

**Transcript:**

18. **IRI**

    =father and =\||

---

### Turn 19

**Speaker:** SUS

**Transcript:**

19. **SUS**

    Bueno eso\||

---

### Turn 20

**Speaker:** SUS

**Transcript:**

20. **SUS**

    Emm [[... the speaker...]]

---

### Turn 21

**Speaker:** IRI

**Transcript:**

21. **IRI**

    =the content is interesting\||

---

### Turn 22

**Speaker:** SUS

**Transcript:**

22. **SUS**

    =the content...= yes\||

---

### Turn 23

**Speaker:** IRI

**Transcript:**

23. **IRI**

    because er | talk about a ... | very important problem\||

---

### Turn 24

**Speaker:** SUS

**Transcript:**

24. **SUS**

    yes | er. | conclusion | the me. |the message is short and clear\||
IRI: yes

SUS: yes

IRI: yes because...

SUS: = questions= speaker encourages people to ask questions

IRI: yes the boy asks to the other people about...

SUS: A ver... yes he says if you have any questions we’ll try to answer them

IRI: yes people ask questions = yes... two girls

SUS: pero lo de may I ask a question? Yo no lo había oído nunca / bueno
Speaker =...= [constant interruptions and encavalcaments but they are complementing each other they are working together]

IRI: = thanks the audience=

SUS: 

IRI: the girl thanks says thank you very much for your attention

SUS: vale, the presentation is clear

IRI: the topic the topic is convincing = yes

SUS: = yes

IRI: convincing es convincente

SUS: me parece que si the speakers make a good team

IRI: the visual aids are effective

SUS: yes but...em no había muchas imágenes

IRI: no

SUS: bueno

IRI: It’s a...

SUS: the time taken is right

IRI: eso que quiere decir? [They stop the cassette to explain.]

SUS: the time taken is right [ restarting the item]

IRI: yes because the time is correct

SUS: yes but only 3 minutes bueno speaking yes pero estaba bien

IRI: xxx [ ending unclear]
TRANSCRIPTIONS
CHECKLIST
2nd pair: Jor and Cesc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Torn</th>
<th>Parlant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>JOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CESC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>JOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CESC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>JOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CESC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>JOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>CESC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>JOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>CESC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>JOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>CESC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>JOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>CESC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>JOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>CESC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>JOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>CESC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>JOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>CESC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>JOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>CESC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>JOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>CESC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
er. yes | she asks if anybody has questions||
how many people ask questions||
er. | only one girl||
false | tan tan tan [with some rhythm their conversation has become a quiz]
what||
er.| they answer | they make three questions | three different people||
>6>
come on | the next||
well | do you think that the speakers thank the audience||
yes||
<4>
cesc | the presentation was clear||
er. | yes||
are you sure||
yes||
why?
because | I am very … [very …] stupid | stressing the pauses] and I understand the.. [the..] the presentation||
ah | ok||
<5>
er. | do you think that the topic is convincing||
no||
because … [self rectification] why||
I don’t know | er. | they don’t convince me that | er. of anything | in that video||
mm | interesting point of view||
cesc | the speakers make a good team?!
er. | I don’t know || [raising intonation]
are you sure||
yes
why?
{@ because } I don’t know | yes | yes | a good team … . | it was a good team||
why||
ior | because it was .. [a good team]||
ok | you don’t give any =
= no ||
=any information ||
= no =
<7>
come on | {{F the next one }}||
the visual aids are effective

what are the visual aids

the things that appears in the screen in the screen in the back

back of the students

the wall

yes no there was a screen in the back of the presentators

ah bueno I don’t know

bueno do you think that the visual aids are effective

I don’t know

pues digas que no

por eso

si no las viste

si no las viste es que no eran efectivas

I don’t know [ raising the voice at the end]

bueno no

you are some philosophal men in the world don’t think like you

It’s very interesting but I don’t like very much your opinion

why not

all the time you ask me why not you can

are you sure

change the question

no

vale you think that the time taken by the presentators are good

the time taken is right because the presentation was not so long and not so short
**TRANSCRIPTIONS**

**CHECKLIST**

3rd pair: Osc and Joa

---

**MODE/TAPE (0) Task 3 Checklist – ENGLISH Secondary Education**

IES Icaria

Oscar – OSC; Student; 14 years old. 3rd ESO

Joana – JOA; Student 14 years old. 3rd ESO

Ana – AN; Teacher

Mar – MAR; Teacher- Researcher – Observer

**English class**

**Date:** 15/05/06.

**Length of activity:** 2'

---

**Last revision:** August 30th 2006

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parlant</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSC</td>
<td>good afternoon Joanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOA</td>
<td>I’m fine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSC</td>
<td>mm ..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOA</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSC</td>
<td>fine fine Joanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOA</td>
<td>I think</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSC</td>
<td>I think they don’t give good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOA</td>
<td>yes { @ }</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSC</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOA</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSC</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOA</td>
<td>{ @ Camela? }</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSC</td>
<td>you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOA</td>
<td>Camel a is a a singer gitane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSC</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOA</td>
<td>= Andres Calamaro = es una mierda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSC</td>
<td>change my day ..... vamos a cantar... [Their short interview ends up with Oscar singing]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This group did not feel they could do the Oral Presentation. Therefore, we have not got all their data for a good analysis and as a result they do not figure in the research. However, they showed such a good level of interaction that we decided to include them in the analysis of problematisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Parling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>DAV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>JOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MIK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4    | JOS     | and this is important because ...| er ...
| 5    | DAV     | why | why|
| 6    | JOS     | is important because.. || er... || is good for.. || understand the lesson...
| 7    | MIK     | yes | ok | the speaker explains why..... || er... he can’t finish sentences |
| 8    | JOS     | yes | yes|
| 9    | MIK     | yes | because || in the introduction || they explain to... || er... he can’t finish sentences |
| 10   | JOS     | yes | mike have a reason |
| 11   | DAV     | the speaker give examples |
| 12   | MIK     | er.. | one moment.. | one moment | = she .. ||= i remember ...[ they interrupt each other constantly but they understand each other]
| 13   | JOS     | =no= | i don’t know |
| 14   | MIK     | yes | yes | one example |
| 15   | DAV     | what example |
| 16   | JOS     | er.. | the speaker was saying | said | in the bullying | and results | calling them names = saying ...= [reads from script which shows he has understood]
| 17   | MIK     | =but | but he ... explain | the bullying.. is more...= |
| 18   | JOS     | =yes= |
| 19   | MIK     | yes |
JOS: ok

DAV: er.. { @ } || the speaker give recommendations | [he stops the tape   corrects pronunciation ] recommendations ||

JOS =yes | he says some recommendations=

MIK = yes | yes he says | you can .. || you can || = go to the director or your parents||

JOS or your friends | or the policeman... ||

DAV do you know this content is interesting ||

MIK no no no| er.._ [he can’t finish the sentence. he’s interrupted by his partner]

DAV do you think the content is interesting|| yes or no||

JOS yes | it’s interesting.. || = because | very people...= have | have this problem||

MIK =because | very people ...=

DAV conclusion || the message is short and clear || [interrupting again]

MIK one moment || = i think no...=

JOS =yes= i think yes | because is a | a short | a short commentary and . _ || he _

MIK and he explains and er... || for you the .. | troubles the... | the question | of the ... || people in the... class ||

JOS yes||

MIK ok | yes||

DAV er.. || questions | the speaker encourages people to ask questions ||

MIK =yes| yes= he says Raquel i remember | what’s your name || to the face

JOS =yes | Raquel =

DAV and people ask questions || people ask questions ||

MIK =yes | only one= only one | raquel is the only one to ask questions

JOS =yes |yes=

DAV the speaker thanks the audience? [cutting answers short]

JOS =yes= he was saying =thanks= to the audience =for listen= to this sermon (laughs)(@)||

MIK =yes= =thanks =...= =for listen=

JOS this question ya...?||

DAV the presentation is clear || what do you think||

JOS yes | I think | because he has images and xxx he _

MIK in spanish is limpia clear ||

JOS but the =traduction is =...

MIK =limpia =

JOS is | no _ | facil de entender y cosas... y directo ||
the topic is convincing

yes | more people = more people... = very interessant this topic

yes because this is a... = { (f) very important this topic} = because...

.. { (Opacoterro cortate el pelo... ) [another student interrupts them]

the speakers make a good team

[f]cortate el pelo [new interruption]

calla borras <3>

the speakers make a good team\[(f)\]

yes... [more or less= no] not more= because the boy.. [don’t speak =very good] i think=

+bueno no= no... ||=yes= no\]

and the girl is very much confident\]

yes\]

the visual aids are effective\]

no\]

why is this\]

er... because er... || no... || = the visual aids er... || are... ill... \[lots of interruptions again but they are not bothered they are building the message together\]

no... || = there is only 2 visuals= and... || are... || xxx = slowly\]

=i remember=

and the end... || the time taken is right | what do you think\]

what do you think of this topic\]

it’s an important problem | because some boys have | have a problem of bullying and...

the boys are... | very .. | angry and ....

and idiot | and idiot .. | and have problems in house and ... <3> but { (F) education| education} ...er...

the problem | the problem is for= the parents=

=tambien=... but education is a...\]

many people are dying because of ...

yes. <4> and isn’t good for| the.. | for the ... | { (F) España}

another problem is the ....

yes [Mik/]

the racismo\]

yes||
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>JOSS</td>
<td>yes [yes]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>MIK</td>
<td>in public institutes many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>JOSS</td>
<td>=black=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>DAV</td>
<td>well the time taken is right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>MIK</td>
<td>did you like this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>JOS</td>
<td>yes this is a ..._</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>MIK</td>
<td>is it difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td>I say no...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>MIK</td>
<td>yes yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>DAVE</td>
<td>well</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2.2. TRANSCRIPTIONS: REHEARSAL

1st Pair: Sus and Jen

REHEARSAL WITH ANOTHER PAIR AS AUDIENCE

| Code/Tape (0) | 0 | REHEARSAL: ORAL PRESENTATION WITH ANOTHER PAIR AS AUDIENCE.
| English Secondary Education. IES Icaria |
| Topic: Ancient Greece |
| Jenny - JEN; student. 14 years old. 3rd year ESO |
| Susana – SUS; student. 14 years old. 3rd year ESO |
| Oscar – OSC; student 14 years old 3rd year ESO (listening) |
| Joanna – JOA; student 14 years old 3rd year ESO (listening) |
| Ana – AN; Teacher |
| Mar – MAR; Teacher- researcher- transcription writer- observer |
| English class |
| Date: 16/05/06. |
| Length: 5'48 |

Last revision: August 10th

1. **JEN**
   hello| we are Susana and Jenny and we are going to talk about the Greek and her history | his philosophy | her food and his art \ er | we think that this topic is interesting because you | you learn more things that you didn’t know and | it’s | {tp no se\ e} | {tf say something (susana)} [[uses Spanish and raises her voice to call for help]

2. **SUS**
   no nada | er about | about_ |

3. **JEN**
   Greece is a very difficult place to live | it’s a more difficult place to live than egypt [[self-rectification] because the soil is not very good to put their food | and there is not much water \ so until the year 55000 before christ| people didn’t come to Greece || in the Greek history there are 3 ages very important| the stone age the er | the bronze age | er | and the iron age | that these ages are different ages| in | in in here \|| [speaks in a good natural rhythm with correct pauses]

4. **SUS**
   ok| about the Greek philosophy|| in the ancient Greek er | philosophy is dominated by three very famous men | Socrates | Plato and Aristotel ||

5. **JEN**
   er | Socrates was the first | was the first [self-rectification]of the three great ancient philosophers he was born in atenas athens in 469 before { (@)christ } and he has not | he was not from a very good family and teach Plato em philosophy \ er \ often he make people angry and sometimes they even tried to bet him up \ about Plato | he was born in Athens in 429 before Christ er... | he was from a very wealthy and aristocratic family \ when Plato was young he went to listen Socrates and learn about and learn a lot of things from Socrates \ after a while | he write his ideas and opinions of the philosophy ||

6. **SUS**
   about Aristotle / Aristotle was not originally from Athens \ he was not from a rich family like Plato | and when Aristotle was a young man | about 350 before Christ | he went to study at Plato’s academy \ Aristotle was more interested in science than Socrates or Plato\ maybe because his father was a doctor || Aristotle was especially interested in biology | in classifying plants and animals | in a way that would make sense || [reads from text but manages to keep a good rhythm ]

and er | the Greek food had all sorts of religious and philosophical meaning | they believed that it was wrong to kill and eat a tame| domesticated animal without sacrificing | it | to the gods \ the Greeks ate mainly the mediterran diet | possibly they ate more fish than most other mediterranean people \ and | about the Greek art / the Greek art is mainly in four forms| architecture| sculpture| painting and painting pottery \ architecture includes houses| religious buildings| and public buildings \ sculpture includes | small figurines and life size statues | and also tombstones \ the paintings were painted on walls as decorations for rooms | like murals or walls paintings \ and they painted pottery from all periods of Greek history ||

7. **JEN**
   we recomenete to study er | more about this | this topic because i’ts very interesting and there is more a lot of information that can be more interesting er. <4> then | have you any questions about Greece ||

8. **JOA**
   why Socrates| Platon and Aristotile was | important | persons in Greece ||

9. **JEN**
   er | because they are...er ... great ancient philosophers that permanent on the history of Greece { (qui)} any more questions ||

10. **JOA**
    no||

11. **JEN**
    well | thank you for your attention { (qui)} and good | good morning ||
2nd Pair: Jor and Pau

CODI/CINTA (0) Rehearsal: Oral Presentation with another pair as audience – English Secondary Education – IES Icaria

TOPIC: Ancient Egypt

Jordi – JOR; student, 14 years old. 3rd year ESO
Pau – PAU; student, 14 years old. 3rd year ESO
Irina – IRI; student, 14 years old. 3rd year ESO (audience)
Françès – CESC; student, 14 years old. 3rd year ESO (audience)
Ana – AN; teacher
Mar – MAR; Teacher - Researcher - Observer

English Class
Date: 16/05/06.
Length: 4'11''
Last revision: August 30th

---

**Rehearsal Notes**

**Jor**

Hello ladies and gentlemen, we’re here to talk about ancient Egypt and their culture. The civilization of ancient Egypt existed for over 3000 years. They discovered a lot of things and this is important! The people of ancient Egypt built mud brick homes. Most ancient Egyptians worked as farmers, craftsmen, and scribes. In Egypt, there were two types of land. The black land was the fertile land on the banks of the Nile. The ancient Egyptian used this land for growing their crops. The red land was the barren desert that protected Egypt from the two sides. Always the ancient Egyptians believed in many different gods and goddesses, each one had their own role. The most important gods and goddesses were Amon, Anubis, Horus, Isis, Osiris, Ra, and Set.

**Iri**

¿Qué quiere decir Ra?

**Jor**

Egyptians developed a method of preserving bodies so they would remain lifelike. The process included embalming the bodies, enwrapping them in strips of linen, and the ancient Egyptians believed in many different gods and goddesses. Each one had their own role. The most powerful person in the ancient Egypt was the pharaoh. He was a political and religious leader of the Egyptian people. He was the ruler of upper and lower Egypt.

**Cesc**

May I ask a question?

**Jor**

The god on earth is the question at the end.

**Cesc**

May I ask a question?

**Jor**

The question at the end.

**Cesc**

Can I ask a question?

**Jor**

{Yes I can. What’s the name of the pharaoh?}

**Cesc**

{The questions at the end.}

**Pau**

The ancient Egyptian built pyramids as tombs for pharaohs and their queens. The pharaohs were buried in the pyramids made from the beginning of the old kingdom to the middle kingdom for example the keops pyramid.

**Cesc**

Can I make a question? How many...

**Pau**

The ancient Egyptian believed that temples were the homes of gods and goddesses. Every temple was dedicated to a god or goddess. The temples were made of stone so that they would last forever.

**Cesc**

Can I ask a question?

**Jor**

{Shut up Cesc.}

**Pau**

No. At the end the question. {You at the end.}

**Cesc**

Si tu di lo que quieras pero si no sabes lo que van...

**Pau**

Would you like to ask...

---

91
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CESC</th>
<th>que vol dir_</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| PAU  | would you like to ask some questions_/
| CESC | i want to ask some questions_/|
| PAU  | ok /
| CESC | what | what is mudbrick homes_/|
| JOR/ | that is | casas de fang_/|
| PAU/ | |
| IRI  | |
| CESC | Yes yes, and what is .... mm.. crops_/|
| JOR  | Que/|
| CESC | Crops /|
| JOR  | plantaciones de maiz /|
| IRI  | doneu les gracies| si us plau /|
| JOR  | thank you for listen_/|
| PAU  | any questions_/|
| CESC | Yes | er you .... /|
| JOR  | {(f) thank you} /|
| CESC | Er...
| JOR  | {(f) Good bye ... }/|
hi everybody | I’m oscar { ( @) and she’s } my mate ||

We’re here to speak of ancient Egypt ||

er… we think that ancient Egypt is important | because is one of the roots of the english | and this culture of Egyptians is more curious || [ she is creating new lexis probably from Spanish]

er… can you explain the Egyptian life / Joana /

mm… the people of Egypt work with his hands | they build houses with mud brick | these are materials of the this time | and they produce food | and Egyptians products and different materials \ they… | er… in the life of ancient Egypt \ the Nile and the fertile land are the most important elements | because the floodings of Nile | helped the soil and crops good surface \ ( P: corta corta ) { ( @) } || [ she is having problems with complicated vocabulary]

er… the the Egyptian live | in two different zones of Egypt | the black land around the nile | and the red land around the desert \ are too many gods and godesses | and Joana explain we the gods \ [Good interaction between speakers]

the Egyptians [Reading from text] believe that adore this gods | mean culture and normal life | some gods and godesses are /Anubis she guides the soul of the to paradise| Isis the mother of gods |Osiris the god of deads| Ka god of the creator | Ra god the soul | Set god of the sun |etc \ and |my partner Oscar | explain the mummification \[

the ancient Egyptians [Reading from text] buried their dead bodies in coffins | to protect their bodies from wild animals and insects | later the Egyptian developed a method of preserving bodies | so they would remain life like \ the bodies weren’t exposed to the hot dry sun of the desert | and the Egyptians had a…a person same as king | who called pharaos | lord of two lands | and he was the most powerful person in Egypt | he was the most powerful person in Egypt \ can you explain we the pyramids Joana /?

the [the ancient Egyptian built pyramids] as tombs for pharaos and queens | now today there are about eighty pyramids from ancient Egypt \[

and the temples\[

em… | every temple was dedicado to a god or goddess were | pray the pharaos \ the last temple was made of stones they would last forever \[

ok | the civi | the civilization of ancient Egypt | lasted for over three thousand years | during this time | in Egypt were many change of culture religion and … | etc < 3> | and the trades Joana | Yo ya he hablado del faraón \ [the pair is not coordinated]

every craftsmen’s life style and social depended of the quality of his skills and experience | for this some craftsmen had a more difficult life than others \ [Some problems of pronunciation]

for last | the ancient Egyptian think that it was very important | to record and guard the information about religion and government | they invented written script to record this information | they used papyrus scrolls with hyroglific script || you have any questions /

yes em… | all the people in Egypt believe in the god and the godesses\[

yes | in the ancient Egypt believe in a lot of goddess | it’s and they believe | em… one of this is one of this function em… [some difficulties when trying to answer]

any more questions /

yes | what characteristics have the gods and all the goddesses in Egypt /

em… | they have.. | mm some parts of animals \
6.2.3. TRANSCRIPTIONS: ORAL PRESENTATION

1st Pair: Sus and Jen

CODE/TAPE (2) Oral Presentacion – English Secondary education – IES Icaria

TOPIC: Ancient Greece
Student: Susana, student; 14 years old. 3rd year ESO
Teacher: Ana, teacher
Researcher-Obs: Mar, teacher - researcher- observer

English classroom
Date: 18/05/06.
Length of talk: 5'12''

Last reviewed: August 10th

JEN ah...||
OSC any more questions || [Rising entonation with a tint of irony]
JEN no no || it’s right ||
OSC right | thank you | persons | bye bye ||

1.9

Torn parlant

1 JEN hello|| we are Susana and Jenny and we are here to talk about the Greek ||and his history ||his philosophy and the food ||about the history of the greek er...|| it was difficult to live in Greece because Greece have || have the land was not good to culture food and there was there was.. no water er.. so people didn’t come to Greece until the year 35000 [sounds unsure of the date] er.. before Christ || er.. in the history of Greece there are three ages|| the stone age|| the bronze age || and the iron age || that have many years in them|| well || we have pictures of the three ages||

2 SUS about the art of the Greece em... || there are four four important things|| the architecture || the sculpture || and the painting || and the painted pottery || in the architecture are er...|| something important || that are the houses || the religious buildings and the public buildings || in the sculpture are the || the small figurines || the statues etc|| in the painting the Greeks painted on the walls er...|| like a decoration of the rooms and like murals and wallpaper and painted pottery is a thing that|| that you paint bueno || the greeks paint in a || in a... sculpture or something like that [Frees herself from the written text and explains in her own words] and these are in all the periods of the Greece about the philosophy || in Greece are || (p) three || three || rising intonation to confirm with partner three || important persons || that are Socrates || Plato and Aristoteles||

3 JEN about Socrates || Socrates was || was from athens and born in the year four || 4069 before christ || and he wasn’t from a wealthy family || and teach the people to make him ask him questions about philosophy to || to be more || different || well || the... he makes sometimes people angry because of a critical character || [ADDS HER OWN COMMENT ] and Plato was little|| he born in athens the year er... 4029 and... || he was from a wealthy and aristocratic family and || when he was young | went to | wrote to || Socrates to... | that teach her || to know more about philosophy|| but always || plato write his ideas and his theories about philosophy|| [SHE HAS A PEDAGOGICAL MANNER OF EXPLAINING]

4 SUS and Aristotele || he was not er...|| original from Athens and... || there is not || he is not || from a very rich family like Plato || and they are more interested in science || than Plato and Socrates || [adds explanation] maybe because his father was a doctor || and they are especially interested in biology || in classifying plants and animals || in a way that makes sense|| <2> ok || if you have any questions||

5 audience no|| no||

6 <4>

7 Student from audience I || would you like to go to Greece||

8 JEN yes || yes||

9 SUS yes||

10 Same st. [lp] why|| Why||

11 JEN because it’s a beau... || it’s a beau... || [P que has preguntado || [she is so surprised by the question she asks in Spanish to reconfirm what she has heard]
**Si t’agradaria anar a Grecia?**

**Another student**

Ah: //yes// it’s a beautiful place and a very interesting culture. [gives her opinion of Greece] yes

**JEN**

any more questions?

**SUS**

well || thank you for your attention||

**JEN**

clapping and cheering

---

**ORAL PRESENTATION**

2nd Pair: Jor and Pau

**CODE/TAPE (2) Oral Presentation – English Secondary education – IES Icaria**

**TOPIC:** Ancient Egypt

(Jordi – JOR; student; 14 years old. 3rd year ESO

Pau – PAU; student; 14 years old. 3rd year ESO

Ana – AN; teacher

Mar – MAR; teacher – researcher – observer

English classroom

DATE: 18/05/06.

Length of talk: 3’13’’

Last reviewed: August 10th

---

**Torn parlant Comentari**

1. **PAU**
   - hello my name is Paolo and he is Adrià

2. **JOR**
   - hello

3. **PAU**
   - we are here to talk about ancient Egypt we think that know about the ancient Egypt is important because it is a civilization that lasted for 3000 years [Good rhythm]

4. **JOR**
   - yes er... geography Egypt the ancient Egypt was divided in two parts the black land and the red land the black land was the fertile land all over the Nile and it was the land er... where the Egyptians put it to land and well the crops and the other land was the desert that protected the Egypt in two sides er... the red land was important because er... it protected Egypt and it was a very poor civilization for the black land self-rectification red land [JOR is a bit nervous and his speech is less clear with some repetitions and rectifications]

5. **PAU**
   - the ancient Egyptians built pyramids for the pharaohs and the queens in the pyramids the pharaohs were buried and there are pyramids of different sizes and [PP xxx] (forgets) the ancient Egyptians also built temples the ancient Egyptians think that the temples were the homes of the gods and goddesses each one had their own role and there was Anubis Horus Isis Osiris Set and Ra]

6. **JOR**
   - the pharaoh was the most powerful person in ancient Egypt and he controls em [repetition while he is thinking about content] the the the the political and the religion and he was the representation of god on earth

7. **PAU**
   - the ancient Egyptians were they have different er... different types of writing self-rectification the most famous is the hieroglyphic that... hieroglyphic that... [forgets what he wants to explain about the hieroglyphic script and cuts down content] there are three or more types of writing but there are not so famous

8. **JOR**
   - the mummification was an aid for preserving the body of the dead person and it was utilised for the rich men in Egypt Any questions

9. **audience**
   - no no no ([@]

10. **JOR**
    - thank you very much

11. **audience**
    - clapping <3

---
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Hi everybody, I’m Oscar and she is Joana, my partner and Joana, can you explain the Egyptian life?

We are here to talk about the ancient Egypt because we think it’s important to learn about ancient nations and the Egyptians are one of the roots of the English.

And now can you explain the Egyptian life? [Oscar is nervous and repeats the same question he is trying to follow the same pattern as in the rehearsal]

The Egyptians live in two parts of Egypt, the black land around the Nile and the red land around the desert.

The ancient Egyptians believed in a lot of gods and goddesses, each one with his function and is represented with many animals and plants, for example, Ra, Isis, Horus and others.

And the Egyptians buried their deads in coffins to protect them and to protect the bodies after the mummification includes embalming to protect the bodies.

The pharaoh has the most power on the Egypt, he is a political and religious leader and he recollected taxes and xxx the pharaoh and the queens are buried in the pyramids.

The craftmens in ancient Egypt were skilled labourers and very often well respected and had a good lifestyle, the objects made by craftsmen are used in temples and in the normal life of Egyptians.

And finally the ancient Egyptians think it’s so important to record this information in of government and religion to the future, they use papyrus in hieroglyphic scripts, thanks everybody, any questions?
6.2.4. TEACHER’S REPORTS

Diagnòstic del grup

Curs: 3er  Grup: B  Horari i calendari setmanal: Dilluns 15:30 Dimarts 11:30 Dijous 10:00 Divendres 10:00
Tipus de crèdit o assignatura: obligatòria (en aquest centre la fan tots els alumnes d’aquest curs)

Criteris de formació del grup:

a) grup-classe
b) grup especial per a aquest crèdit; selecció per
   nivell d’anglès
c) grup de formació aleatòria (p.ex. mig grup-classe)
d) grup especial per a aquest crèdit; selecció per
   rendiment acadèmic general
e) grup especial per a aquest crèdit /assignatura; selecció per
   demanda dels alumnes o families.
f) ...

Equipament:

Gravadores SI .......... quants? ......6..... NO
Ordinadors SI ...... quants? Un per cada dos alumnes..... NO / altres
   (explicar)
Connexió a Internet SI ...... quants? ...Tots... NO / altres
   (explicar)..........................
Canó SI ...... NO / altres (explicar) .........................
Càmera de vídeo SI ...... NO / altres (explicar) ..........................

Diagnòstic de grup:

Nombre d’alumnes: ...19........ Nois: ...12........ Noies: ..7........ Edat: ..14/15.....
Nombre d’alumnes repetidors: ..3........ Nois: ..2........ Noies: ....1......
Perfil lingüístic dels alumnes (llengua familiar; alumnes d’escolarització recent en
   Catalunya; estudien altres llengües estrangeres, apart d’anglès?
Català i Castellà. Cap alumne d’incorporació recent. Alguns fan francès i/o alemany
com a segona llengua.

Experiència prèvia dels alumnes d’aquest grup en ensenyaments AICLE a
   professor o altres professors?
Uns cinc alumnes tenen experiència AICLE des de Primària. La resta, tots menys tres
   alumnes tenen experiència AICLE a Primer Cicle de l’ESO, les assignatures eren de CV
   a Primer d’ESO, segon d’ESO i 3er d’ESO. Els professors eren diferents, però a classe
   d’anglès com Crèdit Comú la majoria van fer 2on d’ESO i ara, 3er d’ESO amb la
   mateixa professora.
Com veus el grup (nivell d’anglès, interès per la història, interès per l’anglès, hàbits de treball en parelles, etc.)?
El grup ho veig bastant motivat per l’anglès i per la resta d’assignatures, excepte per els tres alumnes que repeteixen i que no fan res tampoc aquest segon any.

Com preveus que sigui la introducció de la activitat?
Bé, sempre que expliquem bé en què consistirà.

INFORME A LA CONCLUSIÓ DE LA PRESENTACIÓ ORAL

Data: 9 maig 2006
Tema / materials: EGIPTE I GRÈCIA Tasca: Presentació Oral
Quantes sessions prèvies de preparació per la Presentació Oral has necessitat?
S’ha fet la tasca prèvia de negociació de criteris d’valuació? Si
Data/es?: 9 maig.
Duració? Una sessió Què s’ha fet?: Els alumnes havien de decidir què es necessitava per a ser un bon comunicador.
Com s’ha fet? A partir d’unes activitats orals fetes en parelles i després en grups de quatre.
Han assajat? . Si Data/es?: ..16 de maig......... Duració?: ..Una sessió..............
Què s’ha fet?: Els/les alumnes treballaven en parelles i en grups de quatre per explicar-se què havien de exposar oralment.
Com s’ha fet? Durant la sessió de preparació del text els alumnes s’enregistraven la veu en gravadores i treballaven el full d’activitats on constaven els punts fonamentals d’una bona presentació oral, com ara: presentació, introducció del tòpic, punts importants, etc.
Altres activitats prèvies ?Els/les alumnes havien visualitzat un vídeo d’una parella d’alumnes on feien una presentació oral sobre Bullying.
Data/es?: 11 i 12 de maig. Duració?: dues sessions.
Què s’ha fet?: Els/les alumnes veien uns tres minuts d’un vídeo, un cop acabat feien una tasca de listening, a continuació una activitat de matching sobre el contingut del vídeo que havien vist i finalment es corregia tota l’activitat, per posar en comú totes les opinions del alumnes.
Com s’ha fet? És necessitava un vídeo, els fulls del contingut del vídeo i les tasques d’aprenentatge .El vídeo es visualitzava dos cops, un primer cop sense còpia i una segona vegada amb la còpia per fer el listening.
Com ha reaccionat el grup? Problèmes? El grup ha reaccionat molt positivament, els hi ha agradat força, al començament els hi costava una mica d’entendre tot el que havien de fer i no mostraven molta motivació però després de veure la parella parlant sobre bullying i veure que eren alumnes com ells mateixos, van demostrar molt més d’interès i volien fer la seva presentació millor que la que havien vist . Alguns alumnes no van volgué fer les seves presentacions orals perquè pensaven que no els hi sortiria bé. Vaig insistir-los una mica, però al final vaig respectar la seva decisió.
Els principals problemes, han estat, com sempre qüestions tècniques, encara que contem amb tots els medis tècnics, si aquests no funcionen com s’havia d’esperar, fa que les tasques no surtin com tu t’esperaves, sobre tot per la manca de temps que tot això
comporta i perquè els alumnes se senten desmotivats i es oposen nerviosos perquè no admeten cap inconvenient inesperat.

**Quantes sessions has necessitat per portar a terme i concloure la Presentació Oral? Quantes parelles?** Sis sessions hem treballat amb cinc parelles per fer la presentació oral.

**Data/es:** 18 de maig.

**Duració?:** Una sessió

**Què s’ha fet?** Varem portar una gravadora per sentir la veu de les parella i una càmera digital de vídeo per enregistrar la imatge.

**Com s’ha fet?** Mentre una professora enregistrava la imatge els alumnes sortien en parelles davant la classe, la resta de grup escoltaven mentre omplien el full d’avaluació, l’altra professora escoltava i observava que tot anés correctament.

**Com ha reaccionat el grup?** Molt bé en general, deien que ara es sentien més segurs a l’hora de parlar davant el públic i que no és tant difícil parlar en anglès si tens preparat un tema. També pensaven que d’aquesta manera sentien que el seu anglès era més efectiu i s’adonaven que sabien més del que pensaven.

Quins entrebancs trobem els professors durant la implementació de les tasques, tant de gestió com de comunicació amb l'alumnat?

**Dificultats:** Costa bastant, al començament que els alumnes entenguin de què va el tema. No entenen prou bé quina és la finalitat de les tasques prèvies.

Estratègies docents per a resoldre les dificultats: Intentar sempre explicar i motivar dient que és molt interessant el que fan el que diuen i que els servirà per quan hagin de fer presentacions “de veritat” davant un públic que no coneguin.

**Quins entrebancs troben els alumnes en la resolució de les tasques en quant a la comprensió i la producció de missatges en llenguatge acadèmic?**

Dificultats. No sempre fan servir un llenguatge de qualitat, segurament perquè necessiten més temps, més activitats, més enregistraments i que ells es puguin escoltar i veure posteriorment el que van fer per fer una auto-avaluació.

**Se’n surten? Com ho aconsegueixen?** Sí que se’n surten, ho aconsegueixen perquè les professores han estat insistint i ajudant tota l’estona, perquè sempre trobes algun alumne que ho vol fer bé i llavors n’hi ha d’altres que volen aconseguir-ho també, però com sempre és una tasca que costa d’aconseguir perquè no tots els alumnes són receptius, o perquè voler fer activitats a les tardes és molt complicat, perquè els alumnes estan cansats i no volen tenir classe a les tardes, etc.

**Valoració:**

**Com valores l’experiència feta fins ara? Què destacaries?** La meva valoració final és positiva, tinc pensat continuar fent presentacions sempre que els temes siguin adients. El que més m’agrada’t o destacaria és veure com encara que no siguin tots el alumnes, hi hagi la meitat que se’n surten molt bé i que es senten molt més segurs i motivats. Penso que aprenen anglès.
6.2.5. FIELD NOTES

COMMENTS AFTER WATCHING THE VIDEO

After watching the oral presentation “Bullying” on the video there was a short interaction between the teacher, the observer and the class in general. These are some of the comments the students made. Unfortunately we have not got their names.

| a) | I find them too serious and they don’t move at all. |
| b) | Si la noia feia gestos. |
| c) | Sembla que s’hagin après el treball de memòria |
| d) | They do not move from their first position |
| e) | No hi ha visual aids |
| f) | Si que hi ha i les fotos que? |
| g) | Ho fan bastant bé |
| h) | A mi m’agraden, jo no podría fer ho tant bé |
| i) | I think they are talking to the camera…. |
| j) | No, they are talking to the other students. |
| k) | està bé |
| l) | I don’t like the topic. Now everybody speaks about bullying and violence and this is something that has always existed. |

TRANSCRIPTIONS OF THE STUDENTS NEGOTIATIONS OF CRITERIA OF QUALITY

This is a transcription of some of the comments students were making as they were trying to negotiate the criteria of quality when making a good presentation. We have selected some of the ones that seemed most interesting and they will cover all the twenty items. We would like to include them as evidence of the students’ negotiation and because of their interest.

1. I don’t know what we have to do with this|| did you understand the teacher?|
2. yes|| we have to choose the cards of a good speaker|| and the cards for a bad speaker||
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>IRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>JEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>sì</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>JOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>usa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>ah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>six</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>OSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>seven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>ah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>nine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>RUB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>ten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>eleven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>SUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>IRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>thirteen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>that's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>JOA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

ah vale

speaks clearly

hesitates stops constantly

three does not read

four uses appropriate gestures

usa gestos apropiados

ah si vale

looks at the audience when he/she speaks

speaks very softly

yes but...

seven shows off

it means that the person is doing things so that the others notice him

ah hacer el tonto

right is not arrogant

tries to be funny

this is bad

because he makes the others laugh

but a presentation is serious

dresses appropriately

put is here

speaks fast

bad speaker

good speaker

good speaker

memorises the text

that's good

why not

because if you memorise you speak like a parrot

---
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36. OSC yes \{but you learn it and …\} bueno lo asimilas y lo cuentas con tus palabras

37. JOA but this is not memorise

38. JEN fourteen uses blackboard \{reading\}… yes \{this is a good speaker\}

39. ZAI yes\{ here\}

40. ALE fifteen \{hides behind the others \{reading\}\}

41. RUB se esconde

42. ALE yes\{ this is bad\}

43. JOR sixteen \{is monotonous\} \{reading\}bad speaker

44. PAU Seventeen \{takes the presentation seriously \{reading\} good speaker

45. JOR yes\}

46. MIK eighteen \{shows confidence \{reading\}\}

47. JOS que vol dir \{shows confidence\}

48. MIK que esté seguro de si mismo \{que muestra confianza\}

49. JOS good speaker

50. SUS nineteen \{tries to provoke people \{reading\}\}

51. IRI bad speaker

52. SUS why bad \{A vegades es bo provocar\}

53. IRI si però no en una presentació

54. SUS vinga la darrera \{twenty\} is atletic \{reading\}

55. IRI ni una ni l’altra \{neutral\}

56. SUS finish teacher…. 