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ABSTRACT

The present quali-quantitative study explores the attitudes of teenagers and their level of language anxiety when working with Cooperative language learning (CLL) methodologies and activities in the Valparaiso region of Chile in order to promote students’ oral communication. The intervention was carried out with 30 students of year 11 at Divina Maestra High School located in Villa Alemana, a subsidized school. Three CLL activities were implemented 5 sessions. Then, in order to find out students’ perception of CLL regarding speaking activities, an individual questionnaire was applied. The results of this study concluded that the level of language anxiety is decreased when using CLL methodologies. Notwithstanding, students made positive and negative comments. Some of the positive comments that they made were regarding to group work stating that there was less nervousness when talking in groups and that they could learn from each other, among others. The negative comments made were related to the instructional aspects that teachers have to follow at school such as the misunderstood concept of group work, lazy students, same level of stress when talking in groups or in front of the class. Further research is conducted to explore the application of CLL in other contexts such as public schools or students with different learning styles. Besides, there is a need to research on what are the impressions of school principals or head teachers when using CLL methodology, as from the present study arose from students that teachers are not always willing to incorporate new methodologies.

Keywords: Language anxiety, teenagers, Cooperative Language Learning (CLL), teachers, group work.
RESUMEN

El presente estudio cualitativo-cuantitativo explora las actitudes de adolescentes y su nivel de ansiedad del idioma al trabajar bajo la metodología de aprendizaje cooperativo y sus actividades en la región de Valparaíso en Chile para poder promover de esta forma la comunicación oral entre alumnos en inglés. La intervención fue llevada a cabo con la participación de 30 alumnos de tercero medio en el Liceo Divina Maestra, subvencionado, ubicado en Villa Alemana. Tres actividades de metodología de aprendizaje cooperativo fueron aplicadas en cinco sesiones. Además, para poder identificar la percepción de los alumnos al trabajar con metodologías de aprendizaje cooperativo, los alumnos completaron un cuestionario. Los resultados de este estudio concluyeron que el nivel de ansiedad del idioma es disminuido cuando se trabaja en aprendizaje cooperativo. Sin embargo, los alumnos hicieron comentarios positivos y negativos. Algunos de los comentarios positivos que ellos hicieron están relacionados a trabajo en grupo, menos nervios al hablar en grupos, aprender unos de otros, y otros comentarios. Los comentarios negativos están relacionados a las instrucciones que los profesores deben seguir en una escuela, erróneo concepto de trabajos en grupo, estudiantes pasivos, mismo nivel de estrés al hablar en grupos o en frente de la clase. Se sugiere seguir investigando sobre la aplicación del método cooperativo en otros contextos como escuelas municipales y con estudiantes con otros estilos de aprendizaje. Además, para conocer las impresiones de directores de colegio y profesores jefes al usar el método cooperativo, ya que según estudios previos, algunos profesores no están dispuestos a nuevas metodologías.

Palabras claves: Ansiedad del idioma, adolescentes, Aprendizaje cooperativo, profesores, trabajo grupal.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Second Language Acquisition, especially English, has received a lot of research attention. English is recognized all over the world as a universal language for teaching, learning, business, and other uses. Krashen (1981) claimed that Second Language Acquisition (SLA) is very similar to the process that children use when acquiring first language. Just as a first language, it requires meaningful interaction in the target language and natural communication, in which speakers are concerned with the messages they convey and understand regarding the forms.

According to Al Hosni (2004), speaking is the active use of language to express meaning, and for young learners, the spoken language is the medium through which a new language is encountered, understood, practiced, and learnt. However, speaking problems can be major challenges to effective foreign language learning and communication (Al Hosni, 2014).

The Chilean Ministry of Education (Chilean acronym MINEDUC) is always seeking for new and useful methodologies to improve the teaching of the English subject. In the last two decades, MINEDUC has suggested the use of the Communicative Approach in which Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) is involved. The intention is to improve the speaking skills and thus make students communicate in the target language.

It is the researcher´s perception, from her experience as a teacher and student, that teachers tend to use traditional teaching methods when it comes to teaching English. It seems that there is a tendency to strictly follow what a coursebook suggests without much adaptation to students’ realities, experiences and contexts. The coursebooks provided my
MINEDUC focus mainly on reading and writing having some activities that deal with listening. This evidences a contradiction regarding the aim set by MINEDUC (2012) of improving speaking skills as the speaking skill is given scarce or no attention at all.

In Chile, English is taught as a foreign language. Unfortunately, standardized tests that have been applied to measure students’ knowledge of English at a national level (SIMCE, Spanish acronym for Educational Quality Measurement System) have shown weak results. Additionally, SIMCE does not measure speaking skills, so even if the results were positive, these would not reflect students’ oral performance. It seems sensible to think that students need to work on their oral skills in order to show they can communicate in the target language. In line with this, and in his own words, Al Hosni (2014) comments the following:

“EFL learners, no matter how much they know about the English language, still face many speaking difficulties. Many studies have indicated that oral language development has largely been neglected in the classroom, and most of the time, oral language in the classroom is used more by teachers than by students. However, oral language, even as used by the teacher, hardly ever functions as a means for students to gain knowledge and explore ideas. To develop the knowledge to deal with oral communication problems in an EFL context, researchers first need to know the real nature of those problems and the circumstances in which ‘problems’ are constructed” (Al Hosni, 2014, p.22).

Prior research has acknowledged the fact that the speaking skill, especially in EFL contexts, is the cause of language anxiety as students do not feel comfortable when speaking in a foreign language. The fear of speaking may be related to a variety of complex
psychological constructs such as communication apprehension, self-esteem, and social anxiety (Young, 1990). Therefore, there is a need to address this issue.

The purpose of this quali-quantitative exploratory research is to promote speaking skills through group work with young learners and to evaluate group work methodologies for developing speaking skills and for promoting a positive attitude to oral language in the L2.

Its objective is to investigate group work as a tool to reduce anxiety and observe its impact. Additionally, the present study seeks to determine students’ perceptions when working in groups instead of working and speaking alone. Therefore, some of the activities that are going to be used during this research are group work, pair work, role-play activities, free talk in groups and activities in which individual work is avoided.

As mentioned above, the goals of this study are related to promoting speaking skills through group work and to apply CLL activities to promote speaking, as well as reducing language anxiety when speaking.

1.1 Identification of the problem

As stated in the introduction, the changes in the Chilean curriculum added the implementation of the Communicative Approach. Under this approach, the Curriculum strongly suggests the use of Cooperative Language Learning, Task-Based Language Teaching, The Natural Approach and Content-Based Instruction. Any of these can be used in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom (MINEDUC, 2012, p.1). Additionally, what the curriculum states about the Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) is related to the study of a foreign language and as a useful methodology to develop the speaking skill.
In Chile, most students feel anxious when speaking in front of their classmates or in public events, even in their mother tongue; therefore, there is a need to cope with the levels of anxiety as they tend to increase when speaking. In a foreign language, a speaker has to look for suitable lexis, has to construct an appropriate syntactic structure and needs to use a comprehensible accent, plus the demanding tasks of thinking and organizing ideas and expressing them at the same time (Young, 1990). This is not without concern when facing the English subject at school.

Oral activities are difficult to be carried out when teaching English in Chile. According to Ur (1996), there are many factors that cause anxiety or difficulties in speaking: 1. Inhibition: Students are worried about making mistakes, fearful of criticism, or simply shy. 2. Nothing to say: Students have no motive to express themselves. 3. Low or uneven participation: Only one participant can talk at a time because of large classes and the tendency of some learners to dominate, while others speak very little or not at all. 4. Mother-tongue use: Learners who share the same mother tongue tend to use it because it is easier and because learners feel less exposed if they are speaking their mother tongue (Ur, 1996 as cited in Al Hosni, 2014).

Additionally, it must be mentioned that there is a need to use techniques to cope with and/or lower the levels of anxiety in order to promote oral communication. Finally, this research intends to find out whether group work would impact positively in oral performance.
1.2 Statement of the problem

This study attempts to establish the connection between speaking skills and group work together to find out what are students’ perceptions regarding these two variables. It has already been mentioned that the levels of anxiety play a paramount part when speaking in a foreign language. Young (1990), claims that the fear of speaking in L2 may be due to a variety of complex psychological constructs, among which communication apprehension, self-esteem and social anxiety are present.

It seems imperative to accomplish the aim of MINEDUC regarding the speaking skills in the Chilean context. In this regard, and as it was stated in the introduction of this research, cooperative language learning, and its principles as well, is proposed by the Ministry of Education to promote oral skills. For the same reason, this study is based on the application of CLL to reduce language anxiety and to promote students’ participation in oral activities.

1.3 Research questions

Not without doubt, many questions arose when the researcher sought for addressing the problematic of improving oral production within the context of high school teenagers. Nonetheless, the following questions comprise them all:

- Does group work methodology help reduce oral language anxiety in EFL high school learners?
- What are EFL learners’ perceptions of the use of group work to promote positive attitudes towards oral language in the L2?
1.4. Objectives

Having stated the research questions, the following objectives were set in order to guide this study:

General Objectives:

- To promote speaking skills through group work with teenage learners using CLL.
- To identify students perceptions when using CLL activities.

The specific objectives in the study are the following:

- To explore the application of CLL in the Chilean context.
- To evaluate group work methodologies for developing speaking skills and for promoting positive attitude to oral language in the L2.

1.5 Literature review

Language anxiety and its impact has had an increased attention recently and all over the world, specially to find out its impact on foreign language and, at the same time, seeking for methods and strategies to be able to reduce it.

In this section of the thesis the state of the arts will be presented in regards to language anxiety and its relation to oral performance.

The first study considered was “Examining EFL students’ foreign language speaking anxiety”. This study was carried out by Çağatay (2015) at a Turkish state university, in Turkey. The participants were 147 Turkish students at the English preparatory program of a state university. A questionnaire was administered to the students from each proficiency level to explore their Foreign Language Speaking Anxiety (FLSA). The research questions implemented were: 1) Do the students in English preparatory program experience foreign language speaking anxiety (FLSA) in language classrooms? If so, what
is the level of it? 2) Does the level of foreign language speaking anxiety (FLSA) differ according to gender? 3) Is there a significant difference in terms of FLSA among the students according to their proficiency levels? 4) Do EFL students’ FLSA differ depending on whether students speak with a native speaker or in front of a class? The results of the first research question revealed that EFL students undergo a moderate level of FLSA. The second question as to the gender difference on FLSA presents that female students seem to be highly anxious when speaking. This might stem from the teachers’ attitude towards the students. The third question result pinpoints that the proficiency level of the students does not impact students’ anxiety level. The last finding points out that speaking with a native speaker makes a difference compared to speaking in front of a class. Speaking with a native speaker appears to pose more threat on the part of the speakers, thereby leading them to more hesitation when the foreign language learners need to communicate with them (Çağatay, 2015). One of the most relevant findings and conclusions of this study relates to the present study as it mentioned that in order to help students overcome feelings of anxiety they can, among other things, be encouraged to take part in authentic conversations and make meaningful conversations. It also adds that teachers need to employ different strategies and provide opportunities for students to communicate with native speakers as well as other non-native speakers of English. All in all, FLSA needs to be dealt with great care to be able to contribute to students’ competence at all levels to a great extent (Çağatay, 2015 p. 655).

The second study considered was “Foreign Language Anxiety of Underprepared Non-English Undergraduate Students”. This study was conducted by Lan and Chang (2017). The participants were students from the Freshmen English Listening and Speaking
course in the College of Agriculture at one national university of science and technology. The instruments used were two, a questionnaire assessing students’ foreign language anxiety level and an English achievement test. The research questions of that study were: (1) How do the non-English-major undergraduate students perceive anxiety in a foreign language classroom? (2) Is there a relationship between the participants’ foreign language anxiety and their achievement in their English courses? The findings of these Taiwanese undergraduate non-English Major students were that they experienced anxiety in the Freshmen English Listening and Speaking classroom, especially the fear of making mistakes, test anxiety, and communication apprehension. In addition, the results show that their language anxiety and English achievement are negatively related to each other. Such results indicate that for these EFL learners, language anxiety negatively influences their English achievement; this means that the students with a higher level of language anxiety tended to perform at lower levels than those with lower anxiety. In the same line Öztürk (2014) in his study “Speaking anxiety among Turkish EFL learners: The case at a state university”, also found that language anxiety and students’ performance were related (Öztürk, 2014). These two studies show how anxiety and speaking in English correlate.

Another study carried out by Tanveer (2007) that focused on language anxiety carried out in Saudi Arabia is “Investigation of the factors that cause language anxiety for ESL/EFL learners in learning speaking skills and the influence it casts on communication in the target language.” Tanveer (2007) concluded that the anxiety associated with learning English as a foreign language in the Saudi context is a complex and multidimensional phenomenon. Furthermore, the author suggests that the teacher is the one in charge of making anxiety levels lower. Tanveer (2007), indicated that Foreign Language Anxiety
considerations by a language teacher are highly important in assisting them in achieving the intended performance goals in the target language. In addition to reducing learners’ anxiety, teachers should also build students’ confidence and self-esteem in their foreign language abilities through encouragement, reassurance, positive reinforcement, and empathy. Teachers should create a warm atmosphere to motivate their students to learn English because motivation is negatively and significantly related to anxiety; thus, increased student motivation leads to decreased anxiety. Therefore, this study contributes to the present research as this will suggest some techniques to be considered in order to lower students’ anxiety levels at the moment of dealing with oral performance. Moreover, students should be provided with as much opportunity as possible to practice speaking in the classroom, which is the intention of the present study.

Finally, the researcher found another significant study related to anxiety and English language teaching. This study carried out by Fakieh Alrabai in 2014, namely “A model of foreign language anxiety in the Saudi EFL context. English language teaching” addresses the issue of the learning environment and learning procedures with regards to teaching English. Alrabai (2014) suggests that teachers can decrease language learners’ anxiety by creating friendly, relaxing, informal, and learning-supportive environments for language learning through their friendly, helpful, and cooperative behavior, making students feel comfortable in the language class. Language teachers should avoid beginning their lessons with activities that enhance learners’ early frustrations. Instead, they should start with simple, step-by-step activities that enable learners to feel relaxed and gradually involved in class activities. Certain learning activities, such as creating problem-solving situations and
working through language problems through pair work, group work, games, and simulations, could be useful in this respect (Alrabai, 2014).

Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope, (1986) in a study conducted in Bangkok University examined the effectiveness of cooperative learning approach in reducing foreign language anxiety and investigated its impact on language proficiency of 40 sophomore students enrolled in EN 211 course in the second semester of 2009. The instruments used were the standardized Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS), two proficiency tests covering reading and writing skills, and a semi-structured interview. It was found that the students’ top five sources of language classroom anxiety and overall language anxiety were significantly decreased. In addition, they obtained higher language proficiency scores for the post-test than the pre-test at the significance level of 001 after learning through this approach. The students also had a favorable attitude toward cooperative learning as a whole.

Summarizing the literature review, most of the research suggests group work, pair work and role-play activities decrease the level of anxiety of students when talking in English (Young, 1990; Alrabai, 2014; Salahi, 2014; Atas, 2015; Yen-Chen Yen, 2015).

It is in this line that the present research is based on language anxiety and how to decrease it inside the classroom in speaking activities applying Cooperative language learning. It is fundamental that an intervention is done in the Chilean context to evidence whether or not the results would be similar.
1.6 Overview of the thesis

This thesis has been structured into five chapters including this introductory chapter in which the identification and statement of the problem are addressed, research questions and objectives are set and finally the literature review is presented.

In chapter 2 the theoretical framework is presented. The theory concerning the issues addressed in this study will be discussed, such as Cooperative Language Learning, the input and output hypotheses and language anxiety in EFL learning.

Then chapter 3 presents the methodological framework where the research type, participants and the process of the intervention is set, the instruments to be used are explained, and data analysis of the results are presented.

After the methodological framework, chapter 4 presents the discussion of the findings and results of the study.

Finally, chapter 5 draws the general conclusions of the study, implications, and limitations faced during the research and presents suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER 2: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter presents the theoretical framework for the research. It discusses the main theories and topics that support and conduct this study, such as: The Input and Comprehensible Output Hypothesis, Language anxiety in EFL learners and its impact finally Cooperative Language learning and its characteristics.

2.1. Input Hypothesis

The starting point of the theoretical framework of this research is to understand how children learn and how they acquire and develop their first words regarding language.

According to Al Hosni (2014), oral language acquisition is seen as a natural process for children as it occurs almost unconsciously. With the pass of the time, the ability of speaking grows but not necessarily leads to perfection. The improvement of speaking depends on regular practice and paying more attention to the ability. Speaking fluency appears to develop with increased exposure to second language (L2) input. Input refers to the language data which the learner is exposed to. Even though, it is widely recognized that input is essential for language acquisition, it is not sufficient if not followed by interaction and output (the language a learner produces) because the processing of comprehension is different from the processing of production, and the ability to understand the meaning conveyed by sentences differs from the ability to use a linguistic system to express meaning (Al Hosni, 2014). Therefore, for the purpose of this study, it is essential to consider that when input is negotiated and learners produce output in interaction, they selectively —take in portions of comprehensible input and choose a correct linguistic form to express themselves. This process makes it possible for the learners to internalize what they have learned and experienced.
Krashen (1989), in the same line, states that language is acquired through the understanding of messages. More precisely, the comprehensible input is the essential environmental ingredient. Nonetheless, Swain (1985) modifies the Comprehensible Input Hypothesis arguing that input alone cannot make learners of L2 completely competent in speaking. She then proposes the comprehensible output as a condition to achieve native-like competence. The following section will address this Output Hypothesis thoroughly.

2.2 The Output Hypothesis

Regarding input hypothesis presented in the previous paragraph and its importance for the acquisition of the language, Swain (1985), claimed that the understandable language input and output should both be included during the second language acquisition process. In spite of Krashen’s (1981) (as cited in Swain 1995) claims that the only way to acquire a second language is through non-stressful comprehensible input. Swain (1995), and others propose that the production of language (speaking or writing), under certain circumstances, is a significant part of the second language acquisition process. Swain (1985), also states that there are three functions of output, and one of these is the noticing or triggering function, in which through producing output, learners become aware of their linguistic knowledge. Krashen, (1981) (as cited in Swain 1995) insisted that the only way to acquire a second language was through exposure to sufficient input knowledge. In other words, input merely led to second language acquisition. However, research with French immersion students in Canada demonstrated that in spite of many years of comprehensible input in French, the second-language students showed less grammatical and syntactic proficiency than their native-speaking peers. Swain (1985) argued that one reason the learners made so
many grammatical errors in their second language was because they produced less of the language. These findings lessened the validity of the input hypothesis.

Since Swain (1985) proposed the output hypothesis, she has explored more about this hypothesis and identified three roles of output in second-language acquisition. First, she states output provides a hypothesis-testing function. In other words, producing output is a significant way for a learner to test hypotheses about the target language. The learner can test their interlanguage comprehension and the accuracy of their linguistic formation against feedback received from interlocutors. Second, Swain (1995) adds that the output has a metalinguistic function. The learner's output provides this metalinguistic function when the learner reflects upon his own target use, and that enables him to internalize linguistic knowledge. This emphasis on language may intensify the learner’s awareness on forms, rules, and form-function if the context in which he produces this language is genuine and communicative.

Finally, Swain (1995) states that output can also provide a noticing/triggering function:

"In producing the target language (vocally or subvocally), learners may notice a gap between what they want to say and what they can say, leading them to recognize what they do not know, or know only partially, about the target language. In other words, under some circumstances, the activity of producing the target language may prompt second language learners to consciously recognize some of their linguistic problems; it may bring to their attention something they need to discover about their L2" (pp. 125-126).

Considering the importance of oral production and its process, the negotiation of meaning between teacher and learner increases comprehensible input which focuses on
meaning. Therefore, output produced by student facilitates integration of new linguistic knowledge when the learner notices differences between his/her output and correct forms from the teacher's responses. This is especially so when the teacher monitors the learner's output through indirect correction. Such monitoring should form part of the conversational exchange focused on communicative intent of the learner (LIM, 2017). It can be concluded that teachers can improve their students’ output with the correct activity and the correct way of giving feedback. In that sense, the level of anxiety of the student can be decreased and correlated to it, his/her output, as it is the aim of this current study.

2.3 Language Anxiety in EFL learners and its impact

It can be assumed that some of the factors of the quantity and proficiency of output that a child produces are related to fear, insecurity, self-esteem, language anxiety, and some others. Furthermore, it is important at this point of the research to define what is understood by language anxiety. According to Sato (2003), language anxiety is defined as the fear of losing face, insecurity, and lack of confidence all of which slows down progress and impedes success in foreign language teaching (Sato, 2003). Another scholar that defines language anxiety is Tanveer (2007) who describes it as a basic human emotion that may be brought on by numerous combinations of situational factors. For instance, a student may feel anxious when speaking in front of the whole class. Tanveer (2007) adds that language anxiety is a combination of other anxieties that create a separate form of anxiety intrinsic to language learning.

Language anxiety can reduce students’ participation in oral activities in the classroom. Furthermore, Sato (2003) identifies seven situations with high levels of anxiety and that may make students unwilling to talk in L2: (1) peers may not comprehend what the
students say, (2) peers may misunderstand the students, (3) the students' low proficiency of L2 may stop communication, (4) the students' topic is not thought important enough to speak about, (5) the students may sound comical, (6) the students feel awkward after their peers talk in L1, and (7) the students are afraid of making mistakes (Sato, 2003). As a conclusion of the previous presented, anxiety can affect students’ performances when talking in another language, specifically, in oral activities (Sato, 2003, p.12). From this, it can be stated that it is necessary to consider these factors when teaching the English subject, especially when dealing with oral performance.

2.4 Cooperative Language Learning

According to Johnson and Johnson (1999), Cooperative Learning finds its basis on baseball. One of the greatest pitchers in baseball history was Sandy Koufax; although he was naturally talented, baseball is a team game; thus he could not win without a partner. In baseball and in the classroom, it takes cooperative effort to be present as extraordinary achievement comes from a cooperative group, not from the individualistic or competitive efforts of an isolated individual (Johnson and Johnson, 1999).

Anecdotally, cooperative learning comes from baseball, and was soon adopted, for example, at the University of Minnesota, in 1966. Then, others joined and started to train teachers in how to use cooperative learning. These cooperative learning groups were extended into teaching methods courses in science education.

The formation of the Cooperative Learning Center soon followed and focused on five areas: 1) summarizing and extending the theory on cooperation and competition, 2) reviewing the existing research in order to validate or disconfirm the theory and establish what is known and unknown, 3) conducting a long-term program of research to validate
and extend the theory and to identify the conditions under which cooperative, competitive, and individualistic efforts are effective and the basic elements that make cooperation work, 4) operationalizing the validated theory into a set of procedures for teachers and administrators to use and 5) implementing the procedures in classes, schools, school districts, colleges, and training programs (Johnson and Johnson, 1999).

These five elements result in an understanding of what is and is not a cooperative effort and the different types of cooperative learning. According to Johnson and Johnson (1999), there are five basic elements that are essential and need to be included to reach cooperation among students.

The first essential element is positive interdependence, defined by Johnson & Johnson (1999) as the perception that we are linked with others in a way so that we cannot succeed unless they do. Positive interdependence must be established through common learning goals as learn the assigned material and make sure that all members of your group learn the assigned material. In order to make positive interdependence stronger, it is recommendable to offer rewards. For instance, if all members of the group score 90 percent correct or better on the test, each member of the group will receive 5 bonus points. Divided resources as giving each group member a part of the total information required to complete an assignment, and complementary roles such as reader, checker, encourager, elaborator, among others, may also be used (Johnson and Johnson, 1999).

The second essential element is individual accountability. According to Johnson and Johnson (1999), this exists when the performance of each individual student is assessed and the results are given back to the group as well as the individual. The purpose of cooperative learning groups is to make each member a stronger individual by working in groups. Students learn together so that they can later perform higher as individuals. In order to
reach that goal, each member is strengthened in many ways. Some of the actions that can be done to strengthen students are giving an individual test to each student, randomly selecting one student's task to represent the entire group or making each student explain what they have learned to a classmate (Johnson and Johnson, 1999).

The third essential element is Face-to-face promotive interaction. Johnson & Johnson (1999) add that Face-to-face promotive interaction occurs when individuals promote each other's success by helping, assisting, supporting and encouraging each other. In addition, they named some benefits when promoting Face-to-face interaction as orally explaining how to solve problems, discussing the nature of the concepts being learned, teaching to classmates, and connecting present learning or processes with past learning, ability to influence each other’s reasoning and conclusions, social support, and interpersonal rewards.

The fourth essential element is related to the previous one as it addresses social Skills. Johnson and Johnson (1999) add that contributing to the success of a cooperative effort requires interpersonal and small group skills. Moreover, students must be taught the leadership, decision-making, trust building and communication.

The fifth and final element is Group processing. Defined as:

“Group processing exists when group members discuss how well they are achieving their goals and maintaining effective working relationships. Groups need to describe what member actions are helpful and unhelpful and make decisions about what behaviors to continue or change” (Johnson & Johnson, 1999, p71).
Connected to the previous definition, when difficulties emerged, each member of the group helps in order to solve problems that may appear all together as a group.

Once these five basic elements are understood, they allow teachers to adapt cooperative learning to their own circumstances, needs, context and participants, and to prevent and solve problems that students may have when working together (Johnson & Johnson, 1999).

Conclusively, research based on the study of group work stated that there are a lot of advantages when using CLL methodology (the lack of a teacher-centered class, a friendly community, a relaxed atmosphere with a sense of security and a more active and responsible attitude with more opportunities to speak) as it reduces students’ anxiety (Sato, 2003).

Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) is one of the methods proposed by the Ministry of Education to avoid or reduce language anxiety and to promote participation in oral activities. In the words of Sachs, Candlin, and Rose (2003) CLL is defined as “a group learning activity organized so that the learning is dependent from the socially structured exchange of information between learners in groups, and in which each learner is held accountable for his or her own learning, and it is motivated to increase the learning of others” (Sachs, Candlin, & Rose, 2003 p.181).

Sato (2003) adds that group work allows students to take the initiative in controlling their communicative activities. Therefore, reducing anxiety, facilitating responsibility, creating community, and smoothing the progress of fluency as a result. Above all, group work, with a small group of students than a whole class as one large group, creates an
intimate and more relaxing atmosphere. Working in small groups or peer work, leads to a friendly atmosphere inside the classroom and creates a sense of security.

Sato (2003) argues that students are afraid of making mistakes in front of their classmates even though they might be willing to learn and improve in English. Working in groups allows students to participate more and to be more active in classes. It provides more opportunities to start and to have certain control of the interaction.

Concerning CLL and its practices, Wang (2007) makes a comparison between the roles of the teacher when using CLL and in traditional teaching methods (TTL). Wang (2007) states that the role of the teacher in CLL is totally student-centered and the teacher is permissive and interested in stimulating his or her student while in TTL the activities are usually teacher-centered. Furthermore, the role of the teacher when CLL is being applied is stated as a supporter, facilitator, observer, a change agent, and adviser. The teacher’s role is to arrange the students in heterogeneous groups, to provide students with proper materials and to design structural systematic teaching strategies (Wang, 2007).

2.5 Cooperative learning activities

Given the objectives and goals of this research, it is important to point out the activities related to cooperative language learning. For the purpose of this study, three activities will be explained and developed in the intervention. The activities taken into account were based on Kagan’s structure (2003; as cited in Suwantarathip, 2010), which considered CLL principles and characteristics, as well as its basic elements. For the purpose of this study, only six CLL activities will be proposed.
The first activity proposed by Kagan (2003; as cited in Suwantarathip, 2010) is “Think-Pair-Share”. This activity involves three steps. Firstly, students think silently about a question made by the teacher. Secondly, the students get in pairs and exchange thoughts. Thirdly, the pairs share their responses with other pairs or the whole class. Students are free to choose their partner when working in pairs. This activity covers two tasks, dictation from one to another and writing a summary about what their classmate said (Kagan, 2003; as cited in Suwantarathip, 2010).

The second activity is called “Numbered Heads Together”. A group of four students is set. Each member is given numbers 1, 2, 3, and 4. The teacher asks a question and all the members of the group discuss the answer. The final step is when the teacher says a number from the group and that student with that numbers has to answer what all the members talked about. This activity is conducted to enhance students’ reading comprehension skill (Suwantarathip, 2010).

The third activity is called “Peer Review”. During this activity, students work in pairs and they have to read what their classmates created. This activity gives the opportunity to learn how to provide and receive constructive feedback (Suwantarathip, 2010).

The fourth activity is called “Match mine” in which students attempt to match the arrangement of objects on a grid of another student using just speaking for communication. During this activity, students can practice vocabulary, oral communication and role-taking ability (Kagan, 1989).

The fifth activity is called “Color-Coded Co-op Cards”, in which students memorize facts using a flash card game. Scoring in this game is based on improvement. In this game
students have the possibility to help each other while they are learning or memorizing facts (Kagan, 1989).

The sixth activity is called “Three-step interview” in which students interview each other in pairs, first one way, and then the other way. Each student shares with the rest of the group what they have learned in the interview. This type of activity is used to reinforce participation and listening, as well as sharing personal information (Kagan, 1989).

There are several activities based on CLL, but these seem to be the more appropriate for the present research. Moreover, in this research three out of six activities will be applied.

Having reviewed the theory upon which this study finds its support, being Input and Output hypothesis, Language anxiety, CLL and its activities, the methodological framework will be presented in the following chapter.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

3.1 Research type and design

The main perspective of this research is related to the qualitative design given that the investigation will analyze information and data that is based on the behavior of people (LeCompte, 1995). This research analyzed students’ perceptions before and after the implementation of CLL in order to find out if the level of anxiety changes when using it.

Furthermore, quantitative research methods deal with numbers and anything that is measurable in an investigation of phenomena and their relationships. It is used to answer questions on relationships within measurable variables with an intention to explain and control phenomena (Newman, 1998). This research analyzed data that was based on students’ perceptions, impressions and feelings when using CLL and the impact on language anxiety when CLL activities were implemented. The data collected came from questions 1-2, that only had Yes or No answer and therefore, they could be quantified.

Additionally, it is of an exploratory nature because it is oriented to the exploration of data from a population which has not been considered before in a study with the problematic situation presented in this work. It is also a case study, given that it seeks to investigate a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident. Besides, it is descriptive as the end of the product of a case study is a complete description of the incident or entity being investigated (Merriam, 1998).
3.2 Participants

The participants that were included in this research were thirty eleventh graders in their last semester. It is a mixed group (women and men) with an age average of 17 from Divina Maestra School located in Villa Alemana, Valparaiso. It is a subsidized school and it is one of the high schools in Villa Alemana identified as difficult or complicated. These apprehensions are related to the location of the High school as it is considered a vulnerable school which is constantly addressing problems of alcohol and drugs.

The class that participated in the intervention is one of the classes recognized by teachers and by the principal as one of the most suitable for teaching. Most of the students are respectful, active students, responsible, and participative in the learning process and in events inside the school.

The participants and their parents signed a consent letter for their participation in this study (APPENDIX 2).

The students are active learners most of the time but they are passive learners when it comes to speaking. During this research, students were taught using group and pair work activities based on CLL practices. The participants had their first learning experience with English as a foreign language in fifth and sixth grade.

Since August, 2018, the researcher of this study taught the class and observed them, concluding that they did not participate in oral activities or that they scarcely participated. It was necessary in the first lessons to talk about respect when other classmate was talking in English. The students used to laugh at each other when another was speaking or trying to do it in English. Most of the time, the students made comments about the use of the class
book and they said that they would like to have more oral activities to communicate with others around the world or in their country with foreign people. For the same reason, the researcher wanted to implement CLL activities with that specific group. Stated in previous paragraphs, the students participated voluntarily during the research.

The time of exposure was a month, divided to five sessions of two hours each. In the experience of the researcher, who has faced the role of a student and a teacher, it can be assumed that learners participate more when engaged in group activities. However, it must be considered that there are students that when working in groups just leave all the responsibility and the learning process to one or two students in the group.

3.3 The intervention

The application was conducted during September, in five sessions of two hours each. The activities were based on three CLL activities from the six mentioned in Chapter 2. That is to say, 1) **Think-Pair-Share (TPS)**, in which the students got in pairs and exchanged thoughts based on a question asked by the teacher, then in pairs shared their responses with the whole class. 2) **Numbered Heads Together (NHT)**, in which a group of four students was established and each member of the group was given numbers as 1, 2, 3, and 4. Then the teacher asked a question and all the members of the group discussed the answer. The final step is when the teacher says a number from the group and that student with that number has to answer what all the members talked about. 3) **Peer Review (PR)**. During this activity, students work in pairs and they have to comment what their classmates created, it could be sentences or short dialogues.
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The three activities were adapted to oral activities as the CLL activities presented in the theoretical framework were not all focused on speaking.

In order to help the reader of this research have a general idea of the topics, contents and activities addressed, the following chart helps before the specific explanation of the activities (APPENDIX 3).

**Unit 3: What should I do?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-To identify vocabulary related to illnesses through videos (Fever-backache-flu-cough – toothache – stomachache)</td>
<td>1. Point out the mimics of classmates 2. Creating sentences orally with the vocabulary presented.</td>
<td>Students’ books Projector Speakers Laptop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-To identify uses of <strong>should</strong> – <strong>shouldn’t</strong> related to illnesses</td>
<td>1. Point out the mimics of classmates 2. Give advice according the symptoms and illnesses of classmates</td>
<td>Speakers Projector Notebooks Envelopes with words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.3.1 First session

During the first session the objective of the class was to identify the vocabulary of the unit regarding illnesses. The students first watched a video about illnesses to identify the vocabulary. After watching the video, the teacher asked for a volunteer to act out an illness of the ones presented in the video. The rest of the students were focused on what the classmate in front of the class was doing. The one who pointed out the illness correctly was
the following in making the mimics. After the acting out part, the students got in pairs in
the development of the TPS activity. The question presented by the teacher was: What
illnesses have you had during your life? The students in pairs discussed the question and
shared experiences with their pairs. They had five minutes to discuss and they were asked
to use all the time English to communicate. In the whiteboard, there was a word bank with
some expressions to use as: I have had… I had to drink…. After the time given to discuss
the pairs were separated and the students were asked to form groups of four to do NHT
activities.

The students were given a number from one to four and they had eight minutes to
discuss the following question: What was the first illness that you had? Why? The teacher
was permanently remembering the students to use English during the activities.

After the time of discussion the teacher asked Student 1 to share with the rest of the
class, their classmates’ answers.

Having finished the NHT, the students had to work on their PR activity, creating
sentences using the information collected about the illnesses their classmates had
mentioned they had been through

3.3.2 Second session

The objective of the second session was to identify the uses of should and shouldn’t
to give advice. Once again, the class started with mimics related to illnesses. The one in
charge of making the first mimic was a volunteer. The student who said the correct illness
was the one that continued. After that, the students watched a video of a person going to the
doctor and having the conversation with the doctor about illnesses and symptoms. The
students could identify the use of should and shouldn’t when the doctor gave some advice to the patient about the treatments and the cares to consider in order to feel better. Some of the expressions that they could identify were: you shouldn’t go out, you should drink a lot of water, you should take the pill three times per day.

The TPS activity was based on the question: “What should I do if I…” and next to the question some illnesses were written in order to have students pointing them out. As an example: toothache, backache, headache, etc.

During the NHT activities, the students received an envelope with some words related to the illnesses, symptoms and treatments. The students were assigned a number and each member of the group had to pick up a word and create a sentence giving some advice. For instance, a student picked up the word pill, the sentence created was you should take your pill to feel better. After that, just the students assigned with number two gave the report of some sentences created by the group as he/she picked up the words in the envelope. All the envelopes had the same words.

The PR activity was based on the previous activity about creating sentences with the words in the envelopes but just in pairs. The students were asked to get together with a new partner. After that, one member of the pair shared the sentences.

3.3.3 Third session

The objective of the session was to create dialogues with the example of the video presented in session two. The teacher projected the video again, taking into account the ones missing in the previous sessions.
The TPS activity was based on the questions: What did you say the last time you went to the doctor? What did the doctor answer? The students answered the questions in pairs. After that, the students shared their ideas and experiences with the rest of the class.

In the NHT part, the students were assigned a number just to get in pairs, the students with number one got in pairs with number ones and so one with the other numbers. The students were asked to create a dialogue about going to the doctor, considering the illnesses and the symptoms previously covered in the sessions, as well as the expressions of going to the doctor presented in the video. In the case any student didn’t know a word, they had to ask a classmate.

During this session, it was necessary to talk about feedback and the explanation of it. It was explained that feedback was supposed to be meaningful and more positive than negative. Therefore, it was necessary to talk about respect when the classmates were speaking.

The PR activity was conducted and one member of the pair, voluntarily, talked about the dialogues created. After each member presented what the pair created, they gave feedback to each other.

3.3.4 Fourth session

The objective of the class was to present the dialogues created by the pairs. In the previous session, the students were asked to bring to the class something attractive to support their oral presentation.
The TPS activity was based on the question: What should I do if I feel nervous when speaking? After the discussion, the pairs gave a piece of advice to the rest of the class. During this part, the teacher played music to make the students feel less anxious and nervous before presenting.

3.3.5 Fifth session

During the last session, the students were asked to bring food to share with the class and the teacher brought tea and juice. The idea of the last session was just to talk about the oral activities. After sharing and eating, the students completed the questionnaire 1 (APPENDIX 1) individually in the computer room. After that, the students sent the questionnaires to the teacher’s email. Finally, there was a free talk about CLL and their impressions, suggestions for the class and for the teacher.

3.4 Instruments

After having presented the five interventions with the CLL activities and its explanations, the two instruments used in this research will be detailed.

3.4.1 Questionnaire

A questionnaire obeys to different types of needs and research problems, which gives origin to the question that each study needs to solve. In each study the kind of questions are different. Sometimes a questionnaire includes only closed questions and other times open ones, or mixed (Hernandez Sampieri, 2006 p.351). Some of the advantages of using questionnaires to collect data are the following (Seliger & Shohamy, 1989; Robinson, 1991; Lynch, 1996; Nunan, 1999; Gillham, 2000; Brown, 2001; in Zohrabi, 2013):

-They are one of the efficient means of collecting data on a large-scale basis.
- They can be sent simultaneously to a great number of people.
- The inquirer can fairly easily gather data in field sites.
- Respondents’ anonymity makes them to share information more easily.
- When similar questions are administered simultaneously to a large number of people the acquired data are more identical, correct and standard.
- They are a time-efficient way of collecting data from many people.
- Closed-ended questionnaires can easily be analyzed in a straightforward way.
- They are cost-efficient.

A questionnaire was suitable for this research as it can collect yes and no questions with closed questions or other specific information, and on the other hand, students can freely write about their feelings, impressions and preferences regarding CLL activities and any comment that students would like to share in this investigation regarding group work (APPENDIX 1- QUESTIONNAIRE 1).

Some of the dimensions that were included in the questionnaire were related to their feelings when using CLL methods, their attitudes when using the method, thoughts regarding speaking, the selection of materials and activities, and oral practices in the classroom.

3.4.2 Observation

According to Merriam, 1998, observations during the research have to include some factors as observer’s goal, the research objectives, research questions, the inquirer’s field of study, practical issues, researcher’s personal impressions, and the topic under study and so on. Therefore, according to these considerations, the researcher can select and observe the classroom setting, the students’ activities and behaviors, etc. For the same reason, the observer can either participate in the class intervention or observe what is happening.
Observation was used during the investigation to identify students’ attitudes; engagement during oral activities; whether they stayed on task or not; the resources that they need and how to use them; and if they cooperate with each other on group activities or whether they just rely on one member of the group to do their work. Additionally, when students participate using the method, they were recorded to analyze their participation and attitudes towards group work.

As the goal of this research was to decrease language anxiety and to promote oral communication, the focus of this study was on fluency rather than on accuracy. Grammar mistakes were not considered as far as they did not impede communication with their peers.

### 3.4.3 Collection of data

Brown (2001) divides administering questionnaires into two methods. The first one is the self-administered questionnaire and group administered questionnaire. In this research the group administered questionnaire was taken into account. That means that the questionnaires were administered to the group of participants all at one time and at the same place. Before giving the questionnaires to the students, their parents had to sign a consent letter to participate in this research. The consent letter is presented in APPENDIX 2.

The collection of data started at the end of September with the application of questionnaires 1 after working with CLL. The students completed the questionnaires in the last session, after a coffee break to celebrate the end of the sessions in the computer room. Two questionnaires chosen randomly are presented in the APPENDIX 4-5.
Additionally, the students were recorded during the application of CLL activities to know their participation and attitudes during these activities. Two recordings were transcribed randomly during CLL activities, specifically the session when creating the dialogues (APPENDIX 6-7).

3.5 Data Analysis

The first step was to make a summary of the answers of the questionnaires before the application, some graphics were done to make the results clearer based on the closed questions (questions 1-2).

The second step was to find out the most repetitive answers in questions 3-4-5, to make the analysis of results and discussion clearer. Besides, graphics will be created to make the analysis clearer.

Regarding the observation, the attitudes and participation when working with CLL method will be used for the discussion and conclusion of the research.

In addition, the recordings of the students when participating in the tasks will be transcribed to know students’ participation and attitude. Finally, the analysis of the results will be made based on all the aforementioned.
3.5.1 Analysis of qualitative data

Based on content analysis procedures the phases taken into account were the following:

1. **Phase 1. Transcription:** the first step was to transcribe the audio files recorded when students were on CLL tasks (APPENDIX 6-7).

2. **Phase 2. Coding:** this phase focused on a phrase or word that represents a small unit of the information collected.

3. **Phase 3: Categorizing:** in this phase the small units, phrases or words, were categorized into subcategories.

4. **Phase 4. Comparing:** the answers were compared to have a better comprehension of differences and similarities among participants’ answers.

5. **Phase 5. Concluding:** in this phase conclusions were drawn about the answers previously analyzed.

3.6 Episodes

For a better analysis, the information will be divided into Episodes. These episodes are defined by Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2000) as “any coherent fragment of social life. Being a natural division of life, an episode will often have a recognizable beginning and end, and the sequence of actions that constitute it will have some meaning for the participants” (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2000 p.294). In this case, the open questions of
questionnaire 1 will be divided into episodes, regarding the participants’ experiences, impact in learning, attitudes and beliefs.

3.7 Dimensions

Students’ opinions and perspectives were coded, categorized, and compared among all participants. In the following part, the collected data was divided into three dimensions. These three dimensions are related to the objectives and research questions.

The dimensions were the following: Cooperative Language learning, Language anxiety and Educational system.

In addition, through data analysis, it was possible to create and subdivide each dimension into different emerging subcategories with a positive and negative connotation giving a more illustrative organization of students’ answers. The dimensions and subcategories that emerged were the following:

**DIMENSION 1:** CLL, opinions about working in groups, pairs and activities related to CLL implementation.

**DIMENSION 2:** Language anxiety, opinions about being nervous, anxious, or any comment about talking in English regarding anxiety.

**DIMENSION 3:** Educational system, opinions about school, classroom or environment inside the class.
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## 3.8 Coding

In this phase, based on Content Analysis, the information was categorized into three different main topics: Cooperative Language learning, Language anxiety and Educational system. Additionally, a profound analysis of data was carried out where subcategories were organized to make clear students’ opinions and impressions. This fraction of information has been written into codes using: Dimensions (D), Participant (P), Episodes (E) and the abbreviation of the subcategories classified by dimension:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION 1 (D1)</th>
<th>SUBCATEGORIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLL, opinions about working in groups, pairs and activities related to CLL implemented.</td>
<td>1. Implementation of CLL - Positive (D1CLP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Implementation of CLL - Negative (D1CLN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Learning process (D1LPP) - Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Learning process (D1LPN) - Negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 - Codes for Dimension 2 and its subcategories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION 2 (D2)</th>
<th>SUBCATEGORIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language anxiety, opinions about being nervous, anxious, or any comment about</td>
<td>1. Social exposure - Positive (D2SEP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talking in English regarding anxiety.</td>
<td>2. Social exposure - Negative (D2SEN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Speaking activities - Positive (D2SAP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Speaking activities - Negative (D2SAN)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 - Codes for Dimension 3 and its subcategories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION 3 (D3)</th>
<th>SUBCATEGORIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational system, opinions about school, classroom or environment inside the</td>
<td>1. Time factor - Positive (D3TFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>class.</td>
<td>2. Time factor - Negative (D3TFN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Discipline - Positive (D3DP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Discipline - Negative (D3DN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Educational system in general - Positive (D3ESP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Educational system in general - Negative (D3ESN)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Having presented the methodological framework, including the process, instruments and data analysis to be used, the following chapter will present and discuss the results of the intervention.
CHAPTER 4 - RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this part of the research, the findings are presented and discussed comparing them with theories presented in the theoretical framework of this investigation. In order to identify the real attitudes and perceptions of Chilean teen students towards CLL in the EFL classrooms of Valparaiso, Chile, in Divina Maestra High School, Questionnaire 1 was used as a method of data collection. The information given by the students was processed and compiled to extract the four dimensions with their respective subcategories. Therefore, the analysis is presented divided by the three dimensions and their respective subcategories. Finally, the discussion will be presented at the end of the chapter.

The dimensions and their subcategories were created taking into account the research questions of this study:

- Does group work methodology help reduce oral language anxiety in EFL high school learners?
- What are EFL learners’ perceptions on the use of group work to promote positive attitudes towards oral language in the L2?

4.1 RESULTS OF QUANTITATIVE DATA

As it was explained in chapter 3, the instrument used for the collection of data was a mixed questionnaire. The questionnaire included open and close questions. Questions 1 and 2 were close questions, with Yes or No answers. For the same reason, close questions will be presented first. The answers and data collection of questions 1-2 can be seen in APPENDIX 8 and 9.

Consequently, questions 3-4-5 will be presented in the section of qualitative data, divided by dimensions and subcategories.
4.1.1 RESULTS QUESTION 1: Did you like to work with CLL (group activities, pair work, etc)?

Graphic 1: Illustrates that 87% of students liked to work with CLL

Twenty-six students answered positively, and 4 students answered negatively. As it was observed during the application of CLL activities, the students had more participation in speaking activities when it was pair or group work.
4.1.2 RESULTS QUESTION 2: Did you feel less nervous or anxious when speaking in a group instead of in front of the class?

![Pie chart showing 87% yes and 13% no to the question.]

Graphic 2: Illustrates that 87% of students felt less nervous or anxious when speaking in groups instead of in front of the class.

As Question one, twenty six students answered positively, and four students answered negatively. It can clearly be concluded that there is a relationship among the participation in CLL speaking activities and the decrease of anxiety levels. It is important to add that during the observation carried on while students were speaking in groups, they seemed less anxious and more relaxed.
4.2 RESULTS QUALITATIVE DATA: QUESTIONS 3-4-5

As stated above, the questionnaire used for the collection of data was a mixed questionnaire with open and close questions.

Questions 3-4-5 were open questions and they allowed the students to express themselves freely. The students could answer in their mother tongue or English, with help of a dictionary or the teacher if it was needed. In these questions, the students could write what they felt when working with CLL and their impressions about the activities. Additionally, the answers of questions 3-4-5 were divided by dimensions, and each dimension was divided by subcategories.

4.2.1 DIMENSION 1: APPLICATION AND USE OF COOPERATIVE LANGUAGE LEARNING ACTIVITIES

This dimension refers to the application of Cooperative language learning activities previously presented and the relation of the application with students’ opinions, feelings, attitudes and any comment made on the learning process based on CLL paradigms. Through the analysis some comments of the participants of the research were included. Some of the comments that students made, were in their mother tongue, Spanish. In addition, the researcher made her own translation of the comments for the reader to comprehend.
Table 4 - Number of comments per category and total number of comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION 1 (D1)</th>
<th>SUBCATEGORIES</th>
<th>COMMENTS PER SUBCATEGORY</th>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER OF COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLL, opinions about working in groups, pairs and activities related to CLL implemented.</td>
<td>1. Implementation of CLL - Positive (D1CLP)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Implementation of CLL - Negative (D1CLN)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Learning process - Positive (D1LPP)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Learning process - Negative (D1LPN)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.2 DIMENSION 1- SUBCATEGORY 1: Implementation of Cooperative Language Learning activities

As it was pointed out in the Theoretical Framework, CLL is defined as “a group learning activity organized so that the learning is dependent from the socially structured exchange of information between learners in groups, and in which each learner is held accountable for his or her own learning, and it is motivated to increase the learning of others” (Sachs, Gertrude Tinker; Candlin, Christophe N. and Rose, Kenneth R. 2003 p.181). This kind of methodology allows students to take the initiative in controlling their communicative activities. Therefore, reducing anxiety, facilitating responsibility, creating community, and smoothing the progress of fluency as a result. Above all, group work, with a small group of students different from a whole class as one large group, creates an
intimate and more relaxing atmosphere. Working in small groups or peer work, leads to a friendly atmosphere inside the classroom and creates a sense of security.

Some students´ comments regarding CLL were the following:

**D1CLPP17:**

“cuando trabajamos en grupo podemos hablar más en inglés y no me dio tanta vergüenza”. Researcher´s free translation of the comment: “when working in groups we can speak more in English and it wasn't so embarrassing for me”.

**D1CLPP25:**

“Yo y mis compañeros lo pasamos mejor juntos que solos. Nos podemos reír, hacer bromas y resolver preguntas”. “Researcher´s free translation of the comment: I and my classmates have more fun together than alone. We can laugh, make jokes and solve out the questions”.

As it can be observed in students´ comments, they decreased their level of language anxiety or personality insecurity through methodologies in which group work was applied. Students also expressed in the questionnaire that working in groups was better for them in the learning process as they could learn all together and solved questions as a group. Pair work was also a suitable activity with the class as they could express themselves and share experiences.
4.2.3 DIMENSION 1 - SUBCATEGORY 2: Learning process

Working in groups, as could be observed and analyzed, is beneficial for shy students or anxious students when speaking. Most of them felt less anxious when working in groups regarding speaking activities.

On the other hand, there were two negative answers regarding the application of CLL activities. Some of the comments made were the following:

D1CLPN4:

“las cosas en grupo nunca funcionan en el curso porque siempre termina haciendo todo solo uno de todos los del grupo”. “Researcher’s free translation of the comment: Group work never worked in the classroom because there is always just one member of the group doing everything”.

D1CLPP11:

“When we work in groups, sometimes our same colleagues laugh when we speak English and I prefer to keep quiet”.

This participant used a translator. For the same reason, the translator translated “compañeros” classmates into “colleagues”. It is important to highlight the effort made by this participant to answer in English even though he used translator.

As it can be observed, there are some students that prefer to work alone than in groups and that they have a high level of critical thinking. Some arguments that they mentioned were related to the capacity of work in equal quantities and also related to classmates’ personality and maturity to work in groups and avoid the lack of participation.
4.3 RESULTS QUESTIONS 3-4-5 DIMENSION 2: LANGUAGE ANXIETY

As it has been discussed during this research, language anxiety could have a negative impact on students’ level of participation or if any participation at all. Therefore, in question number 4 related to the participation in group activities, the answers are summarized in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION 2 (D2)</th>
<th>SUBCATEGORIES</th>
<th>COMMENTS PER SUBCATEGORY</th>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER OF COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language anxiety, opinions about being nervous, anxious, or any comment about talking in English regarding anxiety</td>
<td>1. Social exposure - Positive (D2SEP)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Social exposure - Negative (D2SEN)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Speaking activities - Positive (D2SAP)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Speaking activities - Negative (D2SAN)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding language anxiety, Young (1990), suggests that language anxiety is alleviated when students work in small groups, do pair work, and experience personalized language instruction. Besides, he adds that group work not only addresses the affective concerns of the students, it also increases the amount of student talk and comprehensible input (Young, 1990).
4.3.1 DIMENSION 2 - SUBCATEGORY 1: Social exposure

Twelve students commented about the social exposure in a positive way. Some of them expressed that they felt more relaxed being in group than working alone. Additionally, they expressed that speaking in English at school will prepare them for university presentations. Some of the comments made by students were the following:

D2SEPP17:

“hablé más inglés en grupo que cuando hablo sola con la profe o cuando tengo que disertar en inglés. A mí me da pánico cuando presento sola me estreso y a veces me quedo en blanco”. Researcher´s free translation of the comment: “I spoke more in English in group activities than when I speak alone with the teacher or in oral presentations in English. I get in panic when I present alone and I get stressed and in blank”.

D2SEPP30:

”Participe más cuando hacíamos cosas en grupo porque no me daba tanta vergüenza porque al lado mío estaban mis amigos”. Researcher´s free translation of the comment: “I participated more when we did group activities because I did not feel so ashamed as next to me were my friends”.

Therefore, the comments made by the students can be related to group work and its benefits related to reduce language anxiety. It is important to mention that students looked happy and focused in group activities during the intervention.

Regarding social exposure and negative connotation, some of the comments made were the following:
D2SENP2:

“me sentí menos nervioso al trabajar en forma grupal pero igual los compañeros empiezan a hacer malos comentarios o a reírse entre ellos”. Researcher’s free translation of the comment: “I felt less nervous when working in groups but my classmates make jokes even in group work and start to make bad comments or laugh”.

D2SEPP29:

“En grupo o de forma oral igual me da vergüenza hablar en inglés, me pongo rojo y todos se dan cuenta”. Researcher’s free translation of the comment: “I feel ashamed in group activities or individual work, I blush and everyone notices it”.

For some students, the anxiety is related to themselves and their own self esteem problems or personality. Some of them expressed that they tend to be nervous even when using their mother tongue, so in English the level of anxiety was increased.

4.3.2 DIMENSION 2- SUBCATEGORY 2: Speaking activities

The answers related to speaking activities in a positive way were 13 and the negative ones were 7. Some of them were the following:

It was taken into account the same participant and the same comment of P17, in which the student commented that she talked more in English in group activities. She also added that practicing speaking was useful and a preparation for her future. She stated that all the careers at university nowadays include English, for the same, the oral activities were a preparation for that.
D2SAPP17:

“hablé más inglés en grupo que cuando hablo sola con la profe o cuando tengo que disertar en inglés. a mí me da pánico cuando presentó sola me estreso y a veces me quedo en blanco... practicar hablar en inglés también me sirvió para prepararme para la universidad. Todas las carreras incluyen inglés y tendré que hacer presentaciones o diálogos”. Researcher’s free translation of the comment: “I spoke more in English when we worked in groups that when I talk alone with the teacher or when I have to present in oral presentations. I get in panic when I present in oral presentations and I get stressed or sometimes I get in blank...practicing in English also helped me to get prepared for university. All the careers in university include English and I will have to present lots of oral presentations or dialogues”.

Another comment based on Language anxiety and speaking activities is the following:

D2SAPP26:

“en la actividad donde se intercambiaban los grupos sentí que nos sirvió mucho como curso para conocernos más porque yo siempre trabajaba con las mismas personas. sentí que nos sirvió a todos para poder unirnos”. Researcher’s free translation of the comment: “In the activity in which we exchanged groups, I felt that it was useful as a whole group to know each other because I have always worked with the same people. I felt that it was useful to bring us together”.

The comments that have a negative connotation are related to language anxiety. As it was presented in the previous paragraph, some of the students pointed out that they felt ashamed even talking in their mother tongue. They tend to blush or they prefer other ways of communication as through letters, texting, or Whatsapp because they can express
themselves better. Some of the comments made with a negative connotation about speaking activities were the following:

**D2SANP29:**

“*no soy bueno conversando pero si me gusta mucho escribir. Siento que podría decir muchas más cosas si lo hago escribiendo que hablando*”.

Researcher´s free translation of the comment: “*I am not good talking but I like writing. I feel that I could say more things writing than speaking*”.

**D2SANP11:**

“*cuando tengo que contarle algo importante a alguien lo ago por alguna red social como Instagram o WhatsApp porque así no me da tanta vergüenza*”. Researcher´s free translation of the comment: “*When I have to say something important to me to somebody I do it by a social media as Instagram or Whatsapp because in that way, I don’t feel ashamed at all*”.

Both of these comments are related to the preference of writing rather than speaking because they could express themselves better. They mentioned some social media as Whatsapp or Instagram. Writing can be beneficial when students are shy or they feel ashamed with face to face talking. Moreover, this can be a starting point to further on express their thoughts orally.
4.4 RESULTS QUESTIONS 3-4-5 DIMENSION 3: EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

This dimension is related to the educational system and the opinions and feelings of students about it. To know their impressions, question number 5 was included in the instrument of this investigation: **Why do you think that teachers prefer the traditional way (individual work) to teach instead of CLL (pair or group work)?**

For a better understanding of the answers the following table was created:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION 3 (D3)</th>
<th>SUBCATEGORIES</th>
<th>COMMENTS PER SUBCATEGORY</th>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER OF COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational system, opinions about school, classroom or environment inside the class.</td>
<td>1.Time factor - Positive (D3TFP)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.Time factor - Negative (D3TFN)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.Discipline - Positive (D3DP)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.Discipline - Negative (D3DN)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.Educational system in general - Positive (D3ESP)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.Educational system in general - Negative (D3ESN)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.1 DIMENSION 3- SUBCATEGORY 1: Time Factor

In this answer it could be seen how critical students can be. The students showed a high level of critical thinking which can be observed through some comments. Some of the comments that students made about the time factor with positive connotations (3 comments) are the following:

**D3TFPP10:**

"when the activities are group they are more fast because we are more fast with help of other”. Researcher’s free translation of the comment: “When the activities are in group, they are faster as we have help of others”.

**D3TFPP21:**

“es más fácil para corregir para los profesores, en vez de 40 respuestas tienen que corregir solo 6 o 5”. Researcher’s free translation of the comment: It’s easier for teachers to correct or check just 5 or 6 answers instead of 40.

In contrast, there were 16 answers with a negative connotation about the time factor. Some of the comments made were the following:

**D3TFNP17:**

“porque se demoran más las cosas en grupo porque en general nos ponemos más a conversar que a hacer lo que tenemos que hacer”. Researcher’s free translation of the comment: “...because working in groups is more time consuming. In general we start to talk instead of doing what we have to do”.

D3TFNP21:

“cuando hacemos trabajos grupales o actividades tenemos que ponernos de acuerdo en muchas cosas y eso toma más tiempo que hacer las cosas solo. yo en lo personal prefiero siempre hacer las cosas solo por lo mismo. no tengo que ponerme de acuerdo con alguien más en lo que quiero hacer”. Researcher’s free translation of the comment: “When we work in groups we have to agree in many things and that is time consuming. It is faster to do things alone. In my personal opinion, I prefer to work alone because I do not have to take into account others’ comments or agree with somebody else”.

As it can be observed, for some students group work is not the best methodology to be applied because students have other points of view and with higher levels of critical thinking, which made the task completion more difficult to fulfill.

4.4.2 DIMENSION 3- SUBCATEGORY 2: Discipline

This dimension is related to the impressions of students about discipline or organization when working in groups. The comments made with positive connotation were 7 and the comments with negative connotation were 22.

D3DPP10:

“es bueno trabajar en grupos porque si uno se distrae siempre está el compañero que te reta y te dice que hagas lo que tienes que hacer”. Researcher’s free translation of the comment: “It is good to work in groups because if one of the members of the group gets distracted, someone will tell you off and ask you to work”.

On the opposite, there were 22 comments with negative connotation. Some of them are the
following:

**D3DNP7:**

"porque siempre que hacemos cosas grupales nos ponemos a lesiar más que a trabajar". Researcher’s free translation of the comment: “...because any time that we work in groups we start to mess around more than really work”.

**D3DNP21:**

“porque nos desordenamos y nunca trabajamos. Metemos mucha bulla y conversamos mucho de otras cosas”. Researcher’s free translation of the comment: “... because we never work and we get noisy and talkative. We start talking about other things instead of working”.

Regarding these answers, students show a high level of reflection about themselves and what they do when working in groups. They are conscious about what they do right or wrong during their learning process.

### 4.4.3 DIMENSION 3- SUBCATEGORY 3: Educational system in general

In this dimension students could express their opinion and feelings about what they think about the educational system and how it can contribute or affect teaching. There were 2 comments with a positive connotation and 16 with negative connotations. Some of the comments made with positive connotation are the following:

**D3ESPP10:**

“las cosas en grupo nos permiten conocernos más y compartir nuestros conocimientos, también les sirve a los profes porque es más rápido”. Researcher’s free translation of the comment: “Group work allows us to know each other better and to share knowledge. It is good for teachers as the correction is faster”.

D3ESPP7:

“trabajar en grupos tiene muchos beneficios sociales para nosotros. nos sirve para
conocernos más, para aprender a respetar otras opiniones y para aprender a
trabajar con distintos compañeros. Researcher’s free translation of the comment:
“Working in groups has lot of benefits for us regarding social skills. It is useful to
know each other better, to learn to respect others’ opinions and to learn how to
work with different classmates”.

The students are capable to recognize how useful group work is for them regarding
social skills and the practice of them.

On the other hand, there were 16 comments with negative connotations. Some of
the comments made by the students were the following:

D3ESNP1:

“los profesores a veces quieren hacer otras cosas pero la tía Carla los reta”.
Researcher’s free translation of the comment: “Teachers sometimes want to do
other things in the classroom but Aunt Carla tells them off”. In this specific
comment, the participant mentioned “Tia Carla”, related to the UTP manager (Head
of Technical-pedagogical Unit).

D3ESNP8:

“de repente cuando estamos en cosas grupales o cosas entretenidas en verdad, la
tía Carla la pide a los profesores que estemos tranquilos y dejemos de hacer esa
actividad. En todos los colegios hay utp y los profes tienen que hacer caso a los
jefes que se encuentran en los colegios”. Researcher’s free translation of the
comment: “Sometimes when we are doing group work or entertaining activities, Aunt Carla asks the teachers to stay quiet and to stop the activity. In every school there is a UTP and the teachers have to obey what the bosses ask for at school”.

Conclusively, students demonstrated a high level of reflection. They could identify some reasons why they think teachers prefer not to apply CLL. Related to educational system, they had the capacity to mention positive and negative aspects of the educational system in general as well as the hierarchy in the schools.

Having analyzed the results of the study, the next section will discuss these results considering the theory that was presented in previous chapters.
4.5 DISCUSSION

Considering the results previously presented, there are similarities in the results obtained in the present study and the ones reviewed in the state of the arts.

The first study considered was “Examining EFL students’ foreign language speaking anxiety”. This study was carried out by Çağatay (2015). The results of the first research question revealed that EFL students undergo a moderate level of FLSA. In the present study, the results were similar regarding that the foreign language speaking anxiety also decreased. It is also important to highlight that the researcher’s attitude (as the instructor) also facilitated this decrease in students’ anxiety.

The second study considered was “Foreign Language Anxiety of Underprepared Non-English Undergraduate Students”. This study was conducted by Lan and Chang (2017). The results showed that most of the Taiwanese undergraduate non-English Major students experienced anxiety in the Freshmen English Listening and Speaking classroom, especially the fear of making mistakes, test anxiety, and communication apprehension. In addition, the results showed that their language anxiety and English achievement were negatively related to each other. Such results indicate that for these EFL learners, language anxiety negatively influences their English achievement; this means that the students with a higher level of language anxiety tended to perform at lower levels than those with lower anxiety (Lan, 2017). Regarding the results, other study made in Turkey about language anxiety also found that language anxiety and students’ performance were related (Öztürk, 2014). As the aforementioned studies, the results of this research also pointed out that language anxiety and students’ performances correlate in a negative way. The students of this research improved their speaking skills when they felt more relaxed in the classroom. At the beginning of the intervention the students looked anxious and nervous when speaking in
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English. Moreover, as time passed by and the different activities were carried out session by session, the students seemed more relaxed. In this sense, oral language acquisition is seen as a natural process for children that occurs almost unconsciously. With the pass of time, the ability in speaking grows as the level of anxiety is lower but not necessarily leads to perfection (Al Hosni, 2014). On the same line, the participants of the study showed an increased fluency in their speaking skills but not in their accuracy.

During this research, the students were exposed most of the time to English. Regarding to the input hypothesis, language is acquired through the understanding of messages and the comprehensible input is essential during the process of acquisition (Krashen, 1989). Consequently, the students who participated in this study could listen to each other and talk to each other with a similar level or comprehensible input.

Another study carried out by Tanveer (2007) that focused on language anxiety in Saudi Arabia is “Investigation of the factors that cause language anxiety for ESL/EFL learners in learning speaking skills and the influence it casts on communication in the target language.” The author suggests that the teacher is the one in charge of making anxiety levels lower. Tanveer (2007) indicated that Foreign Language Anxiety considerations by a language teacher are highly important in assisting them in achieving the intended performance goals in the target language. For the same reason, this research used some techniques where the teacher applied strategies to help learners cope with its destructive feelings. In addition to reducing learners’ anxiety, teachers should also build students’ confidence and self-esteem in their foreign language abilities through encouragement, reassurance, positive reinforcement, and empathy. All these were applied by the researcher obtaining positive results.
In addition, students should be provided with several opportunities to practice speaking in the classroom. Certain learning activities, such as creating problem-solving situations and working through language problems through pair work, group work, games, and simulations, are pointed out as useful when facing language anxiety problems (Alrabai, 2014). Considering the activities previously mentioned CLL was suitable in this research to make students feel less nervous or anxious and giving them the opportunity to express or interchange ideas in English. Furthermore, research based on the study of group work stated that there are a lot of advantages when using CLL methodology as, for example, to avoid a teacher-centered class, to create a friendly community and a relaxed atmosphere with a sense of security and with lower levels of language anxiety. Besides, CLL and its activities give the opportunities to speak and practice oral skill (Sato, 2003). All the above were considered in the intervention; thus, the researcher (and teacher) gave plenty of opportunities to students to express themselves and share and interchange their ideas framing the activities within a friendly environment and making the sessions student-centered.

The major similarity that the above mentioned studies have with this research is that English is taught as a foreign language. In addition, the main topic of the studies was language anxiety and how language anxiety could affect students’ performances and attitudes. Likewise, another similarity is the use or suggestions of activities in which cooperation, group or pair work are crucial to reduce language anxiety and to create a comfortable atmosphere to communicate in English. Then, when students started to communicate, they could produce orally, this relates to Swain’s (1995) Output Hypothesis. Considering the importance of oral production and its process, the exchange of meaning
between teacher and learner, and learners divided into groups, increases comprehensible input which focuses on meaning. In addition, output produced by student facilitates integration of new linguistic knowledge as well as the process of acquisition (LIM, 2017).
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It is important to remind the reader of the research questions and objectives of this study. Additionally, it is useful to mention, once more, that the participants of the study were 30 students from Divina Maestra High School, a subsidized school in Valparaíso, Chile.

The first research question was whether the group work methodology would help reduce oral language anxiety in EFL high school learners. Given the results previously analyzed the questionnaires and the analysis of qualitative data, this question can be answered as positive. Twenty-six students out of 30 answered that they liked CLL activities as they felt less anxious when performing orally.

The second research question was related to EFL learners’ perceptions when working in groups or pairs to promote a positive attitude towards oral language communication. Regarding students’ comments based on group work, pair work or CLL activities implemented, their perceptions are mostly positive. Some of the comments that students made were related to the support and the lower level of language anxiety when working in groups. Some of them mentioned that they used to be ashamed when talking in front of the class and that they preferred to talk in groups.

Through the application of questionnaire one, question one: Did you like to work with CLL (group activities, pair work, etc.)? Twenty-six students from an universe of thirty answered yes. The same number of students answered positively question two from questionnaire one. Regarding the increment of participation in oral activities, the participants expressed that they participated more in oral activities for the following reasons: the support of classmates in the learning process, the level of language anxiety was lower, they did not feel the pressure of being exposed in front of all the classroom, the
benefits that they had as a whole group, to know better the classmates that they had not worked with before, that it was entertaining for them and that it was a preparation for university in which they think they will need to speak English in the English subject and/or present in front of the whole class. Nevertheless, there were 4 students that answered negatively. Some of the comments that they made were related to the laughter when another was talking, there was no difference for them to talk in groups or to expose in front of all the class. These four students prefer to write using Whatsapp or other social media because they blush when they speak in English even though working in groups.

Regarding the general objectives of this study, which was to promote oral skills through the implementation of CLL activities and to identify students perceptions when using CLL activities, it can be concluded that CLL helped to promote oral communication and that students’ perceptions when using CLL are mostly positive. The students participated more in oral activities and they could communicate with each other without taking into account their grammar or accuracy errors.

The specific objectives in the study were to explore the application of CLL in the Chilean context and to evaluate group work methodologies for developing speaking skills and to promote positive attitudes when speaking in English. To conclude, it can be stated that CLL activities and applications were useful to promote oral communication inside the classroom. Moreover, the impressions and perceptions of the students during this research were mainly positive.
5.1 IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

The findings and results of this research can be useful for teaching/learning EFL in Chile. As it could be observed, the speaking skill is the most difficult skill for teachers to work with and for students to carry out. Besides, this study contributes to give in-service teachers ideas to apply when teaching, in order to decrease language anxiety and to increase students’ participation in oral activities using CLL activities taking into account its principles.

5.2 LIMITATIONS

It is crucial to mention some of the limitations that this research faced:

- Overuse of mother tongue in oral activities
- Students shyness when talking even in their mother tongue
- Values as respect or to listen to each other when talking
- Make every member of the group part of the task and not just one student doing all the task for the rest of the group
- Use of cell phones
- Students’ motivation at the very beginning of the intervention

Despite the limitations, the research could be carried out as it was planned and the intervention had consistent support from the school principal, head teachers and all the members of the school.

Nonetheless, further research needs to be carried out. This study addressed the issue of decreasing language anxiety when it comes to oral communication from the view of the students.

Firstly, it would be advisable to find out what EFL teachers think about CLL and
what are teachers’ attitudes and thoughts about group work.

Secondly, it would be convenient to investigate the application of CLL activities and principles to promote other language skill as reading, writing or listening.

Thirdly, there is a need to research on what are the impressions of school principals or head teachers when using CLL methodology, as from the present study arose from students that teachers are not always willing to incorporate new methodologies. Furthermore, sometimes institutions are reluctant to use new methodologies because they have the perception that this would cause disorder or misbehavior.

Lastly, it is recommended further research is conducted to explore the application of CLL in other contexts such as public schools or students with different learning styles.
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Appendix 1: Questionnaire

Questionnaire for an English Master Degree

The aim of this questionnaire is to find out how students felt when using CLL methods and what their impressions were in oral activities. It has been observed by the researcher of this case study that in some schools, students looked nervous or frustrated when speaking in English. In order to know the answer of this concern, students will be asked to answer this questionnaire to answer some questions related to CLL method and their impressions when using it regarding language anxiety, and if it is decreased inside the classroom with this type of methodology.

Every detail about yourself in this questionnaire will be regarded as strictly confidential. This means that only the writer of this investigation (and her research advisor) will have access to your information.

Please complete the questionnaire in full, and answer the questions truthfully.

If you have any questions please contacts Josefa Aguilera Escobar (research writer) send an email to: missjosefaaguilera@gmail.com
## Using Cooperative Language Learning to Promote Speaking Skills

Name: ______________________ School name: ___________________ City:_________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Did you like to work with CLL (group activities, pair work, etc.)?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Did you feel less nervous or anxious when speaking in a group instead of in front of the class?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) If yes, why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Did you participate more in oral activities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why? Why not?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Why do you think that teachers prefer the traditional way (individual work) to teach instead of CLL (pair or group work)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Estudio de caso sobre el uso del método cooperativo para promover uso de comunicación verbal en idioma extranjero inglés
Josefa Aguilera Escobar
Facultad de Educación y ciencias sociales
Universidad Andrés Bello

Estimados/as Apoderado/a y Alumnos/as:
Usted ha sido invitado a participar en un estudio de caso que investiga el uso del método cooperativo y actividades grupales para poder promover el uso del idioma extranjero inglés en alumnos y en contexto escolar.
A través de esta carta queremos invitar a usted a participar del proyecto de investigación titulado “Uso del método cooperativo para promover el uso de la comunicación verbal en idioma extranjero inglés” a cargo de la investigadora Josefa Aguilera Escobar, docente del colegio Divina Maestra.
El objeto de esta carta es informarle sobre este estudio para ayudarle a tomar la decisión de participar en la presente investigación.

¿Cuál es el propósito de esta investigación?
El propósito de esta investigación es aplicar métodos cooperativos entre los estudiantes, para de esta forma intentar disminuir la ansiedad que causa hablar en un idioma extranjero.
El presente estudio piloto aborda específicamente relaciones interpersonales entre alumnos, y relaciones alumno-profesor.

¿En qué consiste la participación en el estudio?
Su participación en el estudio requerirá de su asistencia a la asignatura inglés y participación en actividades orales en el idioma de forma grupal y/o en parejas. Esta metodología se aplicará durante todo el mes de Septiembre. También, a través de la presente carta, autorizará a ser grabado y entrevistado antes de comenzar y después de realizar las sesiones cooperativas a través de un cuestionario relacionado al uso del método.

¿Qué pasa con la información y datos que usted entregue?
La entrevista será grabada y luego transcrita para su análisis. La investigadora de este estudio mantendrá estricta confidencialidad respecto a la información proporcionada en la entrevista y cuestionario. Al presentar los resultados del estudio, nunca se reportará ningún antecedente que permita identificar a los participantes.

¿Es obligación participar?
Su participación en este estudio es voluntaria, y si decide retirar su participación podrá hacerlo en cualquier momento sin repercusión alguna.

¿A quién puede contactar para saber más de este estudio o si le surgen dudas?
Si tiene cualquier pregunta acerca de esta investigación, puede contactar a Josefa Aguilera, profesora de inglés del colegio, a través del correo: missjosefaaguilera@gmail.com

HE TENIDO LA OPORTUNIDAD DE LEER ESTA DECLARACIÓN DE CONSENTIMIENTO INFORMADO, HACER PREGUNTAS ACERCA DEL PROYECTO DE INVESTIGACIÓN, Y ACEPTO PARTICIPAR EN ESTE PROYECTO.

__________________________________________________________________________  ___________________________________________________________________
Nombre Apoderado/a Firma

__________________________________________________________________________  ___________________________________________________________________
Nombre Alumno/a Firma
APPENDIX 3

Unit 3: What should I do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-To identify vocabulary related to illnesses through videos (Fever - backache - flu - cough - toothache - stomachache)</td>
<td>1. Point out the mimics of classmates 2. Creating sentences orally with the vocabulary presented.</td>
<td>Students’ books Projector Speakers Laptop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-To identify uses of <strong>should</strong> – <strong>shouldn’t</strong> related to illnesses</td>
<td>1. Point out the mimics of classmates 2. Give advice according the symptoms and illnesses of classmates</td>
<td>Speakers Projector Notebooks Envelopes with words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-To create dialogues about “Going to the doctor”</td>
<td>1. Give advice according to the situations presented 2. Create a short dialogue using should/ shouldn’t and the vocabulary presented to go to the doctor 3. Present a summary of the dialogue created</td>
<td>Laptop Projector Speakers Notebooks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4 | -To act out dialogues created by students | 1. The students act out the dialogues created  
2. Give feedback each other | Materials to support oral performance  
Speakers |
|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | -To reflect about the use of CLL  
-To full fill the questionnaires | 1. The students make questions and comments as a group about the use of group and pair work  
2. Full fill questionnaires | Questionnaires |
**APPENDIX 4**

Name: ______________________ School name: ___________________ City:_________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6) 1) Did you like to work with CLL (group activities, pair work, etc.)?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Did you feel less nervous or anxious when speaking in a group instead</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of in front of the class?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) If yes, why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>porke podia conversar con mis compañeros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>si tenia preguntas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Did you participate more in oral activities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why? Why not?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>siento que participe mas porque mis amigos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>me audaron a hablar en ingles cuando no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sabia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Why do you think that teachers prefer the traditional way (individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work) to teach instead of CLL (pair or group work)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>porque no metemos bulla cuando trabajamos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>solos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Did you like to work with CLL (group activities, pair work, etc.)?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Did you feel less nervous or anxious when speaking in a group instead of in front of the class?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) If yes, why?</td>
<td>yes because my friends were next to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) Did you participate more in oral activities?</td>
<td>yes because my friends help me to talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why? Why not?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) Why do you think that teachers prefer the traditional way (individual work) to teach instead of CLL (pair or group work)?</td>
<td>because they are flojos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is more silencio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 6

Creating dialogues

P1: what can we do? (laughs)
P2: a woman sick of backache
P1: eee…. como se deciaaaaaaaaaaa! e…….eeeeee...
P2: que cosa?
P1: muebles
P2: quien sabe decir mueble??????? (shouting)
P1: jajajajajajajajaj
Teacher: furniture
P1: esooooooo! we can say woman with backache movio furniture in the house por el aseo
P2: jajajajaj wenaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa gringo
Teacher: don’t laugh of your classmate, keep working! (cheering them up)

APPENDIX 7

Creating dialogues

P3: ok let work the teacher is here
P4: ok…we can create something with a person die
P3: jajajajajaj why you gotta be so mean??’ (singing Taylor Swift song)
P4: jajajajajajaja yees po, something like cancer because of cigarettes
P3: ok pero hombre o mujer?
P4: a man, and the man go to buy cigarros and dissaper ajajjajaja like morande girl
P3: jajajajajaja siii jajajaja la polilla ajjajaja ya eso
P4: the man have two weeks to live and have to take advantage and do all the crazy things
P3: jajajajja ya pero escribamoslo, como lo pongo? profe me pone nerviosa aca al lado
hajahahah
teacher: keep working! I am not here! jajaja ok I will stop it. Thank you guys
P3: your welcome! jajajaj one hundred pesos
APPENDIX 8
Answers Questionnaire 1 – Question 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 11</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 14</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Student 15 | X |
| Student 16 | X |
| Student 17 | X |
| Student 18 | X |
| Student 19 | X |
| Student 20 | X |
| Student 21 | X |
| Student 22 | X |
| Student 23 | X |
| Student 24 | X |
| Student 25 | X |
| Student 26 | X |
| Student 27 | X |
| Student 28 | X |
| Student 29 | X |
| Student 30 | X |
### APPENDIX 9
Answers Questionnaire 1 – Question 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 11</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 14</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 15</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 16</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 17</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 18</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 19</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 21</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 22</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 23</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 24</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 25</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 26</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 27</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 28</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 29</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 30</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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