



UNIVERSIDAD ALBERTO HURTADO

FACULTAD DE EDUCACIÓN

TESIS PARA OPTAR AL GRADO  
DE  
MAGISTER EN LA ENSEÑANZA DEL INGLÉS COMO LENGUA EXTRANJERA

“EFFECTS OF THE TEACHING SPEAKING CYCLE ON THE LEVEL OF  
STUDENT’S ENGAGEMENT WITH ORAL TASKS AT UNIVERSITY LEVEL”

FLOR IRENE GALLO PINILLA

PROFESOR GUÍA: STEPHEN DARWIN

SANTIAGO DE CHILE, NOVIEMBRE 2021

**Table of contents**

I.	Abstract .....	3
II.	Introduction .....	4
III.	Action Research Question .....	7
IV.	Rationale .....	8
V.	Literature Review .....	10
VI.	Methodological design .....	13
VII.	Findings .....	16
VIII.	Research implications .....	27
IX.	Conclusions .....	34
X.	References .....	36
XI.	Appendix .....	43

## Abstract

This thesis reports on findings of a qualitative action research that was designed to enhance students' levels of engagement with oral tasks in a General English course at a university level in the Chilean context. Furthermore, this project focused on assessing strategies that may strengthen students' oral production in the target language. For this purpose, the Teaching Speaking Cycle (TSC) of Goh and Burns (2012), which highlights the importance of metacognitive instances to develop engagement and foster speaking skills, was implemented. This research was undertaken between August and November in 2019 in a private university located in Santiago and was centered on the learning experiences of a group of 23 students, aged between 18 and 21 years old. Data was collected through observations, interviews, questionnaires and a document analysis. The findings of the study suggested different outcomes. First, the implementation of the Teaching Speaking Cycle (TSC) had a positive impact on most students' levels of engagement. Secondly, even though students' levels of engagement increased, their oral skills did not improve significantly after the three-week implementation of the TSC. Finally, metacognitive instances noticeably rose students' language awareness. These findings illustrated that the TSC is a potentially suitable method to improve students' levels of engagement with oral tasks at University level in Chile.

*Keywords: Metacognition - Engagement - Speaking skills*

## Introduction

This reported thesis was conducted in 2019 at Finis Terrae University, a private educational institution located in Santiago of Chile. Due to globalization, speaking English as a foreign language has become a desired professional competence in the employment sphere. Nonetheless, a recent standardized test (SIMCE, 2019) and a National English Study conducted by Agencia de la Calidad de la Educación (2018) established that an important portion of EFL learners in Chile still struggle with English language acquisition due to a variety of factors such as students' cultural background, their parents' educational attainment, number of hours of English classes they have a week and their socio-economic group. The students who belong to the lower socio-economic segments and study in subsidized or public schools have demonstrated to reach the lowest level of knowledge of English in Chile (Agencia de Calidad de la Educación, 2018).

Until 2014, the majority of Finis Terrae students came from private schools. Nonetheless, this has changed since Finis Terrae University joined the new educational reform legislation in 2015, which has guaranteed free access to tertiary education to a portion of secondary students who come from private subsidized and public schools (Mi Futuro, 2018). These students come from a lower socio-economic background (Ministerio de Educación [MINEDUC], n/d). In 2019, 67% of UFT new students were benefited by the free education policy, while 53% of the whole student enrollment has gratuity (Universidad Finis Terrae, 2019). To access gratuity, students must belong to the 60% lower income according to FUA (Socioeconomic Accreditation Single Form).

In order to keep track of new students' English language proficiency, UFT applies an Oxford English Placement Test on its new student cohorts, placing them in a General English level according to their results. This socioeconomic change of UFT cohorts has had an impact on these tests' results which has resulted in a generally lower level of English over the last years, as most students currently enrolled are mainly derived from public and private subsidized schools (Mi Futuro, 2018). Up until 2015, most new UFT students were placed at A2 level, while during the last years last cohorts have been placed mostly between A0 and A1 level.

Finis Terrae's English Department aims to assist students to reach level B2 according to CEFR, at the end of the program (Universidad Finis Terrae, 2019). To do so, the UFT English Department provides four mandatory General English (GE) courses from level I to IV for all UFT students. These courses are taught for two and a half hours a week and are a degree requirement.

Up until 2014, most students from new cohorts were placed at English Levels II and III, however, since 2015 the test results have declined considerably, thus most new students have been placed at level I. (UFT's English Department, 2019).

Alongside with the drop in new cohorts' performance in the English placement test over the last academic years, observational student oral production represented in UFT English department's tracking rubrics has unveiled a broad decline in the level of English language capability in speaking skills. These results are aligned with the Chilean EFL context, wherein national performance has likewise turned out to be deficient.

Each General English course is taught for two and a half hours a week and each class has between 25 and 30 students. Regarding the curriculum and according to UFT's General English level III Syllabus (2019), the methodology currently being used is *Active-*

*participatory*, where students are expected to actively participate in activities that include oral and written production, reading and listening comprehension, among others.

Regardless of this fact, oral assessments and rubrics from last year, as well as classroom observations have shown that a significant portion of students attending GE courses has not managed to engage with their oral tasks. Most students have struggled to achieve the required oral standards for their level, which are established by the Common European Framework (CEFR). Combined, these factors have prevented students to improve their spoken performance in the classroom.

A group of 23 university students participated in the study. The majority of those students were derived from the private subsidized and the public sector. Classroom observations suggested that the skill which learners struggled most with was speaking. The majority of students were reluctant to use the target language in the classroom, as all of their responses were made in their mother tongue. As observed in classes, whenever asked to use the target language, most students were reluctant to speak English. Students often claimed their lack of knowledge to avoid using the target language in the classroom. During class interview 1, students expressed their lack of strategies to learn English due to the fact that they were never taught to reflect upon their English Learning Process. Likewise, they mentioned that if they were taught language strategies, they could manage to improve their performance.

Furthermore, another relevant element observed among students in classes was the lack of engagement, primarily with oral tasks. Despite the fact that the teacher used topics and material that seemed appropriate for that group of students, most of them gave the impression of being disengaged. This was illustrated by student lack of engagement, expressed in a range of attitudes and performance observed in classes. Firstly, as mentioned

above, most of them were reluctant to use the target language and conduct the activities given by the teacher. Most of them listened to the instructions, but they did not work on their tasks. Those students rapidly turned their attention into their mobile phones or other businesses such as other subjects' pieces of work. Secondly, as their English class was held every Friday at 8.30 am, all students were extremely sleepy and did not react to stimuli, not even the morning greeting. The teacher had to greet students several times in order to get a response. Moreover, some students did not take out their materials or did not group with their classmates to work. By doing so, the class started with difficulty. Thirdly, the majority of students tended to not show interest in overcoming language barriers such as vocabulary and when asked to express an idea, they used a translator instead of a dictionary or their class notes. Fourthly, a considerable number of students usually arrived at classes late or even skipped them. As General English Courses were not part of their career courses, but general training at university, some students prioritized other subjects over English. Further, being university students, they had the freedom to manage their time and most of them argued their delay based on morning traffic and absences on the program's flexibility to miss 6 classes. Finally, some students used the time of the English class to discuss other subjects and matters. Some of them talked about other assessments or even talked about personal matters.

### **Action Research Question**

The action research project focused on the implementation of a strategy that might help students engage with oral tasks in order to increase their speaking skills in the target language inside the classroom. In order to understand the effects of an approach that

engages students with oral tasks, the research question for this project was: *What effect does the implementation of the Teaching Speaking Cycle have on the levels of students' engagement with oral tasks in a General English course at University level?*

### **Rationale**

Even though English is a needed competence which most future professionals should manage to some extent, many students struggle to engage with their English classes and speaking in the target language. This apprehension amongst students might be caused by several reasons, either because they are shy and embarrassed to speak English in public, lack of confidence or are afraid to produce inaccurate speech, to name a few (Burns, 2012; Zhiping & Paramasivam, 2013). In regard to these factors, the authors observe that the process of speaking display too many simultaneous challenges for students. First, the topics presented in classes might not be sufficiently motivating or the language structures required to carry on with the tasks might represent a level of difficulty not suitable for students. To overcome these situations, the authors suggest teachers to rise their awareness on students' needs. That is to devote adequate time in order for students to increase their insight, structures and vocabulary required to cope with the topics treated in classes. Secondly, students should be provided with several opportunities to practice the different features required in speaking tasks, such as vocabulary, discourse markers, pronunciation, etc. Thirdly, one of the most relevant aspects highlighted by the authors is to foster students' metacognition (Goh, 2012). The authors assert the importance of learners' metacognitive awareness to endure learning success. Combined, these three elements should increase

students' engagement to speak. Moreover, as speaking is a strikingly complex skill, the authors emphasize that it should be instructed explicitly in the EFL classroom.

Richards (2005) states that there is a broad range of methodologies and approaches designed to help students engage and boost their oral skills. On the one hand, he affirms that there are classic communicative language teaching approaches advocated from the 1970s until the 1990s, such as the Communicative Approach, which aims to enable the learner to communicate appropriately and effectively in different situations (Brumfit & Johnson, 1979; Littlewood, 1981) and the Natural Approach or the Direct Method (Krushen, 1983) wherein grammar rules are avoided and emphasis is made on input and usage of the target language. On the other hand, Richards (2005) claims communicative language teaching approaches from the late 1990s to the present, which focus on learners' meaningful interactions, collaborative learning, input and feedback, such as Task-Based Instruction (Willis, 1996; Ellis, 2003 & Nunan, 2004). The author advocates that the different elements involved in communicative competence can be fostered through interactive tasks that engage students. There are also manifold approaches, methodologies, and strategies meant to actively engage students such as Active Methodologies (Kanopka, Adaime & Mosele, 2015), the Kagan Structures (Kagan, 2014), Gamification (Figueroa, 2015) and the use of authentic material (Spelleri, 2002). Although all these different approaches are student-centered and aim to foster students' engagement, none of them focus their attention on metacognition. Several authors support the fact that metacognitive instances are essential to acquire a second language (Carrell, Gajdusek & Wise, 1998; Singhal, 2001; Thamraksa, 2005; Lam, 2009; Goh 2014). According to the authors, metacognitive instances should facilitate learning opportunities for the student to, for example, plan some communicative tasks. Goh (2016) notes that when students get the

chance of reflecting upon their learning processes and strategies, metacognitive instances should help them actively engage with their own learning processes, thus, to engage with their oral tasks.

Unlike the aforementioned approaches, methods and strategies, the Teaching Speaking Cycle of Goh and Burns (2012), which focuses not only on the development of the elements required to develop communicative competence and speaking skills, but also provides students with systematic metacognitive instances, came up as the most suitable approach to be implemented in UFT GE context. The main difference between the Teaching Speaking Cycle (TSC) and the previously mentioned approaches lies on its awareness on students' needs. It systematically provides students with discourse structures and speaking strategies, opportunities to practice and metacognitive instances. Having said that, the TSC would delve into students' needs to develop metacognition in order to actively engage them with oral tasks, so as to finally increase their oral production in the classroom.

### **Literature Review**

As mentioned in the context section, an important number of learners who are studying General English courses at Finis Terrae have become reluctant to use the target language in the classroom. This lack of engagement with oral tasks might be the result of the language acquisition reality in Chile at a national level, as 'SIMCE Inglés' (2019) and 'Estudio Nacional de Inglés' (2018) reported. Araneda, Gairín, Pedraja-Rejas, & Rodríguez-Ponce (2018) analyzed recent access to higher education by lower socioeconomic segments of the Chilean society. These authors mentioned how this phenomenon has derived into the

diversification of students' profiles, who mainly come from subsidized and public schools.

It is argued by Araneda et al. (2018) that most of these students are the first generation who have accessed university in their families, they come from economically deprived social backgrounds, and their parents' educational attainment is limited. A study carried out by Agencia de la Calidad (2018) attributed social background and lack of access as some of the main factors that affect students' language acquisition in Chile, while the students from the public sector have proven to have the lowest English proficiency in the country.

Considering UFT new student profiles since 2015 and their related academic flaws, the aforementioned socioeconomic elements might be causing learners' disaffection and lack of engagement with oral tasks in the classroom. In order to effectively engage students with oral tasks at UFT, learners should be provided with metacognitive instances that allow them to reflect upon some language strategies that might have been resulted helpful for them to develop language skills during their childhood and school years, no matter how limited their social background or parents' educational attainment was.

Three concepts were at the center of the design of this action research project: Cognition and Metacognition, Student Engagement and the Teaching Speaking Cycle of Goh & Burnes (2012). Those elements resulted critical to the research given its potential impact on students' levels of engagement with oral tasks in the classroom and expected increase of oral skills.

### **Engagement in young adults at university level**

Wilms (2000), who reviewed multiple studies related to the role of engagement, refers to this concept as “the extent to which students identify with and value schooling outcomes and [...] students' sense of belonging or attachment to school, which has to do with feelings

of being accepted and valued by their peers and other in the school” (2000, p.8). Zyngier (2008) advocates the view that although students at risk tend to lack engagement in the classroom, they just need to be given the chance to connect with the academic context in order to succeed. The author indicates that students at risk can achieve engagement through appropriate methods that encourage them to learn. That is to say, UFT students who come from a lower socioeconomic level only need the appropriate method to engage with the oral tasks in the classroom. Other authors complement the definition of engagement by addressing it from more specific perspectives. Davis, Summers, and Miller (2012) approach student engagement from three dimensions: behavioral, relational and cognitive. Behavioral engagement is related to learners’ behavior in the classroom, expressed in the effort and persistent participation in the class; relational engagement, is identified with learners’ emotions and interactions with their teachers and peers; and cognitive engagement is understood as learners’ cognitive investment to develop self-learning skills. Lester (2013) also emphasizes how cognitive engagement is mainly defined by motivational goals and the capacity of students to self-regulate their learning through metacognition.

### **Teaching Speaking Cycle and Metacognition**

As mentioned in the previous section, several studies have demonstrated the importance of providing students with metacognitive instances to achieve language acquisition. Metacognition is understood as the human’s mindful ability to manage cognitive processes (Schmitt & Newby, 1986; Sternberg, 1998; Veenman, Van Hout-Wolters & Afflerbach, 2006; Haukås, Bjorke & Dypedahl, 2018). That is to say, once students are able to manage their own cognitive processes in regards to English acquisition, learning the target language should result into a more reasonable process for them. Given the aim of this action research

is to increase UFT students' levels of engagement with oral tasks, metacognitive instances might help students engage by managing their own learning process. Learning will not be merely guided by the teacher, but learners shall have a central role on understanding their pace of learning and the most suitable strategies to learn speaking.

In this regard, Burns (2016) directs the focus of metacognition towards its importance to communicate in a foreign language. She argues that to the extent to which learners use strategies to think about the way they communicate, their oral skills will improve.



*Figure 1: Teaching Speaking Cycle*

Source: *Teaching speaking: Towards a holistic approach*. Goh and Burns (2012).

The Teaching Speaking Cycle (TSC) of Goh and Burns (2012) is an approach used to plan speaking lessons. It consists of seven stages to be implemented according to students' profiles, needs, and speaking goals. The steps included in the cycle consider situations to raise metacognitive awareness, various input instances, peers, self and teacher's feedback

and communicative strategies. The aim of the cycle is to work holistically on core speech features such as accuracy and fluency along with metacognition instances when students get to reflect upon their learning process and development of speaking skills. Since this teaching speaking cycle contemplates both speaking and metacognitive instances, students might become more aware of their strengths and weaknesses when using the target language and engage with oral tasks. Therefore, metacognition is here understood as the foundation of language acquisition.

### **Methodological design**

This qualitative research used the triangulation method (Creswell & Miller, 2000; Bush, 2007). The data collection strategy encompassed three perspectives to understand the complexity of the conducted study. The range of data collection tools used for this study intended to be aligned with the compilation of these three points of view. The data collection tools used were Interviews, Observations and Document Analysis. Whilst the data collection process of the reported study consisted on two stages: Pre-intervention, and During and Post-intervention.

Throughout the pre-intervention stage, Classroom Observations, Interviews with the students and document analysis of public documents such as learning material, rubrics, assessments and General English's programs were the tools used to understand the learning context. Thus, they provided fruitful insight that set the guidelines to design the intervention. Those strategies generated data about students' interactions, their performance in the classroom, the moments when they were more or less willing to participate by using

the target language, the strategies that seemed to be more suitable for achieving the class objectives, etc.

Systematic classroom observation was conducted in order to allow the researcher to have an approximation to students' levels of engagement with oral tasks by focusing on oral production patterns. O'Leary (2013) and Mertler (2014) highlight the importance of carrying out observations to collect data when undertaking qualitative research. Through observations, a better understanding of UFT students' engagement level was assessed, since they shed some light on students' behavior and attitudes with oral tasks in the classroom. As observations are aimed to be an objective picture of students' interactions in the classroom, observation forms must be filled avoiding personal opinions and biased comments. Given the fact that the teacher-researcher is an active participant on the research and due to time limitations, classroom observations were completed immediately after the class was ended. The observation protocol considered the following aspects: students' reactions when asked to use the target language; and students' engagement with oral tasks in the classroom (See Appendix B).

Pre-intervention, students were required to answer a questionnaire proposed in the Teaching Speaking Cycle of Goh and Burns (2012). This questionnaire aimed to delve into students' perceptions of spoken English and how they felt when they produced it. (See Appendix C). Thus, a range of Finis Terrae University's public records were analyzed in order to delve into elements that might be encouraging or discouraging students' engagement with oral tasks. These elements considered activities, assessments, types of material presented to students, etc. They were explored through a simple discourse analysis process. Triad 3 (2016) notes several advantages of doing artefact analysis, such as

efficiency, data source reliability and access to data that cannot be observed or provided by individuals on interviews or observation procedures.

Mills and Birks (2014) point out that interviews are highly suitable for qualitative research projects, as they allow the researcher to get a better understanding of individuals.

That is why class interviews were conducted in order to get students' perspectives both pre, while and post intervention (see appendix D). Interviews were conducted during classes, with all students present and participating. They focused on students' perceptions towards speaking English and aspect that made them feel comfortable or uncomfortable to speak.

Finis Terrae's public records such as learning material and General English programs contributed to achieving a better understanding of the EFL situation at Finis Terrae University. The data provided by these tools enhanced the researcher's comprehension on students' relation with (spoken) English and provided some insight on how to present activities to students during the intervention.

While and post-intervention, classroom observations, class interviews, exit cards proposed in the TSC and artefact analysis in the form of oral assessments provided the research with different perspectives - consistent with the triangulation method being used- to understand the effects that the implementation of the Teaching Speaking Cycle had on students' levels of engagement with oral tasks. The exit cards were retrieved from the TSC design and consisted on simple questions which guided students' metacognitive instances (see appendix E). The information provided by students through the exit cards helped the teacher understand what students were learning, how students felt they learnt better, and what strategies and activities they valued most.

Considering this was a qualitative research, the triangulation method was used. In order to ensure validity of the research, data was collected from multiple sources (Creswell & Miller, 2000; Bush, 2007). Likewise, the data gathered while and post intervention was read several times in order to be able to identify different themes and categories which later were coded and categorized into themes that arose from rough data collected through the different sources. The findings that emerged from the pre, while and post intervention stages turned into new theories that guided the researcher towards a better understanding of the research question. Each finding provided the researcher with information to understand the different effects that the Teaching Speaking Cycle had on students' levels of engagement.

### **Findings**

In order to analyze the qualitative data collected through classroom observations, classroom interviews, students' questionnaires and document analysis, the researcher carried out thematic coding, which generated a range of findings. The data primarily suggested that the Teaching Speaking Cycle had a broadly positive impact in a significant majority of General English level III students' engagement with oral tasks, with most engaging responses towards conducting the speaking activities in classes. Nonetheless, although most students were broadly engaged with the activities, some seemed to struggle focusing on the usage of the target language during the realization of the activities, since a minority of them started speaking Spanish instead. There were also some relevant secondary findings which refer to features that affected students' speaking production of English.

Both, primary and secondary findings of this research are detailed below.

### **Primary Findings**

- 1. Most students increased their levels of engagement with oral tasks when speaking English, however, a few students who were less engaged did not successfully meet the levels of engagement expected.**

The data revealed that after the implementation of the Teaching Speaking Cycle, almost all students achieved a higher degree of engagement with the oral tasks presented in the classroom. Prior to the intervention, document analysis demonstrated that the activities presented by the learning material such as the student book lacked opportunities for students to prepare the oral tasks before speaking. Furthermore, some students expressed that the lack of time to prepare oral tasks prevented them from feeling confident to speak (Interview 3). This lack of engagement was also observed in classes prior to the intervention, where most students were reluctant to speak English during the oral activities.

Although the TSC was conducted for a short period of time, the data indicated that most students' levels of engagement with oral tasks were positively impacted after its implementation. On the one hand, it was consistently observed that even though a couple of students repeatedly refused to work with a partner or in groups in order to carry out with the speaking activities given by the teacher, most students seemed enthusiastic towards the completion of the oral tasks. In later interviews, some students stated that these types of activities were 'funnier' than just doing the regular ones retrieved from the book or executing a handout. Several students referred to the topics discussed in classes and expressed that the ones used along with the TSC were 'more entertaining' than the ones

retrieved from the student book used in regular classes. In addition, a student expressed in the exit cards that she engaged better with these types of activities mentioning that she understood 'it was not necessary to speak a perfect English'. Another student stated that 'at my pace, my classmates will understand what I want to say' (Interview 3). Later in the interviews, a learner also mentioned that he enjoyed these classes since he realized he could also 'use body language' to complement what he wanted to say and 'look my conversation partner in the eye to get a better understanding of what he wanted to say' (Interview 4). Weighing up these statements, the data revealed students engaged not only when they considered an activity as entertaining, but also, they engaged as they felt capable of using spoken English to express an idea.

On the other hand, the lifespan of the moments when students engaged the most with the speaking activities proved to be brief during the interventions. Even though it was observed that majority of students were able to engage with the speaking tasks for the time provided by the teacher, data revealed that most students who engaged with the oral activities turned to Spanish at some stage of the lesson. In this regard, a student alluded that 'We never speak English. This is the only moment when I speak English and I don't realize when I start speaking Spanish' (Interview 3). Moreover, classroom observations repeatedly showed that students who engaged with the lessons used the target language to start the conduction of the tasks, but after expressing a main idea in English, most of them developed the tasks in Spanish. Despite of the fact that data demonstrated the TSC broadly had a positive impact on students' levels of engagement, there was not sufficient data to make a judgment on the long-term impact that the cycle might have had on students' capacity of using the target language for longer stretches of time in order to complete the speaking tasks.

Data also exposed that even when most students were engaged, some of them got easily distracted and turned into a different topic that caught their attention while doing the activities. In this regard, a student mentioned that in her group they ‘started talking about some other stuff, but some of those things we spoke in English’ (Interview 3). Furthermore, classroom observations steadily showed that during the intervention a great number of students often lost their attention. Even though they were engaged, some class topics led to personal conversations where students lost track of the activities.

## **2. Metacognitive instances helped most students become aware of their learning process.**

Data suggested that the implementation of the Exit Cards proposed by Goh and Burns in the Teaching Speaking Cycle helped most students become aware of the fact that they made progress every class – to different extents – in relation to their oral production in English. Exit cards asked students to think of a word, an expression or a strategy they learnt during the lesson to improve their oral skills. Prior to the implementation of the Exit cards, document analysis showed that students did not have a real instance to raise their awareness on their learning progress. Instead, by the end of each lesson, in the plenary of the class, students were asked what they learnt in front of their classmates. Later, during the interviews, some students mentioned it was difficult for them to think about what they learnt with such a short notice. This was also observable in classes. The majority of students remained silent when asked what they learnt; thus, the teacher finished the class with one or two students saying a word they had memorized. After the implementation of the TSC, exit cards were given individually to students, in a written form. These cards had guided questions that directed students to understand their process in a time lapse of 7-10

minutes. The exit cards implemented as part of the TSC aimed to help students guide their metacognitive process regarding their oral production with hints for a guided reflection such as ‘Today I learnt to do the following in spoken English’ or ‘I learnt the following useful expressions that can help me speak more effectively’. Through these exit cards’ guided reflections, almost every student realized they actually learnt something every class, from a simple word or expression to an understanding of their own learning process. For some students this progress was represented in learning a new word, a new expression or simply in the internalization of a new speaking strategy to help them speak more fluidly, such as pausing or emphasizing intonation. After the first intervention, a student expressed ‘Today I learnt the expression <I like It, because> and then give reasons why’. Another student expressed in his exit card ‘I learnt I can speak English, but little by little’, another student stated ‘Today I learnt I don’t have to be afraid of speaking English because I will get better by practicing’, while another one expressed ‘Today I learnt that my pronunciation is not as bad as I thought’. Several reflections similar to the ones previously mentioned were replicated by the majority of students of the General English level III after the interventions. ‘I realized I know English, because I know words’, said a student (Interview 3); ‘I don’t know the connectors, but I can say ideas’, said another one (Interview 3). Prior to the intervention, several students expressed to be disengaged with oral tasks due to the fact they felt they couldn’t learn. ‘I can’t learn English, no matter what. Because I am like my father. My mother is gringa, and my father Chilean. My mother speaks English, but my father does not speak English and I am like him’, expressed a student in an interview (Interview 2). ‘I think I must have a trauma, because I can’t learn’ said another one Interview 2). Metacognitive instances helped disengaged students who had no sense of achievement to become aware of their learning process to speak English and

increased their levels of engagement, since they showed to realize speaking was not an immediate outcome, but a process that consists on little improvement every class.

### **3. Most students' levels of engagement were benefited from updated and meaningful learning material.**

Prior to the intervention, most speaking instances were retrieved from the coursebook, Straightforward pre-intermediate. Document analysis revealed that even though the book provided speaking instances in every Unit, students did not engage with the material. In fact, almost every student referred to these activities as 'boring'. The course book was utterly outdated. Its edition was from 2006, which made its topics little pertinent for students' interest. Units related to technology or leisure time included vocabulary from obsolete devices and non-relating activities for students. Furthermore, the coursebook was grammar-focused, provided minor strategies to develop students' speaking skills so as to help them conduct speaking tasks and lacked metacognitive instances. As observed in classes, prior to the implementation of the teaching speaking cycle, several students struggled with the completion of the speaking activities and they disengaged easily. Only students who already were more proficient managed to perform the activities and engaged for longer stretches of time. After the implementation of the TSC, wherein the material was retrieved from more updated sources in which students' topics of interest were covered and metacognitive instances were included, classroom observations showed that most students' levels of engagement with oral tasks increased to an extent and almost every student spoke by using the target language. This was observed in classes during the intervention stage and confirmed by students in classroom interviews with comments such as 'it -the speaking

task- was more fun. Besides, the topics we talked about were more entertaining, which made it -speaking English- easier' (Interview 3).

On the one hand, the oral skills of the small group of students who entered General English level III with a higher knowledge of English were most positively impacted by the TSC. As these students were already prone to engage with the oral tasks given their language proficiency, once they were faced to topics of their interest, their spoken outcomes boosted. This was established by the different assessments conducted in classes and the classroom observations, which reflected students' levels of engagement and participation through their interventions and participation in the class. In this regard, after actively participating in the classroom, a student made comments such as 'it is more fun to talk about things we like' (Interview 3). These comments were consistent with what was observed in the classroom during the conduction of oral tasks.

On the other hand, a group of more disadvantaged students who did not have the language competences required for a General English III level and rarely engaged, shown to increase their levels of engagement with oral tasks in the classroom after the implementation of the TSC. During the first two weeks that lasted the pre-intervention stage, the teacher was able to identify the different levels of language proficiency that students had. This was achieved through observations and assessments, that evinced that some students entered the course with a higher degree of confidence and level of English proficiency, whilst there was another group of students who displayed little confidence and demonstrated a generally lower level of language proficiency. These students valued the new material presented by the teacher, even though they acknowledged their difficulties to express complex ideas and pronounce words. A student argued that he 'didn't know how to

pronounce some words, but it was easier to look for vocabulary and write some ideas about it (i.e. the topic) first' (Interview 3).

Observations and assessments exposed that the TSC did not have any effect on a small group of students who refused to work with their classmates. Even though they were placed in different groups, with different students and constantly monitored by the teacher, this group of students did not engage with the oral tasks.

Classroom observations conducted during and post the intervention suggested that providing students with adapted material which focused on oral production, contained strategies to develop students' speaking skills and provided metacognitive instances such as the implementation of the exit cards, positively impacted most students' levels of engagement with oral tasks. On later interviews, several students expressed their preference towards updated, familiar topics.

#### **4. Speaking strategies benefited most students' speaking skills in different degrees.**

Given that the time to conduct the TSC was limited, the data collected through class interviews and classroom observation established that students' oral production improvement was not as significant as it might have been if the implementation had lasted longer. However, the data revealed that most students valued the opportunity of having time not only to have speaking instances, but also to review some strategies that might help them develop their speaking skills. This was extracted from the exit cards where a great number of students expressed how useful speaking strategies were for them. Also, it was observed in classes and through assessments that their spoken production did not have significant improvements, as students kept repeating errors. Prior to the intervention,

through class interviews and the questionnaire, several students expressed they felt 'incapable' of speaking English. In regard to this issue a student said 'I can't learn English. No matter how much I want to' (Interview 1), while another student said 'There is no point. we can't speak -English-' (Interview 1). Classroom observations and assessments also exposed that students were reluctant to speak English, and, in several opportunities, they did not make effort to carry on with the tasks. These constraints were also observed on students' lack of participation in spoken activities, their low levels of engagement with oral tasks in classes and in their low outcomes in oral assessments.

Post intervention data oral assessments and classroom observations indicated that even though most students who had a lower language proficiency still struggled expressing their ideas orally, due to limitations in their vocabulary range and grammar knowledge, made a great effort to apply those strategies when speaking. These students were more willing to get involved in oral interactions when aware of these strategies, even though some of them struggled delivering a clear message. Concerning this, during a classroom interview a student mentioned 'using connectors is really difficult for me. I have the ideas, but I don't know how to put them (in words)' (Interview 2) and another student mentioned 'we wanted to speak, but grammar was difficult for us' (Interview 2). The comments made by students during the classroom interviews give account of how reluctant some were to speak sometimes and how some of them imposed self-limitations due to their fear of speaking and making mistakes.

In respect to the students who had a higher English Language domain but presented paralinguistic flaws such as robotic speech, flat intonation or lack of body language, data showed that not only their engagement, but also their fluency improved. The implementation of the TSC aimed to engage students with oral tasks, but also to increase

their oral skills. Prior to the implementation of the TSC, students who had a higher level of English, struggled less than their classmates to complete the oral tasks since they were able to communicate orally. Nevertheless, some of them did not engage with the activities.

During the classroom interviews, some students referred to them as ‘boring’ . After the implementation of speaking strategies in the TSC, assessments and classroom observations shown that students were more engaged and willing to participate. For instance, a student mentioned that he ‘learnt to mimic the words I don’t know so my partner can understand what I want to say’ (Interview 4).

Besides, a group of the most advantaged students shown an improvement on their fluency. It was observed in classes that, as they incorporated strategies such as pausing or emphasizing intonation, they were able to speak more fluently with their conversational partner(s).

In spite of the teacher’s monitoring, a small group of students who did not engage with the activities also did not incorporate the strategies taught by the teacher. Unfortunately, the TSC had no effect on this group of students.

Despite students’ language limitations, the implications of including speaking strategies in the oral tasks were overall positive and fostered students’ engagement with the speaking activities.

##### **5. Although most students engaged with the speaking activities, a great majority of them used Spanish in the EFL classroom**

A significant majority of students made an observable effort to use the target language during the speaking activities, nonetheless, oral assessments and classroom observations evinced that several students drew on Spanish to express some of their ideas, rather than

making an effort to find an equivalent simpler expression in English. In this regard, a student argued that she ‘had the ideas but did not know how to put them in English’ (Interview 2). Also, some of them stated that ‘grammar is too difficult’ or they could not find the right words, since ‘they were too difficult’ (Interview 2). Even when these students were engaged with the speaking activities, classroom observations showed that some of them lost track of the conversation and started speaking Spanish instead. It was repeatedly observed that a considerable number of students engaged with the topics. However, as they developed their ideas, some students continued to express them in Spanish. In this regard, when the teacher commented this situation in classes, a student said, for example, ‘I needed to say it, but I did not how to say it in English so I just said it in Spanish and then I forgot to speak English again’ (Interview 4). Given the Teaching Speaking Cycle was implemented twice, further research would be required to evaluate its long-term effects on students drawing to Spanish.

#### **6. Relationship between time and the development of four language skills**

Even though the General English III course aimed to develop Reading, Writing, Listening and Speaking simultaneously, supported by learning material such as the coursebook or different sources used by the teacher, time was too limited and hindered the completion of all of the objectives of the course. The document analysis conducted in the book, the program and the assessments, evinced that the objectives set by the English department proved to be too ambitious for such short time and that conducting everything in four months-or two and a half, as in the semester studied- was simply difficult, not to say the least.

Oral assessments, classroom observations and classroom interviews suggested that the implementation of the Teaching Speaking Cycle, notwithstanding brief, proved that setting more simple objectives and focusing one language skill for a while, had a positive effect on most students in GE III.

### **Secondary Findings**

#### **1. Working in groups had a positive effect on students' levels of engagement**

Data suggested that the seating arrangement used during the implementation of the Teaching Speaking Cycle had a positive effect in almost every student of the GE level III group. The TSC fosters speaking tasks in which students can work in pairs or groups so as to enhance the self-regulation and self-monitoring of their language progress. That is why the teacher moved from a semi-circle sitting arrangement to grouping students in threes or fours. Classroom observations 5, 6 and 7 demonstrated that after the implementation of the TSC, students engaged with the oral activities as they actively participated, asked questions and interacted with their peers to conduct the tasks. In classroom interviews and exit cards most students valued working in groups and argued that speaking in small groups should be maintained. In this regard, during a class interview, a student mentioned that 'we stop being afraid (of speaking English) and start gaining confidence' (Interview 3). Also, even though during the interviews most of them recognized being embarrassed of speaking English in front of their classmates, they also acknowledged the importance of using the target language with their peers. For instance, a student expressed 'my classmates helped us correct our mistakes' (Interview 3). Moreover, students endorsed the necessity of practicing

spoken English with different classmates. 'It might be good to rotate and work with a classmate I don't know. That way, it will be more realistic', a student said (Interview 3).

Finally, students acknowledged feeling more comfortable by working in groups (interviews 3-4) rather than individually.

## **2. Topics used in the units of study directly affect students' levels of engagement**

Prior to the intervention, document analysis of the textbook and learning material showed that the topics and vocabulary contained in the course book were old fashioned and disengaging for students. For example, when the vocabulary was related to communicative devices, some outdated words such as 'fax' appeared. For instance, many students expressed that they were unfamiliar with this expression. The data revealed that moving from the topics proposed by the Straight Forward's student's book to more relevant ones for them, made students increase their levels of engagement with the lessons. Some students said they found it "easier" to work with those topics, while one student, for example, argued 'it is more entertaining to talk about something we like, like movies or series' (Interview 3). Even though the book also contained some activities related to the entertaining business, such as movies, actors or devices used to play movies, the vocabulary and the images contained in the book might have been too old fashioned and outdated for these group of students.

## **Research Implications**

In the previous section, primary and secondary findings were discussed. This study overall found that the majority of students increased their levels of engagement with oral

tasks when speaking English after the implementation of the Teaching Speaking Cycle.

However, there was not a significant improvement in learners' speaking skills.

Furthermore, metacognitive instances helped most disengaged students become aware of their learning process and engage with the lessons. The secondary findings exposed that learning material, the topics addressed in classes and working in groups had a great impact on students' level of engagement. Most students benefited from the implementation of more familiar updated topics, learning material prepared by the teacher and working in groups, instead of individual work.

This section will attempt to understand some of the implications of these findings in the context of studies that have had a similar focus and from the theoretical perspectives of the Teaching Speaking Cycle developed by Goh and Burns.

### **Effects of TSC on students' engagement**

The Teaching Speaking Cycle's objective is to combine speaking strategies and metacognitive instances to improve students' performance in relation to their oral production. To do so, it was important to engage students with the oral activities presented in classes.

One of the key outcomes of this study revealed that even though some students remained disengaged, the majority of students increased their levels of engagement with oral tasks when speaking English in the classroom. Coates (2006) defined engagement at university level as students' involvement with activities, while Davis, Summers, & Miller (2012) described it as students' persistent participation in the class. After the implementation of the TSC data revealed that GEIII students actively involved with the oral activities and persistently participated in classes. Wilms (2000) also referred to engagement as a sense of

belonging whilst Krause and Coates (2008) established a direct relation between students' levels of engagement and academic achievement. The TSC provided students with metacognitive instances which gave them a sense of belonging in relation to their learning process. Data showed that as students became aware of their learning progress, they increased their levels of engagement. According to these authors, the implementation of the teaching speaking cycle effectively engaged Finis Terrae students with oral tasks.

However, only students who entered the course with a higher degree of language domain in relation to their peers managed to significantly increase their oral skills. Burns (2012) asserts that the TSC was created to help teachers develop appropriate tasks for students and have proved to engage them at a cognitive and affective level. In this regard, as observed in classes and expressed by learners themselves in the class interviews conducted while and post intervention, most students at Finis Terrae University were observably more engaged than what they were prior to the implementation of the Teaching Speaking Cycle.

Another key outcome of the study revealed that most students' levels of engagement were benefited from updated and meaningful learning material. Burns (2016) asserts the importance of using attractive material so students can cognitively engage. According to that statement, the topics and material used during those lessons played a crucial role on increasing students' levels of engagement with oral tasks. Data revealed that students appreciated the topics addressed in classes as they were more attractive for them and their participation in the oral activities increased.

Students levels of engagement were impacted to different extents by the Teaching Speaking Cycle. The authors of the Cycle expect learners to show interest in the topics addressed and to feel motivated to contribute to it in classes. Having this in mind, there was a group of students whose levels of engagement increased considerably. Prior to the

intervention, those learners used to pay attention in classes but did not actively engage with the oral activities. However, once learning material was adapted, speaking opportunities and feedback were provided during the implementation of the TSC, data revealed that those students commenced to actively participate in the activities, connected with their classmates and made effort to use the target language to conduct the tasks. The authors of the cycle emphasize on the importance of providing learners with effective feedback to gradually gain confidence to communicate ideas in the target language.

There was a second group of students who already engaged with the oral tasks prior to the implementation of the TSC. Those learners entered the course with a higher degree of knowledge of English and data revealed that this fact -plus personality characteristics- made them feel more comfortable to speak English in front of their classmates. The TSC helped those students remain engaged, as they got involved in the activities and helped their classmates to conduct the tasks by correcting some mistakes or providing them with feedback to improve. The authors highlight the implications of social factors when speaking English. Burns (2016) refers to the importance of sensitive speakers, who will play a fundamental role on interpersonal expectations. These group of students played a crucial role on helping their classmates achieve more confidence to speak English in the classroom.

Finally, there was a minority of students who were disengaged both prior and post intervention. Data revealed that those students' language proficiency was under the standards of the course (CEFR A2, Council of Europe, 2001) and they were the most reluctant ones to participate and speak English in classes.

Generally speaking, the research conducted at Finis Terrae University successfully helped students to increase their levels of engagement with oral tasks, as expected by the

authors of the cycle. One of the main objectives of the Teaching Speaking Cycle of Goh and Burns (2012) is to support students in relation to affective aspects such as speaking anxiety, embarrassment or lack of engagement. It systematically considers activities, learning material and topics that engage learners both at the cognitive and affective level. The different components of the implementation of the cycle such as adapted learning material, familiar topics, opportunities to prepare speaking tasks, sitting arrangement and metacognitive instances positively impacted students and increased their levels of engagement with oral tasks.

Del Rosario (2019) , a researcher who applied the Teaching Speaking Cycle on a Senior High School in Philippines, identified high levels of anxiety among her students when speaking English as a foreign language. According to her study, anxiety hindered students from developing their oral skills. In order to lower Philippine students' levels of anxiety when speaking English, the researcher implemented the Teaching Speaking Cycle of Goh and Burns (2012). After conducting this research, Del Rosario claimed the effectiveness of the TSC on her students' affective level. After the implementation of the TSC Philippine students' language anxiety went from almost high to low.

Both in the Philippine and Chilean context the TSC effectively addressed the affective factors that hindered students from developing oral skills in the ESL classroom. After the implementation of the Teaching Speaking Cycle Philippine students' levels of anxiety lowered and Chilean students' levels of engagement increased. However, there were some differences in the conduction of both studies that might have impacted the outcomes achieves by the implementation of the TSC. Del Rosario undertook a quantitative research where 338 high school participants were involved, while this qualitative study considered

23 university students. Furthermore, Del Rosario's implementation of the cycle lasted longer than the implementation of the TSC at Finis Terrae.

### **Effects of the TSC on students' metacognitive processes**

The Teaching Speaking Cycle aims to provide learners with several and repeated metacognitive instances simultaneously with a series of speaking strategies, with the objective of increasing students' oral skills.

One of the key outcomes of this project revealed that although the majority of students did not necessarily increase their English Language proficiency, metacognitive instances were crucial for learners to engage with the oral tasks presented in classes. In this respect, one of the authors of the Teaching Speaking Cycle (Goh, 2014; 2016), claims that speech production will not occur without the involvement of metacognitive processes. Prior to the intervention, when metacognitive instances were not effectively addressed in classes, Finis Terrae students were reluctant to speak. However, the outcomes of the study suggested that after the intervention, most students valued the presence of metacognitive instances such as the implementation of exit cards. Burns (2012) suggests there are insufficient metacognitive opportunities when teaching speaking and refers to the fact that most speaking lessons provide students with speaking instances, yet not with opportunities for students to reflect upon their learning processes. The majority of students involved in this research claimed they were usually exposed to speaking activities but did not have the cognitive nor speaking tools to execute them. After the implementation of the exit cards, data suggested that students valued the opportunity to evaluate and monitor their speaking performance. The authors of the cycle assert that metacognitive development is directly related to autonomy development, which means a greater motivation for learning. Data suggested that UFT

students increased their sense of achievement and levels of engagement through metacognitive opportunities.

The rise of awareness which emerged from the metacognitive instances provided by the TSC was not necessarily reflected on students' improvement of their speaking proficiency. Nevertheless, the outcomes of the study were consistent with what one of the authors of the cycle asserts. Burns (2012) establishes that by planning classes with the TSC teachers can address students' learning barriers and provide beneficial relevant scaffolding to boost students' levels of engagement with oral tasks. The outcomes of the study suggested that the majority of UFT students felt more confident when speaking English in the classroom after the intervention.

A similar study conducted by Dewi, Kahfi, & Kurniawati (2017) focused on EFL students' metacognitive strategies in a speaking class. This study found out that most students who used metacognitive strategies got better results when speaking English in the classroom. Furthermore, the findings of the study suggested that students who regularly used the metacognitive strategies enhanced their speaking skills. The main difference between Dewi, Kahfi, & Kurniawati's study and the current research is present in the achievements accomplished by learners. Metacognitive opportunities developed Dewi, Kahfi, & Kurniawati's learners, while metacognition enhanced UFT students' sense of achievement and levels of engagement as it rouse their language awareness.

The main objective of the Teaching Speaking Cycle is to develop and improve learners' speaking skills. Unlike the study conducted by Dewi, Kahfi, & Kurniawati (2017), the Teaching Speaking Cycle did not have a significant impact on UFT students' speaking skills. Dewi, Kahfi, & Kurniawati's study consisted only on the implementation of metacognitive strategies to enhance learners' speaking skills, while the TSC combines

speaking strategies and metacognitive instances as well. Nevertheless, as previously mentioned, one of the main objectives of the TSC was also to affect students' affective level, which was addressed in this study, as students effectively increased their language awareness. Metacognitive opportunities guided UFT learners towards a better understanding of strategies to facilitate oral interaction.

### **Effects of the TSC on students' speaking skills**

As previously mentioned, the main objective of the Teaching Speaking Cycle is to strengthen EFL students' speaking skills. Burns (2012) claims the primary objective of the TSC is to help students develop their fluency towards an advanced speaker-level where meaning is delivered with only few hesitations. One of the key outcomes of the study demonstrated that even though GEIII UFT students' sense of achievement increased after the implementation of the TSC, their English language proficiency levels did not demonstrate major improvements. Unlike what expected by the authors of the cycle after its implementation, UFT students' spoken language was not used accurately, their speech register was not always used appropriately, and communication strategies were not often effectively used when speaking.

The conduction of the Teaching Speaking Cycle was apparently insufficient—or did not last enough—for UFT students to improve their speaking skills. However, the outcomes of the study indicate that students' sense of achievement improved noticeably after the implementation of the exit cards, where students rose their awareness on their learning process. Unlike the outcomes of this study, Del Rosario (2019) who implemented the Teaching Speaking Cycle of Goh and Burns in Philippines, found out that in her specific context the TSC significantly improved the level of speaking skills of her senior High

school students. The learners involved in her research lowered their levels of anxiety when speaking English and showed a significant difference in their levels of core speaking skills before and after the implementation of the Teaching Speaking Cycle.

The contrast of the outcomes obtained by this action research in relation to the ones achieved by Del Rosario (2019) in Philippines might have been a result of two different factors. Firstly, the differing lengths of the implementation of the TSC, and, secondly the differing levels of student language proficiency profile prior to the entrance of the course. Secondly, due to the social and political contingency that Chile was experiencing at the time, the implementation of the TSC at Finis Terrae University lasted three weeks. The short length of the intervention might have prevented students from taking the most advantage of the cycle as they could have if it had lasted longer. The outcomes of the study demonstrated that in three weeks students were able to increase their levels of engagement with oral tasks and rise their language awareness. Both expected outcomes of the TSC. Nevertheless, the cycle is expected to be implemented more than once in order to achieve the desired results. Secondly, as illustrated by Estudio nacional de Inglés 2017 (Agencia de la Calidad de la Educación, 2018) and SIMCE 2017, the English language proficiency levels of the students who were currently studying General English Level III at Finis Terrae University were under the standards of the course. The English language education those students received at school was not sufficient to prepare them to face the standards of EFL classes at university.

### **Effects of TSC on students' interactions**

One of the secondary outcomes of the study showed that along with the boost on students' engagement there was a significant improvement on students' interactions inside

the classroom. Goh & Burns (2012) noted that by providing students with time to prepare speaking tasks, learners were encouraged to interact with their peers, as they knew in advance the vocabulary to be used, the topics to be discussed and the possible questions to be asked. As expected by the cycle, students effectively used their preparation time to prepare their oral interventions and interactions. For this, students worked in groups and helped each other to conduct the activities by correcting mistakes and providing feedback, also, they shared some strategies that might result useful to complete the tasks. In this regard, Goh (2016) argues that language learners need to become aware of language skills in their mother tongue before they do it in a foreign language such as English. The metacognitive instance provided by the cycle played a crucial role in this matter. Students also used preparation time to contrast Spanish features with English features, such as intonation and sentence formation.

### **Conclusions**

In recent years, students at Finis Terrae University demonstrated to have lowered their English language proficiency levels, as well as their levels of engagement. Learners were reluctant to speak English in classes and to take part into speaking tasks. Those specific students' needs urged to look for a new mechanism that helped learners increase their English language skills and levels of engagement. The Teaching Speaking Cycle of Goh and Burns is a method that aims to provide students with activities that engage learners at a cognitive and affective level. That is why the objective of this study was to understand the effects of the Teaching Speaking Cycle on student's levels of engagement with oral tasks to increase their speaking skills.

This action research project had to deal with several limitations related mainly to time. Firstly, the time when the lessons were scheduled hampered the classes to start on time, as students at university had freedom to manage their entering times or the absences they might have during the semester. Secondly, organizational problems hindered the course to start on time, so classes with this group started 3 weeks behind schedule. This fact limited the amount of interventions conducted on the GEIII course, limiting the time lapse of the implementation of the Teaching Speaking Cycle to three weeks, which hindered the effect that the Cycle might have had if the interventions had lasted longer.

After analysis of the qualitative data, overall, the outcomes of the research suggested the following:

1. The levels of engagement with oral tasks of UFT students noticeably increased after the implementation of the Teaching Speaking Cycle.
2. Even though UFT students' levels of engagement increased, there was not a significant improvement on their speaking skills after the implementation of the Teaching Speaking Cycle.
3. Metacognitive instances such as exit cards effectively rose students' language awareness and increased their sense of achievement.
4. Students benefited from updated learning material and familiar topics discussed in classes.
5. Sitting arrangement impacted students' interactions. Moving from a semi-circle sitting arrangement to groups boosted students' interactions and levels of engagement.

Largely, the outcomes of the study showed that students effectively benefited from the implementation of the Teaching Speaking Cycle. Notwithstanding, further studies are required to understand two phenomena present in this research:

1. The reasons why a couple of students remained disengaged, refused to interact with their peers and were still reluctant to use the target language in the classroom after the implementation of the Teaching Speaking Cycle.
2. It is essential to understand why even though students increased their levels of engagement, most of them did not improve or developed their core speaking skills after the implementation of the Teaching Speaking Cycle.

This research contributed to understand that the implementation of the Teaching Speaking Cycle is essential in the Chilean university context. Students enter university with low English language proficiency standards and little confidence towards their language skills. The Teaching Speaking Cycle was an effective method to increase Chilean university students' levels of engagement and language awareness. Nevertheless, further studies are required to understand the effects that a long-term implementation of the Teaching Speaking Cycle might have on General English courses at Finis Terrae University.

To conclude, the outcomes of this study advised that Chilean students might benefit from an early implementation of the Teaching Speaking Cycle of Goh and Burns. As data suggested, most students' lack of engagement with oral tasks were derived from previous experiences at school, where they had not had real speaking opportunities, neither metacognitive instances. National Studies on English Testing as a Foreign Language also

demonstrated that Chilean students are not acquiring the target language in schools. One of the key outcomes of this research suggested that EFL students' levels of engagement noticeable increased after the 3-week implementation of the TSC. That is why a broader earlier implementation of the Teaching Speaking Cycle is suggested from primary school education in the Chilean context, to study its long-term effects on Chilean students' language skills and levels of engagement with English as a foreign language.

## References

- Araneda, C., Gairín, J., Pedraja-Rejas, L., & Rodríguez-Ponce, E. (2018). Percepciones sobre el perfil del estudiante universitario en el contexto de la educación superior de masas: Aproximaciones desde Chile. *Interciencia*, 43(12), 864-870. Retrieved from [https://www.interciencia.net/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/864-ARANEDA-43\\_12.pdf](https://www.interciencia.net/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/864-ARANEDA-43_12.pdf)
- Attard, A., Di Lioio, E., Geven, K., & Santa, R. (2010) *Student Centered Learning: An Insight Into Theory and Practice*. Retrieved from [http://www.ehea.info/media.ehea.info/file/T4SCL\\_forum\\_Leuven\\_October\\_2010/34/2/2010\\_T4\\_SCL\\_Stakeholders\\_Forum\\_Leuven\\_-\\_An\\_Insight\\_Into\\_Theory\\_And\\_Practice\\_600342.pdf](http://www.ehea.info/media.ehea.info/file/T4SCL_forum_Leuven_October_2010/34/2/2010_T4_SCL_Stakeholders_Forum_Leuven_-_An_Insight_Into_Theory_And_Practice_600342.pdf)
- Brumfit, C. J., & Johnson, K. (Eds.). (1979). *The communicative approach to language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Burns, A. (October of 2012). A holistic approach to teaching speaking in the language classroom. *Linguistic Symposium 2012. Symposium held at University of Stockholm, Stockholm, Sweden*.
- Burns, A. (2016). Teaching speaking: Towards a holistic approach. Proceedings of 25th ETA-ROC Anniversary Conference: *Epoch Making in English Language Teaching and Learning*. Taiwan: Chien Tan Overseas Youth Activity Center, November.
- Bush, T. (2012). Authenticity in research: reliability, validity and triangulation. In Briggs, Ann., Coleman, M., & Morrison, M. (eds). *Research methods in educational leadership and management* (75-89). London, England: SAGE Publications.
- Carrell, P. L., Gajdusek, L., & Wise, T. (March, 1998). Metacognition and EFL/ESL reading. *Instructional science*, 26(1-2), 97-112.

- Chile, Agencia de la Calidad de la Educación (2018). *Informe de Resultados Estudio Nacional de Inglés*. Retrieved from [http://archivos.agenciaeducacion.cl/Informe\\_Estudio\\_Nacional\\_Ingles\\_III.pdf](http://archivos.agenciaeducacion.cl/Informe_Estudio_Nacional_Ingles_III.pdf)
- Coates, H. (2006). *Student engagement in campus-based and online education: University connections*. London, England: Routledge.
- Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge, U.K: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.
- Creswell, J. W., & Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory into practice*, 39(3), 124-130. doi [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip3903\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip3903_2)
- Davis, J., & Miller, L. (2012). *An Interpersonal Approach to Classroom Management: Strategies for Improving Student Engagement*. New York, U.S.A.: Corwin Press.
- Del Rosario, M. J. (2019). The Road to Multi-literacy: Teaching Speaking Cycle and Foreign Language Speaking Anxiety. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications (IJSRP)*, 9(2), 230-236. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.9.02.2019.p8629>
- Dewi, F. A., Kahfi, E. H., & Kurniawati, N. (2017). Exploring EFL Students' Metacognitive Strategies in Speaking Class: An Indonesian Context. *The Tenth Conference on Applied Linguistics and The Second English Language Teaching and Technology Conference in Collaboration with The First International Conference on Language, Literature, Culture, and Education*, 149–152. doi: 10.5220/0007163601490152
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based Language Learning and Teaching*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

- Figuroa, J. (2015). Using gamification to enhance second language learning. *Digital Education Review*, (27), 32-54. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1065005.pdf>
- Goh, C. C. (2014). Reconceptualising second language oracy instruction: Metacognitive engagement and direct teaching in listening and speaking. *AJELP: The Asian Journal of English Language and Pedagogy*, 2(1), 1-20. Retrieved from <https://repository.nie.edu.sg/bitstream/10497/18487/1/AJELP-2-1-1.pdf>
- Goh, C. C. (2016). Teaching speaking. In W. A. Renandya & H. Puji Widodo (Eds.). *English Language Teaching Today* (143-159). Cham, Switzerland:Springer International Publishing.
- Goh, C., & Burns, A. (2012). *Teaching speaking: Towards a holistic approach*. New York, U.S.A.: Cambridge University Press.
- Haukås, Å., BJORKE, C., & DYPEDAHL, M. (2018). *Metacognition in Language Learning and Teaching*. Retrieved from <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/e/9781351049146>
- Kagan, S. (2014). Kagan Structures, Processing, and Excellence in College Teaching. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 25(3-4), (119-138). Retrieved from <http://celt.miamioh.edu/ject/fetch.php?id=595>
- Konopka, C. L., ADAIME, M. B., & MOSELE, P. H. (2015). Active teaching and learning methodologies: some considerations. *Creative Education*, 6(14), 1536-1545. Retrieved from [https://www.scirp.org/pdf/CE\\_2015081213402863.pdf](https://www.scirp.org/pdf/CE_2015081213402863.pdf)
- Krashen, S. D., & Terrell, T. D. (1983). *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom*.


- Krause, K. L., & Coates, H. (2008). Students' engagement in first-year university. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(5), 493-505. Retrieved from [https://research-repository.griffith.edu.au/bitstream/handle/10072/26304/53553\\_1.pdf?sequence=1](https://research-repository.griffith.edu.au/bitstream/handle/10072/26304/53553_1.pdf?sequence=1)
- Lam, W. Y. (2009). Examining the effects of metacognitive strategy instruction on ESL group discussions: A synthesis of approaches. *Language Teaching Research*, 13(2), 129-150. doi <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168809103445>
- Lester, D. (2013). A Review of the Student Engagement Literature. *Focus on Colleges, Universities & Schools*, 7(1), 1-8. Retrieved from <http://www.nationalforum.com/Electronic%20Journal%20Volumes/Lester,%20Derek%20A%20Review%20of%20the%20Student%20Engagement%20Literature%20FOCUS%20V7%20N1%202013.pdf>
- Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative Language Teaching*. New York, U.S.A: Cambridge University Press.
- Mi Futuro (2019). Porcentaje de Matricula de Pregrado 2014-2019 por establecimiento de origen. Retrieved from <https://www.mifuturo.cl/buscador-de-instituciones>
- Mills, J., & Birks, M. (2014). *Qualitative Methodology: A Practical Guide*. Thousand Oaks, U.S.A.: SAGE Publications.
- Ministerio de Educación. (n/d). *Gratuidad*. Retrieved September 15, from <http://www.gratuidad.cl/>
- Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-Based Language Teaching*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511667336.001
- O'Leary, M. (2013). *Classroom Observation: A guide to the effective observation of teaching and learning*. Abingdon, England: Routledge.

- Richards, J. C. (2009). *Teaching listening and speaking: from theory to practice*. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- Richards, J. C. (2005). *Communicative language teaching today* (pp. 22-26). Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- Schmitt, M. C., & Newby, T. J. (1986). Metacognition: Relevance to instructional design. *Journal of instructional development*, 9(4), 29-33. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02908316>
- Singhal, M. (2001). Reading proficiency, reading strategies, metacognitive awareness and L2 readers. *The Reading Matrix*, 1(1).
- Spelleri, M. (2002). From Lessons to Life: Authentic Materials Bridge the Gap. *ESL Magazine*, 5(2), 16-18.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1998). Metacognition, abilities, and developing expertise: What makes an expert student? *Instructional Science*, 26, 127-140. Retrieved from [http://people.bath.ac.uk/edspd/Weblinks/PGCES\\_U LL/PDFs/Learning%20to%20Learn/Sternberg%201998%20IS.pdf](http://people.bath.ac.uk/edspd/Weblinks/PGCES_U LL/PDFs/Learning%20to%20Learn/Sternberg%201998%20IS.pdf)
- Szanajda, A., & Chang, W. Y. (2015). Encouraging student engagement in ESL writing classes in Asian classrooms: Recommendations for actions to be taken. *Journal of Linguistics and Language Teaching*, 6(2), 259-274.
- TRIAD 3 (2016): *An Introduction to Document Analysis*. Retrieved from <https://lled500.trubox.ca/2016/244>
- Universidad Finis Terrae. (2019). Gratuidad. Retrieved from <https://admission.uft.cl/becas-beneficios-y-convenios/gratuidad-cae-y-becas-estatales/gratuidad/>

- Universidad Finis Terrae (n/d). *Idiomas*. Retrieved from <https://uft.cl/idiomas>
- Veenman, M. V., Van Hout-Wolters, B. H., & Afflerbach, P. (2006). Metacognition and learning: Conceptual and methodological considerations. *Metacognition Learning*, 1(1), 3-14. Retrieved from <https://www.csuchico.edu/~nschwartz/Veenman%20Metacognition.pdf>
- Willis, J. (1996). *A framework for task-based learning* (Vol. 60). Harlow: Longman.
- Willms, J. D. (2003). *Student engagement at school: A sense of belonging and participation: Results from PISA 2000*. OECD Publishing, Paris, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264018938-en>.
- Yang, Z. (2014, May). Strategies of Improving Spoken English for Learners. Proceedings of *International Conference on Education, Language, Art and Intercultural Communication (ICELAIC-14)*. Atlantis Press.
- Zhiping, D., & Paramasivam, S. (2013). Anxiety of speaking English in class among international students in a Malaysian university. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 1(11), 1-16.
- Zyngier, D. (2008). (Re) conceptualising student engagement: Doing education not doing time. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24(7), 1765-1776. DOI: 10.1016/j.tate.2007.09.004

## Appendices

### A. Students' Consent form

 <b>Facultad de Educación Universidad Alberto Hurtado</b>
<b>Research Project: Effects of the Teaching Speaking Cycle on student's levels of Engagement with oral tasks</b>
<b>Participant Consent Form</b>
<p>1. I ..... consent to take part in the research project <b>Effects of the Teaching Speaking Cycle on Students' levels of Engagement with oral tasks</b>. I understand the nature of this research its objectives and my consent is freely given.</p> <p>2. I understand that if I agree to participate in the research, I may be asked to take part in an interview or other data collection activities.</p> <p>3. I understand that while data developed during the research may be published in an academic research thesis, my name, position title or any other identifying information will not be used in relation to any of the input I have provided to the research, unless I explicitly consent in writing to be identified when quoted.</p> <p>4. I understand that personal information, such as my name and contact details, will be kept confidential. This form and any other identifying materials will be stored separately in a password protected file. All data will be kept in a computer accessible only by password by the researcher.</p> <p>5. I understand that my participation in this research is entirely voluntary and I may withdraw from the research at any stage without providing any reason and that this will not have any adverse consequences for me. If I withdraw, the information I provide will not be used by the project.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Signed .....</p>

Date .....

**B. Observation Protocol****Observation Protocol**

English Level 3 – NRC: 2576043    Teacher: Flor Irene Gallo    Date: Friday

Time \_\_\_\_\_ - \_\_\_\_\_

Reactions of students when asked to use the target language

**Do students engage with the oral tasks presented?**

Yes – Why? How?

No – Why?

Pre:

Pre:

While:

While:

Post:

Post:

Other Comments:

**C. Pre-Intervention Questionnaire**

- Cuál es la razón principal por la que aprendes a hablar inglés?

---

---

---

- Hay algo que te guste de hablar en inglés? Qué?

---

---

---

- Hay algo que no te guste o te incomode al hablar en inglés? Qué?

---

---

---

- Cómo te sientes cuando hablas en Inglés? Por qué?

---

---

---

- Menciona 3 cosas que te gustaría mejorar al hablar en Inglés

1. 

---
2. 

---
3. 

---

**D. Interview 1 - Pre-intervention: Semi – structured class Interview Guiding questions**

- 1) Cuándo comenzaron a tener inglés por primera vez?**
- 2) Cómo definirían su relación con el inglés?**
- 3) A lo largo de los años, sienten que algo los haya motivado de forma particular a aprender inglés?**
- 4) Qué creen que los motivaría a aprender a hablar inglés?**

**E. Interview 2 – Pre-intervention: Semi – Structured class interview guiding questions**

- 1) Cómo se sienten cuando tienen que hablar en inglés?**
- 2) Hay algo que los haga sentir inseguros? Qué? Por qué?**
- 3) Hay algo que los haga sentir seguros? Qué? Por qué?**
- 4) Cómo se pueden mejorar esos aspectos?**

**F. While and post: Semi- structured class interviews guiding questions**

- 1) Cómo se sintieron hablando Inglés en esta clase?**
- 2) Hay algo que los haya hecho sentir seguros? Qué? Por qué?**
- 3) Hay algo que los haya hecho sentir inseguros? Qué? Por qué?**
- 4) Cómo pueden mejorar esos aspectos?**

**G. Exit cards**

Reflecting on my speaking performance

- Today I learnt to do the following in spoken English:

---

---

---

- I learnt the following useful expressions that can help me speak more effectively

---

---

---

---

- This is how I feel about my learning this week:

1. I am confident that I can do this again
2. I am not very confident that I can do this again
3. I am still unsure about what and how I have to say