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Abstract

This study explored the perception of a teaching strategy designed to be implemented in English Pedagogy at Universidad Andres Bello, Viña del Mar, Chile. The strategy stemmed from a task based on learning by teaching which was devised to fulfil the need to encourage metacognition, collaborative group work, emotional competency, and to expose pedagogy students to an earlier than usual experience of teaching before undergoing their internships. It was assumed that the participants’ perception of the strategy would be mostly positive based on theories sustaining similar teaching strategies, such as “Microteaching” and “Lernen durch Lehren” (German for “Learning by Teaching”), (Grzega, 2005). A survey was conducted during the experimental implementation of this strategy, which has taken place within a three year period. As a result, the task has been perceived by teachers and learners themselves to have had positive outcomes in the improvement of their competencies, involving EFL learning, group work, fostering metacognition, and developing teaching skills. Therefore, it may be suggested that the strategy favours overall competencies of future EFL teachers.
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INTRODUCTION

While planning the fifth level of the English language course at Andres Bello University, we were challenged to propose a task which could fulfil some particular needs.

Firstly, there was the need to help trainees improve their English language skills by giving them the chance to discover that teaching others may develop
metacognition. Secondly, there was the need to get trainees acquainted with their role as future EFL teachers at an early stage of their Pedagogy Major, by providing them with the opportunity to have a first encounter with a teaching experience. Considering this, it was observed that a great variety of tasks used previously, had been devised to develop one aspect or the other, but not both. Besides, there was a need to instil in our learners a positive attitude of collaboration, tolerance, and respect when interacting and working with their peers.

In order to achieve all this, the Learner-to-Learner Unit Review (Henceforth referred to as LTL Review) was devised, and then a qualitative, participative research was carried out in order to find out whether this task was perceived by experienced professors and teacher trainees as an effective strategy to fulfil the needs stated above.

**DESCRIPTION OF THE TASK**

Most language courses are organized into teaching units, and for each unit the professor usually plans a final review to clarify doubts and make sure that learners acquired the skills included in it. In the LTL review, however, the learners themselves are in charge of planning and carrying out their own reviews, and the professor becomes a participant in the classroom.

**How is it done?**

The class is divided into groups, with one unit assigned to each group. This is not a typical presentation, it is an English language class; therefore, the students prepare a lesson plan to teach their classmates according to the content of the unit or those parts of it which the professor suggests that need to be reviewed for clarification of doubts, further practice, or updating.
The acting teachers (reviewers)

Within a 90 minutes period, reviewers should go over the content of the unit and sub-units intended for their task. In order to do this, they should condense the content of the unit and then, research for didactic ways of explaining it to their classmates. First year learners will usually tend to imitate their own professor’s techniques since they have not yet taken any course on teaching techniques or methodology. To get their explanations across, they should resort to clear examples already used in class by their professor, or they may use new or modified ones. Their lesson plan should include activities for their peers to apply grammar rules, vocabulary, and any other unit content under review. See image:
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The reviewers may organize the class as they wish, for didactical purposes. They may also arrange the classroom as they think fit to accomplish their teaching goals. When these acting teachers organize their LTL Review class, they may assign a specific part of the unit to each member of their group, who will be assisted by the collaboration of the other group members whenever necessary during the review class, as if they were a unified teaching entity. For example: One member of the group is in charge of the activities but the
other members help to monitor and respond to any doubts the learners in their class may have. See image:

![Image 2](image2)

Finally, reviewers close with a reflective self-assessment or a critical view of their work as a group, to share with their peers a brief account of their learning experience throughout the preparation of this task. However, the task may also be assessed by using rubrics (Appendix 1) designed for the different levels of English classes based on Mertler’s models (2001).

**The role of the Professor**

The role of the professor is semi passive. He/she will act as just one more learner in the class. However, as a more “advanced” learner, the professor should collaborate with the reviewers if they find themselves in a difficult teaching situation due to their lack of experience, or if they do not realize that they are leading their peers into error. The professor should be regarded by learners as an active “backup” to clear up any doubts, correct mistakes, fine-tune explanations to clarify errors, and “polish up” basic teaching techniques. The professor must also observe and note down possible weaknesses and errors or mistakes which need to be worked on.
The role of the Student as Learner in the Classroom

The learners in the classroom are encouraged to participate actively in the class, by asking questions, seeking clarification of doubts, sharing knowledge, participating in the activities designed by the reviewers, and so on; keeping a positive and collaborative demeanour at all times.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The strategy proposed in this study was originally designed based on the concept of constructivism and on professional competency as explained by Bloom’s taxonomy (Bloom, 1971), and a small dose our own intuitive creativity based on over fifteen years of teaching experience; however, it was discovered through further research, that there were two teaching methods which had already been applied for similar purposes. These two methods are “Microteaching”, and “Lernen durch Lehren” (LdT: German for “Learning by Teaching”). Therefore, it was decided to analyse both methods as reference to endorse the LTL Review strategy as it is based on similar theoretical frameworks, even though LTL Review places more emphasis on the concepts of “metacognition”, “reconstruction of knowledge” and “attitude”.

Microteaching

Microteaching is a method created at Stanford University in the early 70’s, and it has been defined as a “training process in a context in which a real teaching situation is emulated in the classroom, but reduced in scope or simplified in some systematic ways” (Forum Journal article by Essam Hanna Wahba, 2003). This means that the task may be simplified to the teaching of a specific topic or skill to be mastered by the trainee, and allows the teacher to focus on the learners’ development of that particular teaching skill. The main similarities with LTL Review may be summarized as follows: a) just as our new proposal,
microteaching is still evolving to prove its value as an efficient method to develop cognitive structures within a constructivist paradigm (McGarvey and Swallow, 1986); b) according to Carretero (1993), microteaching is composed of tasks and activities to ensure meaningful learning, metacognition, as well as modification and enrichment of knowledge, and so is the LTL Review task; c) another similarity is that microteaching exposes learners to a more realistic teaching environment, with the possibility of receiving feedback (Allen and Ryan, 1969). On the other hand, the main differences are the following: a) microteaching reduces the teaching situation or simplifies it in a systematic way to allow the professors to focus on the learners’ development of a particular teaching skill (Essam, 2003), but even though LTL Review also considers teaching skills, it mainly focuses on language skills; b) Essam also points out that the duration of the rendering of a microteaching class may be shortened from 5 to 20 minutes or so, however, LTL Review uses the full 90-minute class; c) The same author states that the size of the class may be reduced to a number suitable to the goals of the task, however, LTL Reviews take place in front of the whole class.

**The LDL model in Germany**

This is an innovative method originally designed by a French teacher called Jean-Pol Martin in the early 1980s for secondary schools in Germany, and proposed as a model for German teachers to teach French as a reaction to the emphasis on communicative skills since the 1970s.

The main similarities with LTL Review based on Grzega (2005), are as follows: a) In the German model, as well as in the LTL Review task, students prepare a lesson, or part of it, and teach their peers using the highest possible degree of interactive activities and group work; b) in LDL “The role of the teacher consists of preparing, supporting, moderating and supervising”, a very similar role played by the professor during the LTL Review; c) “High School Students
create their own teaching methodology”, which is true for our first year students of English pedagogy since they have not yet taken any course on teaching methodology; d) “learners develop ways of grasping knowledge in order understand it clearly before conveying it to their classmates” (Taken from http://www.ldl.de), in other words, it fosters metacognition, just as the LTL Review task.

On the other hand, also based on Grzega (2005), the main differences are: a) the LDL method was conceived to teach a foreign language at school level for communicative purposes, and it was German professor Joachim Grzega who pioneered the implementation of this model at university level in Germany, but to teach linguistics, not EFL for English pedagogy students; b) students prepare every language class throughout the school year and teach their peers, the LTL Review is used only at the end of a teaching unit.

**THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

*Metacognition and the recovery of knowledge*

Pozo (2008), reveals some principles that could help learners’ metacognition process:

1) Attend to relevant contextual elements to be recognized as indicators for recovery

2) Design learning tasks to recover knowledge as used in real contexts,

3) Recover the same knowledge through varied paths, and

4) Organize tasks to promote reflective thinking and conceptual comprehension.
(The concepts used by Pozo, were translated into English by the author of this article).

These principles may apply to the LTL review strategy because it was conceived as a task where the reviewers first “recuperate” previously learnt information by reinterpreting it consciously and deliberately in order to feel prepared to teach it to their peers. Thus, this information becomes meaningful knowledge, and the learners realize through individual reflective thinking which is their best path to recover it, i.e. repetition, writing the information down, teaching it to their peers, etc., then hopefully, this “re-learning” process of different English language contents would become “acquisition”. This may be inferred from Krashen’s hypothesis, since he argues that language acquisition takes place once the conscious learning process of memorizing grammar rules, vocabulary, expressions, and other contents, becomes a “subconscious process” which follows a “natural order” of grammatical structures. He also states that when we learn a second language consciously, grammar rules aid us to “monitor” ourselves so that we may correct our mistakes. However, Krashen also clarifies that the contents devised to teach a language must be meaningful or “comprehensible input”, otherwise acquisition will not take place. Therefore, this hypothesis would support the idea that when learners review content over and over, making their best effort to comprehend it in order to teach it, and make it comprehensible to others, their monitoring skill should be enhanced, and the learning process should be followed by the natural process of acquisition (Krashen, 2013).

Once this metacognition or “re-learning” process is attained, reviewers may help their peers go through the same process of recovering knowledge. This review should be more meaningful than just a systematic association of memorised elements; thus, not only the group of learners who prepared the review may benefit from the task, but also their peers attending as regular learners.
In other words, the metacognition process manifests itself when the learner reviews information for self-tutoring and especially to teach others. To support this idea Bruning, Schraw and Ronning (1999), state that learning increases when it is the learner who constructs a meaningful context. Therefore, it may be assumed that reviews of recently obtained knowledge would facilitate guided cognitive reconstruction; the reason being, according to these authors, that students learn more and remember better when they are active learners who elaborate meaningful knowledge by taking it from previous one, and processing it at a deeper level.

**Social Interaction and Collaborative Group Work**

Vygotsky states that language is not innate. It is the product of activities practiced in the social institution (family) within the culture where the child grows up. This implies that internal developmental process will only occur when children are interacting with other people within their own environment (Vygotsky, 1978). According to this theory, individual internal process, such as learning a new language, would also be facilitated if it takes place in an environment which is easily associated to authentic situations where the learners are interacting with others who are regarded as having similar interests, or are in affinity with them. Ideally then, a new language should be learnt within a community of speakers of that language, but in our particular case in Chile, the nearest thing to such a community is the English class, therefore, the student-teachers (reviewers), and their classmates, as well as the English professor become the natural setting, since they are all part of an English Pedagogy course.

Considering this, it is assumed that the unique characteristics of the Learner-to-Learner review which fosters a relaxed class environment, where the authority is adopted by a group of learners instead of the teacher, may enhance communicative interaction between learners and reviewers. We must
remember that the professor will only intervene as a more advanced classmate whenever there is a need for corrections, but always within this unorthodox learner-to-learner teaching and learning atmosphere where hierarchy is minimal.

This relates to Krashen’s affective filter hypothesis, which claims that learners feel more self-confident and motivated in a classroom environment with low levels of anxiety (Krashen, 1982). Consequently, when the LTL review takes place, professors should encourage LTL reviewers to maintain an enthusiastic, positive, respectful, and cordial demeanour at all times, and to motivate class participation, creating a relaxed environment, and if possible, use some humour to promote a pleasant atmosphere. This will, ideally, reduce the affective filter mentioned before.

Then, the relaxed atmosphere during the LTL review class, plus the affinity and common interests among participants, should facilitate collaborative group work and social interaction, as well as being beneficial to prepare the reviews by doing pre-teaching with group partners, thus consolidating the knowledge of contents to be taught to the class.

**Attitudinal competency**

The LTL Review task may well be regarded as a teaching strategy that promotes cognitive and procedural development, however, it also seeks to instil attitudinal or emotional competencies in our learners.

Considering the above, learners are urged to become self-conscious of their overall attitude during their task; for example, during their group work they should adopt a collaborative sense of participation, respond efficiently and responsibly to the group’s demands, as well as taking a democratic and fair stand when organizing their task. However, these emotional conducts are not easily and readily acquired; according to Bloom (1971) they require a
continuum of activities where such emotional objectives are well defined, otherwise the subject will only achieve partial results such as learning to accept, admit and deal with certain correct behaviour for a definite context of ethical values sustained by society, a process known as “socialization”. This supports the idea of proposing the LTL task as a teaching strategy to be repeated every semester during the pedagogy major so that not only the continuum factor is present, but also the fact that the learners get older, and enhance their personal internal growth or “internalization”, which according to Bloom, happens when emotional factors become part of ourselves and we react subconsciously, in other words, attitudinal values become innate. This proves that the development of a positive attitude in our students, should not be neglected when designing strategies to be implemented in teacher training. Bloom also writes that there is evidence suggesting that emotional behaviour may only be developed when the learner has the opportunity to participate in a continuum of tasks or activities partly designed for that particular purpose, planned to fulfil three stages of emotional development within an appropriate span of time for such purpose: in the first stage, the learner becomes aware of the emotional factors needed for certain contexts and circumstances; secondly, the learner responds with an adequate attitude and emotional behaviour, but only when supervised by a recognized external authority; and in the third stage, the learner responds adequately in any circumstances when faced with obstacles or barriers, without any supervision.

Bloom considers that it is only at the third stage that emotional behaviour has been internalized. Bearing this theory in mind, the LTL review strategy may produce such attitudinal results so as to internalize the required emotional competency of a future EFL teacher if implemented as it is being done currently at Universidad Andrés Bello, during every semester of the English pedagogy programme.
METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

This was a qualitative and participative study of an exploratory nature, carried out during the experimental implementation of the LTL task during a three-year period, from 2010 to 2013, seeking to show how learners and teachers had perceived this task in terms of a strategy to aid the improvement of learners’ competencies in EFL-learning, EFL-teaching, collaborative group work, vocational awareness, self-reflection, and an overall positive attitude towards self-improvement, which could foster metacognition in EFL learning. Also, this study would show learners’ and professors’ opinion regarding the relevance of this task with the EFL Pedagogy Programme.

Location

The study was carried out at the Faculty of Education, Department of English Pedagogy, Universidad Andrés Bello, campus Viña del Mar, Chile.

Participants

Two groups of subjects were surveyed: A group of 6 university professors, currently teaching English language at Universidad Andrés Bello, and a group of 96 undergraduate students taking different courses from first to seventh level (semester), majoring in English Pedagogy.

Instrumentation

Five validations of the instruments used in this study were requested based on the following indicators:

1. Content of the questionnaires address the topic of the research overall.

2. Questions are coherent with the items to be measured in the study (Items listed above as goals).
3. Questionnaires intended for teachers and learners show coherence among them to measure perceptions of either group of subjects.

4. Questions are clearly devised to predict whether subject’s perceptions are favourable or unfavourable towards the proposed task.

5. The questionnaire is written and composed using understandable and relevant terminology.

   (Actual documents may be seen in González-Acevedo E.A. (2013), included in the bibliography)

Written surveys included 2 questionnaires for teachers, 1 questionnaire for students, and 1 check list for students’ self-assessment.

Questionnaire 1 for professors provided the 6 main objectives of the strategy and 2 questions related to those objectives. Number of respondents: 6 professors currently implementing the task (Appendix 2).

Questionnaire 2 for professors included 14 closed-ended questions related to their perception of the LTL review as a classroom task (Appendix 3). Number of respondents: The same 6 professors currently implementing the task.

5 individual professors were interviewed with open questions and were recorded in video tape.

Questionnaire 3 for students of 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 5th semester, included closed-ended questions related to their perception of LTL Review as a classroom task. Some of those questions were in English and some in Spanish to ensure full comprehension of each (Appendix 4). Number of respondents: 84 students.
Self-assessment check list for students of 1st, 2nd and 3rd semester. The check list provides 6 indicators directly related to the objectives of this task as a teaching strategy (Appendix 5). Number of respondents: 68 students.

21 students were interviewed individually using open questions.

One videotaped interview of a group of learners in a classroom setting with open questions. Number of Respondents: 12 students of 6th and 7th semester.

(Transcriptions of video-taped interviews may be seen in González-Acevedo E.A. (2013), included in the bibliography)

**Findings**

All the professors interviewed admit that, according to their experience so far implementing LTL reviews, the task must be well prepared by the reviewers, otherwise, their performance as teachers would be weak and their explanations of grammar or other content would be confusing, and consequently, the professor monitoring the task would need to intervene and interrupt the class too often. Notwithstanding this, they sustain that the task is still beneficial to improve English language learning. Another perception common to all professors interviewed is that, when they were undergraduates themselves, they would have found a task like this to be very beneficial for them, if done before their internship or practicum. They also agree that learning by teaching is an effective method which promotes attitudinal development such as responsibility, teamwork, creativity for problem resolution, and motivation. It was mentioned that some learners become so engaged that they even volunteered to do an extra LTL task for their peers.

These participants feel that the following 6 goals were possible to be fulfilled by implementing the LTL task:

1. Provide the learner with access to EFL teaching experience.
2. Reinforce English language structures and vocabulary

3. Encourage learner’s meta-cognition,

4. Foster learner-to-learner interaction within a low affective filter environment.

5. Promote collaborative group-work, and

6. Facilitate learners’ self-awareness of their vocational aptitudes at an early stage of their EFL teacher training program.

However, according to them, the goals which have been fulfilled to a greater extent after implementing this task as a teaching strategy are: 2, 3, 5, and 6.

Therefore, it may be stated that all professors feel that they have successfully helped their learners to achieve cognitive, procedural, and attitudinal competence by implementing this task as a teaching strategy.

As for their perception of the effectiveness of the task to facilitate learners’ learning process, they responded positively, mainly in regards to the learners who are receiving the information from the reviewers in the classroom, especially in connection to grammar and vocabulary. Professors also agree that this task fosters interaction in the classroom.

Every professor surveyed thinks that the experience in applying LTL so far has been a positive one, and they feel that the task has been fairly easy to apply.

Every participant professor, with one exception, feels that this task contributes to learners’ teaching experience. However, half of the teachers think that learners were somewhat self-motivated about the task. This may be due to lack of explanatory instructions of how to carry out the task, and more importantly, lack of a deeper understanding of the purpose and objectives of the task. This aspect needs revision.
All comments from professors express their approval regarding this task as a good experience so far, which should be used from the first year of the major. It is also mentioned that learners acting as reviewers should be well prepared for the task to be effective.

On the other hand, the total of 33 students interviewed individually, or in a group, expressed that the LTL review is an important and valuable experience which helps them to become aware of their L2 learning process so that they may find better ways to organize and strengthen that process. They also manifested that although there are similarities with the micro-teaching tasks, the main difference is that the LTL task is more effective when it comes to learning English grammar and vocabulary. Also, this task was regarded as a valuable first encounter with real and challenging teaching situations because they are reviewing content which is fairly new to them and to their peers in the class. It is also suggested that the LTL review should be implemented from the first semester onwards. This was suggested because this task was applied for the first time in a 3rd semester course. They view this task as an encouragement to do research on teaching methodology to prepare their lesson plan. Actually, one of the subjects stated that he did not learn much in the preparation of this task “because ... um... we are irresponsible...we did it at last minute” ...that’s the truth” (Sic). This may be interpreted as a self-reflective conduct which might ignite a positive change in attitude. Another opinion regarding attitude is that teaching peers fosters respect, good behaviour, self-confidence, and other personal values gained by doing collaborative group work, even though a few learners would rather work on their own because they are afraid that some group members may “hold them back” in their learning process.

An average of 81% of the students who responded questionnaire 3 (Appendix 4), found it useful to work in groups with their classmates and the other 19% found it somewhat useful. This variance may be minimized by explaining
clearly to them the concept of “collaborative group work”, as well as its importance in their future professional competence. 4 students expressed that they would rather work individually due to negative experiences when working with partners who were lazy or irresponsible.

An average of 85% of students responded very positively to the questions regarding their perception of the effectiveness of the LTL review for their learning process, and rewarding as an early teaching experience.

An average of 54.5% answered that they had been somewhat motivated by their professor or confident to prepare the task. It is very likely that these participants may have experienced lack of full understanding of the objectives of the task. The other 45.5% felt very motivated and confident.

An average of 77% of the total number of students responded that they used their intuition and creativity to prepare the lesson plan and the activities; the other 33% used a methodology similar to that of their professors.

27 out 68 learners who responded the self-assessment check list (Appendix 5) added comments to their questionnaires. Some of the subjects are in their first year and others are in their third year. All of them wrote that LTL is a good task which mainly helps their learning process. They also value the task as an opportunity to experience teaching at an early stage of their major, especially because it has helped them to confront their own doubts as to whether teaching is their real vocation.
CONCLUSIONS

Theory sustains that learning new content, and then re-learning it in order to teach it to their peers, may help to foster metacognition and self-awareness of their own learning process and make their learning-by-teaching experience so meaningful that it may actually enhance their cognitive and procedural competencies as they move from one level to the next within the Pedagogy programme.

Regarding a first teaching experience, LTL review strategy has been perceived as a means to rationalise and reflect on the real perspective of undertaking a teaching career, specifically teaching EFL. Moreover, this teaching strategy may be considered as a means to make the learners aware of their own emotional capabilities to cope with the great diversity of challenges and complexities involved in teaching.

The outcome of this research shows beyond any doubt that the perception of the subjects involved in the study favours the implementation of LTL Review in an English Pedagogy programme.
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# APPENDIX 1

## LTL unit review rubric levels 1, 2, 3, 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>7</th>
<th>5-6</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>1–2–3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXCELLENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOOD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUFFICIENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAIL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Group work 15%**

- **EXCELLENT**
  - Members’ participation is organized in an **orderly fashion**, according to reviewed content.
  - Review comprises the chosen Unit or sub-units thoroughly.
  - **Group work is evident** as clear and accurate answers are rendered by **every member** of the group to questions which are relevant to their assigned unit.

- **GOOD**
  - Members’ participation is organized in some **order**, according to reviewed content.
  - Review comprises **most of** the chosen Unit or sub-units.
  - **Group work is fairly evident** as clear and accurate enough answers are rendered by **most members** of the group to questions which are relevant to their assigned unit.

- **SUFFICIENT**
  - Members’ participation is organized in a **complex unclear fashion**, according to reviewed content.
  - Review comprises **some parts** of the chosen Unit or sub-units.
  - **Group work is somewhat evident** as clear and accurate answers are rendered by **just one member** of the group to questions which are relevant to their assigned unit.

- **FAIL**
  - Members’ participation is completely disorganized, according to reviewed content.
  - Review comprises a **scarce part** of the chosen Unit or sub-units.
  - **Group work is not evident** as clear and accurate answers are **not rendered by any member** of the group to questions which are relevant to their assigned unit.

**Errors and Mistakes**

- **EXCELLENT**
  - Proper, effective and **timely** management of errors and mistakes during the task. **Fairly effective and timely.**

- **GOOD**
  - Good management of errors and mistakes during the task. **Some overlooked errors and mistakes during the task or managed untimely.**

- **SUFFICIENT**
  - Some overlooked errors and mistakes during the task or managed untimely.

- **FAIL**
  - Poor, ineffective management of errors and mistakes during the task (too many of them overlooked).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content: Grammar 30%</th>
<th>-Clear explanations and examples of reviewed English grammar rules.</th>
<th>-Minor problems explaining and providing examples of reviewed English grammar rules.</th>
<th>-Somewhat clear explanations and examples of reviewed English grammar rules.</th>
<th>-Some unclear explanations and examples of reviewed English grammar rules.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate number of Coherent and effective exercises and activities for the application of grammar rules.</td>
<td>Number of coherent and effective exercises and activities is OK for the application of grammar rules.</td>
<td>Number of coherent and effective exercises and activities is OK for the application of grammar rules.</td>
<td>Number of coherent and effective exercises and activities is OK for the application of grammar rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content: Vocabulary 30%</td>
<td>-Clear explanations and examples of reviewed English vocabulary and expressions.</td>
<td>-Minor problems explaining and providing examples of reviewed English vocabulary and expressions.</td>
<td>-Somewhat clear explanations and examples of reviewed English vocabulary and expressions.</td>
<td>-Some unclear explanations and examples of reviewed English vocabulary and expressions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate number of coherent and effective exercises and activities for the application of new English words, concepts and expressions.</td>
<td>Number of coherent and effective exercises and activities is OK for the application of new English words, concepts and expressions.</td>
<td>Number of coherent and effective exercises and activities is OK for the application of new English words, concepts and expressions.</td>
<td>Number of coherent and effective exercises and activities is OK for the application of new English words, concepts and expressions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude 15%</td>
<td>All members of the group maintain an Enthusiastic, positive, respectful, and cordial overall attitude during the review.</td>
<td>All members of the group maintain an Enthusiastic, positive, respectful, and cordial overall attitude during most part of the review.</td>
<td>Some members of the group maintain an Enthusiastic, positive, respectful, and cordial overall attitude during some part of the review.</td>
<td>The group does not maintain an Enthusiastic, positive, respectful, and cordial overall attitude during any part of the review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teacher comments:**

**LTL unit review rubric for levels 5, 6, 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology 0%</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>5-6</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>1 – 2 – 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXCELLENT</strong></td>
<td>- Adequate application of teaching methodology by <strong>all</strong> members of the group.</td>
<td>- Adequate application of teaching methodology by <strong>some</strong> members of the group.</td>
<td>- <strong>Somewhat</strong> adequate teaching methodology applied by <strong>all</strong> members of the group.</td>
<td>- <strong>Inadequate</strong> application of teaching methodology,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group work 10%</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>5-6</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>1 – 2 – 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXCELLENT</strong></td>
<td>- Members’ participation is organized in an <strong>orderly fashion</strong>, according to reviewed content.</td>
<td>- Members’ participation is organized in <strong>some</strong> order, according to reviewed content.</td>
<td>- Members’ participation is organized in a <strong>complex unclear fashion</strong>, according to reviewed content.</td>
<td>- Members’ participation is completely <strong>disorganized</strong>, according to reviewed content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Review comprises the chosen Unit or sub-units <strong>thoroughly</strong>.</td>
<td>- Review comprises <strong>most of</strong> the chosen Unit or sub-units.</td>
<td>- Review comprises <strong>some parts</strong> of the chosen Unit or sub-units.</td>
<td>- Review comprises a <strong>scarce part</strong> of the chosen Unit or sub-units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Group work is evident</strong> as clear and accurate answers are rendered by <strong>every member</strong> of the group to questions which are relevant to their assigned unit.</td>
<td>- <strong>Group work is fairly evident</strong> as clear and accurate enough answers are rendered by <strong>most members</strong> of the group to questions which are relevant to their assigned unit.</td>
<td>- <strong>Group work is somewhat evident</strong> as clear and accurate answers are rendered by <strong>just one member</strong> of the group to questions which are relevant to their assigned unit.</td>
<td>- <strong>Group work is not evident</strong> as clear and accurate answers are not rendered by any member of the group to questions which are relevant to their assigned unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Errors and Mistakes</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>5-6</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>1 – 2 – 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXCELLENT</strong></td>
<td>- <strong>Proper, effective and timely</strong> management of errors and mistakes during the task.</td>
<td><strong>Good</strong> management of errors and mistakes during the task. <strong>Fairly effective and timely.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Some overlooked</strong> errors and mistakes during the task or <strong>managed untimely.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Poor, ineffective</strong> management of errors and mistakes during the task (too many of them overlooked)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content: Grammar</th>
<th>Content: Vocabulary</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Clear explanations and examples of reviewed English grammar rules.</td>
<td>- Clear explanations and examples of reviewed English vocabulary and expressions.</td>
<td>All members of the group maintain an Enthusiastic, positive, respectful, and cordial overall attitude during the review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Minor problems explaining and providing examples of reviewed English grammar rules. - Number of coherent and effective exercises and activities is <strong>OK</strong> for the application of grammar rules.</td>
<td>- Minor problems explaining and providing examples of reviewed English vocabulary and expressions. - Number of coherent and effective exercises and activities is <strong>OK</strong> for the application of new English words, concepts and expressions.</td>
<td>All members of the group maintain an Enthusiastic, positive, respectful, and cordial overall attitude during <strong>most part</strong> of the review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Somewhat clear explanations and examples of reviewed English grammar rules. - Few coherent and effective exercises and activities for the application of grammar rules.</td>
<td>- Somewhat Clear explanations and examples of reviewed English vocabulary and expressions. - Few coherent and effective exercises and activities for the application of new English words, concepts and expressions.</td>
<td>Some members of the group maintain an Enthusiastic, positive, respectful, and cordial overall attitude during <strong>some part</strong> of the review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Some unclear explanations and examples of reviewed English grammar rules. - Very few coherent and effective exercises and activities for the application of grammar rules.</td>
<td>- Some unclear explanations and examples of reviewed English vocabulary and expressions. - Very few coherent and effective exercises and activities for the application of new English words, concepts and expressions.</td>
<td>The group does not maintain an Enthusiastic, positive, respectful, and cordial overall attitude during <strong>any part</strong> of the review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers comments:

APPENDIX 2

Questionnaire: QUESTIONS FOR ELF-PROFESSORS WHO APPLIED THE TASK AND ARE CURRENTLY TEACHING IN THE ENGLISH PEDAGOGY PROGRAMME AT UNIVERSIDAD ANDRES BELLO, VIÑA DEL MAR, CHILE.

Name__________________________________________________
Academic Background_____________________________________________________

The Learner-to-Learner Unit Review task has the following goals as a teaching strategy:

1. Provide the learner with access to EFL teaching experience.
2. Reinforce English language structures and vocabulary
3. Encourage learner’s meta-cognition,
4. Foster learner-to-learner interaction within a low affective filter environment.
5. Promote collaborative group-work, and
6. Facilitate learners’ self-awareness of their vocational aptitudes at an early stage of their EFL teacher training program.
7. According to your best judgment, which of these goals would you consider are possible to fulfil when you implement this task in your classroom? Please, circle the number next to the goal.
8. According to your experience in the results of the implementation of this task, which of these goals are fulfilled to a greater extent?
APPENDIX 3

Questionnaire for teachers: SURVEY ON THE TEACHER’S PERCEPTION AFTER APPLYING A LEARNER-TO-LEARNER UNIT-REVIEW TASK AS PART OF A LESSON PLAN IN DIFFERENT EFL COURSES

The Teachers surveyed are all Professors of EFL for a Major in Pedagogy of English as a Foreign Language at Universidad Andrés Bello, Viña del Mar, Chile

Name: ______________________________________________________

Academic Background: _________________________________________

To answer each question please check one of the alternatives

1. How effective do you think the task has been for your student’s learning process when acting as reviewers?
   Effective       Somewhat effective       Not effective

2. How effective do you think the task has been for your student’s learning process when it has been their turn to participate in the class as learners?
   Effective       Somewhat effective       Not effective

3. How helpful do you think the task has been for your students’ internalization of grammar and vocabulary?
   Helpful       Somewhat helpful       Not helpful

4. How relevant would you say the task is, in connection to the language course-plans?
   Relevant       Somewhat relevant       Not relevant

5. How much relevance do you think the task has with the Pedagogy Major?
   Relevant       Somewhat relevant       Not relevant

6. How self-motivated did you feel the students were about the task?
   Motivated       Somewhat motivated       Not motivated

7. How satisfied were you overall, with the Unit-Reviews done by your students?
   Satisfied       Somewhat satisfied       Not satisfied

8. How satisfied were you with the participation of your students as learners during the review done by their peers?
   Satisfied       Somewhat satisfied       Not satisfied

9. Do you think this task contributes to your student’s teaching experience?
   Yes       Somewhat       Not at all
Please, answer the following questions checking yes or no

10. Would you consider including this task in your EFL lesson plans, if you are given precise instructions on how to apply and assess the task?
   YES  NO

11. Do you think the name “Learner-to Learner Unit- Review” is adequate for this task?
    YES  NO

12. Do you find this task fairly easy to implement?
    YES  NO

13. Is your experience in applying this task a positive one so far?
    YES  NO

14. Do you feel comfortable in your role as an “advanced collaborative student” in the classroom when the LTL review is taking place?
    YES  NO

COMMENTS:
APPENDIX 4

Survey: SURVEY ON THE STUDENT’S PERCEPTION OF THE “LEARNER-TO-LEARNER UNIT REVIEW TASK”.

The students surveyed are undergraduates from different course levels, majoring in Teaching of English as a Foreign Language at Universidad Andres Bello, Viña del Mar, Chile.

Name: _________________________________________________

Thank you for answering the following questions.

PART 1
1. How effective do you think the task was for your learning process when it was your turn to apply it in class?
   Very much so  Somewhat  Not at all

2. How effective do you think the task was for your learning process when your peers applied it?
   Very much so  Somewhat  Not at all

3. How clear was to you the whole purpose of the task?
   Very much so  Somewhat  Not at all

4. How much relevance would you think the task had with the semester’s course-plan?
   Very much so  Somewhat  Not at all

5. How much relevance do you think the task has with your Major?
   Very much so  Somewhat  Not at all

6. How motivated did you feel about carrying out the task?
   Very much so  Somewhat  Not at all

7. How satisfied were you with the response from your peers when it was your turn to apply the task?
   Very much so  Somewhat  Not at all

8. How satisfied were you with the answers from your peers when you when they applied the task?
   Very much so  Somewhat  Not at all

9. How helpful was the teacher during the task?
   Very much so  Somewhat  Not at all

10. How confident did your teacher make you feel about carrying out the task?
    Very much so  Somewhat  Not at all

11. How confident did you feel during the task?
    Very much so  Somewhat  Not at all
12. How much do you think this task contributes to your EFL-teaching experience?

Very much so  Somewhat  Not at all

PART 2: En cada pregunta selecciona una de las opciones.

13) ¿Dirías que esta tarea te estimuló a razonar?
☐ Sí  ☐ Más o menos  ☐ No

14) ¿Te permitió entender con mayor facilidad los aspectos de la gramática inglesa que tuviste que explicar a tus pares?
☐ Sí  ☐ Más o menos  ☐ No

15) ¿Para comprender el tema, te resultó útil trabajar con tus compañeros al desarrollar la tarea?
☐ Sí  ☐ Más o menos  ☐ No

16) Al no tener experiencia enseñando, ¿usaste tu intuición, imaginación para preparar la lección junto a tus compañeros de grupo?
☐ Sí  ☐ Más o menos  ☐ No

17) ¿Usaste una metodología similar a la de tus profesores para enseñar la lección?
☐ Sí  ☐ Más o menos  ☐ No

18) El docente dio posibilidades a los alumnos para hacer preguntas sobre las dudas que iban surgiendo durante el desarrollo de la tarea?
☐ Brindó muchas posibilidades  ☐ Brindó escasas posibilidades  ☐ No brindó posibilidades

19) El tiempo asignado para aplicar la tarea en la sala de clases te pareció
☐ Excesivo  ☐ Apropiado  ☐ Insuficiente.

20) La preparación de la tarea te permitió relacionar distintos objetivos de la unidad de enseñanza?
☐ Sí  ☐ Más o menos  ☐ No

21) ¿Consideras que esta tarea es importante en tu formación como profesor de inglés?
☐ Sí  ☐ Más o menos  ☐ No

22) La participación de los alumnos y el apoyo del profesor durante la aplicación de la tarea ¿te ayudaron aprender?
☐ Sí  ☐ Más o menos  ☐ No

Comentarios: ..............................................................................................................

Questions to be answered freely during a group interview: when participating in a unit review class:

1) Did you feel more comfortable asking questions to your peers?

2) Did your peers help you clarify any doubts you had about the content of the unit?

3) Did you feel relaxed during the review?

4) Did you feel more relaxed than when the review is done by one of your teachers?

APPENDIX 5

SELF-ASSESSMENT SHEET OF THE “LEARNER-TO-LEARNER UNIT REVIEW” EXPERIENCE, DURING THE EFL-PEDAGOGY PROGRAM AT UNIVERSIDAD ANDRÉS BELLO, VIÑA DEL MAR, CHILE.

Student’s name: ____________________________ Course Level: ______

The Learner-to-Learner Unit Review task has the following goals:
1. Provide the learner with an early access to EFL teaching experience.
2. Reinforce English language structures and vocabulary
3. Encourage learner’s meta-cognition,
4. Foster learner-to-learner interaction within a low affective filter environment.
5. Promote collaborative group-work, and
6. Facilitate learners’ self-awareness of their vocational aptitudes at an early stage of their EFL teacher training program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not really</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I value this task as an early teaching experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing the Unit Review to teach my peers facilitated my learning process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of grammar and vocabulary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process of preparing the Unit Review to teach my peers helped me find</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my own way of understanding the content reviewed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The atmosphere in the classroom was relaxed and comfortable during the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Reviews.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that collaborative group-effort may be more effective than</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual work to carry out this task.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am more aware now of my aptitudes for teaching English as a Foreign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mark with an “X”

Comments: