UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO CEARÁ
CENTRO DE HUMANIDADES
DEPARTAMENTO DE ESTUDOS DA LÍNGUA INGLESA, SUAS LITERATURAS E TRADUÇÃO
CURSO SUPERIOR DE LICENCIATURA EM LÍNGUA INGLESA

JOÃO VICTOR SANTOS ALVES

COMPARING PEER PLANNING TO INDIVIDUAL PLANNING AND ITS RESULTS ON THE ORAL PERFORMANCE IN AN ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOM

FORTALEZA
2023

JOAO VICTOR SANTOS ALVES

COMPARING PEER PLANNING TO INDIVIDUAL PLANNING AND THE RESULTS ON ORAL PERFORMANCE IN AN ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOM

Projeto de pesquisa apresentado ao Curso Superior de Licenciatura em Língua Inglesa, da Universidade Federal do Ceará.

Orientadora: Profa. Dra. Diana Costa Fortier Silva

FORTALEZA

2023

JOÃO VICTOR SANTOS ALVES

COMPARING PEER PLANNING TO INDIVIDUAL PLANNING AND THE RESULTS ON ORAL PERFORMANCE IN AN ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOM

> Trabalho de Conclusão de Curso apresentado ao Curso Superior de Licenciatura em Língua Inglesa da Universidade Federal do Ceará, como requisito parcial à obtenção do título de licenciado em Letras Inglês. Área de concentração: Linguística Aplicada.

Aprovada em: 05/12/2023.

BANCA EXAMINADORA

_____

Profa. Dra. Diana Costa Fortier Silva (Orientador)

Universidade Federal do Ceará (UFC)

_____

Profa. Dra. Lídia Amélia de Barros Cardoso

Universidade Federal do Ceará (UFC)

_____

Profa. Dra. Maria da Glória Guará Tavares

Universidade Federal do Ceará (UFC)

ABSTRACT

Communicative Approach has brought a broad niche of research on its own. Some categories have been outlined several times by many authors because of its capacity to elicit the way language teaching and learning might benefit a classroom in different ways . Tasks are much explored in this sense, bringing students from the old fashioned focus-on-form way of learning to a brand new way of discovering languages, focusing especially on the performance of the task itself and thus, being able to learn in an immersive environment. Studies have notched the importance of pre-task activities, such as planning time for performing tasks in order to deliver a well-developed language outcome in a task-based classroom. In order to seek hints for language classroom improvements, researchers started to point out that the environment also plays an important role in it, enabling students to find interest in many different factors within classroom activities, such as peer activities and group discussion. Studies point out that peer planning can influence the outcome of a task, if requirements are matched and students feel interest in this particular kind of classroom environment. This particular research aims to compare the results from a pair of students performing two similar tasks under two different conditions. First, students who are going to participate will plan a task individually and then perform it, and then students will pair up to plan for performing another task.

The data collection suggested that the comparison between individual planning and peer planning did not represent any significant difference in terms of fluency outcome on this particular corpus, although one of the students seemed to like planning in pairs. Peer planning tasks have then proved to enrich classrooms with attractive content in a sense. Results might be relevant for broadening possibilities for classroom planning and management to reach a desirable result. Language learning and teaching development might be influenced by students if they engage with the task together, opening a window for meaningful language knowledge negotiation and further outcome.

RESUMO

A Abordagem Comunicativa trouxe para si um amplo nicho de pesquisa. Algumas categorias foram desenvolvidas diversas vezes por muitos autores devido à sua capacidade de elucidar a forma como o ensino e a aprendizagem de línguas podem beneficiar uma sala de aula de diferentes maneiras. As tarefas são muito exploradas nesse sentido, levando os alunos de uma forma antiga de aprender com

foco-na-forma para uma forma totalmente nova de descobrir línguas, focando especialmente no desempenho da tarefa em si e, assim, sendo capazes de aprender de uma forma imersiva. Estudos observaram a importância das atividades pré-atividade, como o planejamento do tempo para a execução das atividades, a fim de proporcionar um resultado linguístico bem desenvolvido em uma sala de aula baseada em comunicação. A fim de buscar dicas para melhorias nas aulas de idiomas, os pesquisadores começaram a apontar que o ambiente também desempenha um papel importante nisso, permitindo que os alunos encontrem interesse em diversos fatores dentro das atividades em sala de aula, como atividades entre pares e discussões em grupo. Estudos apontam que o planejamento entre pares pode influenciar o resultado de uma tarefa, se os requisitos forem atendidos e os alunos sentirem interesse neste tipo específico de ambiente de sala de aula. Esta pesquisa específica tem como objetivo comparar os resultados de uma dupla de alunos realizando duas tarefas semelhantes sob duas condições diferentes. Primeiro, os alunos que vão participar planejarão uma tarefa individualmente e depois a executarão, e depois os alunos formarão duplas para planejar a execução de outra tarefa.

A recolha de dados sugeriu que a comparação entre o planeamento individual e o planeamento por pares não representou qualquer diferença significativa em termos de resultado de fluência neste corpus específico, embora um dos alunos parecesse gostar de planear em pares. As tarefas de planeamento entre pares proporcionaram então, de certa forma, enriquecer as salas de aula com conteúdos atrativos. Os resultados podem ser relevantes para ampliar as possibilidades de planejamento e gestão de sala de aula para alcançar um resultado desejável. A aprendizagem de línguas e o desenvolvimento do ensino podem ser influenciados pelos alunos se eles se envolverem na tarefa em conjunto, abrindo uma janela para uma negociação significativa do conhecimento da língua e para resultados futuros.

SUMMARY

1. INTRODUCTION

This piece of research is a replication of Xhafaj, Muck, and D'Ely(2011)'s research, which also compares data related to individual planning and peer planning. The research aforementioned provides an overall analysis through collecting data from task performances of 2 groups, comparing quantitative results as well as discussing it in a qualitative analysis session.

Peer planning for tasks can play an important role in the development of the capacities of students' oral production. To Xhafaj, Muck, and D'Ely(2011) students may struggle when facing an oral task for many reasons. But peer planning strategies sometimes have the capacity to overcome it, considering the adequate context and situation.

The present research aims to show that planning and performing a task with a peer can help enhance a student's oral production(speaking ability) in EFL, rather than doing it individually. Considering that oral production can be developed with practice and planning, and planning with a peer can be beneficial to students in their attempt to solve possible doubts.

Thus, in an attempt to fill in this gap in research, the present study aims to (1) compare the performance of learners planning an L2 oral task individually to the performance of learners planning with a peer, as well as (2) eliciting the participants' opinions and differences on planning with a peer *versus* planning individually.

2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

"The framework proposed by Skehan (1996; 1998) for the design and implementation of tasks for second language (L2) acquisition is comprised of three phases – pre-, middle-, and post-task. Still, so far, research has been conducted mainly on the pre-task phase; and, more specifically, with regards to one particular kind of pre-task: strategic planning (Skehan, 2007)."(Xhafaj, Muck, and D'Ely, 2011, p. 39) There is a lot to read nowadays about strategic planning as Xhafaj, Muck, and D'Ely(2011) point out in their research. For them, it is a fact that the students tend to focus on meaning rather than form when having to perform an oral presentation, consequently making them struggle when having to produce language "from scratch". They also affirm that the planning time prior to the oral production activity might reduce the burden imposed by the pressure of the task and maximizing the chances of focus on form to occur. Between those aspects that are relevant for tasks' success, they mention: the impact of task type (Foster; Skehan, 1996), different lengths of planning time (Guará-Tavares, 2004; Mehnert, 1998;), planning conditions (D'Ely, 2006), and level of proficiency (Kawauchi, 2005), among others. According to Xhafaj, Muck, and D'Ely(2011, p.39), "a variable that has been overlooked is the support learners have when planning." For that support role, peer-to-peer work might be a relevant factor if collaborative work exists between the pair of students.

In Vasconcelo Neto's research there is also a moment when one of the participants of his research cites the peer strategy on their interview moment: "Although peer feedback is not the focus of this research, it was an emerging theme on the interview. When asked about the use of corrective feedback strategies, STA answered that "Eu não gosto de botar os alunos pra se corrigirem entre si", not describing why he did not like to do it. This kind of belief reinforces the concerns that teachers usually have about peer feedback, relating students' low proficiency on a L2 to the way they would provide feedback to their classmates (SHULIN AND ICY, 2016, pp. 483). Research on Peer feedback, however, has shown that not only the students giving feedback, but also the ones receiving it might benefit from it (SIPPEL AND CARRIE, 2015)." (Vasconcelos Neto; 2018, p. 27-28).

When considering peer planning for the realization of a task centralized in a communicative approach, there is the need to review some definitions related to

background what are the expectations in a Task Based Approach classroom environment. Brown points out what is a task, considering some other authors' views concerning definition for this particular methodology: "A task is really a special form of technique. [...] But in other cases, a task may be comprised of several techniques (for example [...] a specific turn-taking procedure) (Brown; 2000, p. 48). In fact, what Xhafaj, Muck, and D'Ely(2011) and Guará Tavares (2008) proposed in their method of analysis was a turn-taking activity in which students would first plan the task and then present it according to those specifications chosen by the researchers.

Brown continues delivering definitions for task when they say: "As you will recall, there are a number of different interpretations in the literature on what, exactly, a task is. What these various understandings all emphasize, however, is the centrality of the task itself in a language course and, for task-based teaching as an overall **approach**, the importance of organizing a course around communicative tasks that learners need to engage in outside the classroom."(Brown; 2000, p. 242) It's important to notice the importance of tasks and its settings for students' life in a broader point of view. The fact that courses wear this task-based approach always rely on the idea of the meaningful tasks students will engage in.

In Ortega (2005) her own participants point out that individual planning may bring a feeling of frustration sometimes."[...]one way to end the frustration potentially caused by individual task planning and maximizing the possible effects of planning on learners' performance is by allowing learners to plan with a peer. Indeed, the beneficial effects of collaborative work have already been documented (e.g., Basturkmen; Loewen; Ellis, 2002; Figueiredo, 2007; Swain; Lapkin, 1998, 2002; Vidal, 2007)."(Xhafaj, Muck, and D'Ely, 2011, p.40)

As for matters of analysis, this research is going to consider D'Ely's definition of strategic planning and rely on participants having her same method used to conduct a questionnaire herein, inquiring them for data analysis focusing on explaining possible reasons for success or not related to strategic planning. "Ellis (2005) defines strategic planning as allowing the learners to prepare for a task; that is, allowing them time to look at the task materials and consider what they will say and how they will do that. In this study we enlarge the scope of Ellis' definition and define strategic planning as "a metacognitive process that may lead learners to purposefully exert some control, guidance and regulation over what they know, which, in turn, may optimize the process of organization of thought to foster their

(oral) performance" (D'Ely, 2006, p. 67). "(Xhafaj, Muck, and D'Ely, 2011, p.41). "The lack of gains in accuracy might be dependent on (1) learners' focus of attention while planning, (2) learners' effectiveness on implementing pre-planned intentions on-line, (3) the existence of trade-off effects, and (4) the strong relationship between strategic planning and the cognitive demands that task type may impose on learners (see D'Ely, 2006)." (Xhafaj, Muck, and D'Ely, 2011, p.41-42).

The authors of the replied work did research what aspects may affect students while planning a task, being those aspects of high importance and guidelines this results' research.

"Bearing in mind recent studies on the role of strategic planning, results have signaled a myriad of variables that might interact and possibly affect learners' planning process. In this vein, it can be mentioned: (1) learners' level of proficiency (Skehan; Foster, 2005; Kawauchi, 2005), (2) learners' approach to instructions and how effective they may be in orienting learners' focus of attention (Kawauchi, 2005; Ortega, 2005), (3) learners' ability to sustain the effects of planning (Skehan; Foster, 2005), (4) learners' ability to plan effectively (Iwashita; Elder, 2005), (5) learners' approach to task type and task structure (Foster; Skehan, 1996; Tavakoli; Skehan, 2005), (6) learners' reaction to the context in which they are inserted (testing vs. teaching context) (Elder; Iwashita, 2005), (7) learners' ability to cope with time pressure while performing (Ellis; Yuan, 2005; Yuan; Ellis, 2003;), (8) learners' working memory capacity (Guará-Tavares, 2005), (9) learners' age and availability of time while planning (Philp; Oliver; Mackey, 2006), (10) learners' level of proficiency and learners' performance in focused tasks (Mochizuki; Ortega, 2008), (11) learners' familiarity with the process of planning itself (D'Ely, 2006), and (12) learners' educational histories, encompassing issues such as learners' identity, social context and learning culture (Batstone, 2005)."(Xhafaj, Muck, and D'Ely, 2011, p.42).

According to Vygotsky (1978, 1986, in Nassaji; Swain, 2000) language learning occurs through what they call the zone of proximal development(ZPD)[1], allowing a student(novice) to learn with the collaboration of an expert(teacher or parent). For peer-to-peer planning negotiation, it may happen in a different way, but following the same idea. To highlight what happens and why this becomes a

---

[1] "[T]he distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers" (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86, in Nassaji; Swain, 2000, p. 36)

possibility, Brooks and Swain suggests that in this kind of interaction, the role of expert is shared between learners.(2001, in Swain; Lapkin, 2002)

There are a considerable number of studies which come to corroborate the claims for the impact of peer-peer dialogue on L2 learning made above. Brooks and Swain (2001, in Swain; Lapkin, 2002), for example, found that when learners discussed a grammatical item between them, they usually incorporated the form they agreed as correct in their repertoire.(Xhafaj, Muck, and D'Ely, 2011, p.44)

3 METHODOLOGY

In this section, there is going to be an overall view of the criteria used for selecting participants, what is going to be used as a tool to analyze data, as well as how data is going to be collected and analyzed.

3.1 Introduction

The present research is going to be conducted by following these main aspects: a cross sectional, experimental and quali-quantitative research. Since this article stands for a TCC and is supposed to be relatively short in all aspects,the quantitative results concerning **fluency** are going to be the data taken from: one individual task analysis of two students and one peer task analysis of the same two students. The latter being constituted of the students analyzed in the individual task, meaning that both groups to be compared are going to have only two participants in total.

3.2 Participants and setting

The participants are going to be two students, **(two male students)** from the 96 hours long subject, HL0803 - INGLÊS IV: LÍNGUA E CULTURA (2023.2). The students were currently in the fourth semester of the UFC undergraduate course, *Letras Inglês(Noturno)*[2]. The participants and settings were selected according to the following criteria. First, this subject is supposed to be taught in the target language, meaning that students have a good amount of contact with it, which is a much needed characteristic due to the aspect of the task to be performed. Second, it was convenient to do the research with those students because they already agreed in engaging with the task beforehand[3]. Both students who contributed with this research speak Brazilian Portuguese as their native language.

Data will be collected in three stages: (1) an oral task A with individual planning time (2) an oral task B with peer planning time. Then, participants will (3) answer a questionnaire. The questions will assess their thoughts and beliefs about the different moments they will engage in when planning the oral task, while their presentation of the task will serve to make a quantitative analysis on their speech.

3.3 Tasks and procedures

---

[2] This program provides degrees on Teaching English Language and Literature.
[3] Their professor, who is my supervisor and the person that will collect data, had already invited them to participate in this research. All students responded positively in engaging with the task.

The participants are going to plan and perform two dialogue tasks. Differently from Xhafaj, Muck, and D'Ely(2011) that gave them some keywords to include in their speech, this time they are going to have freedom to choose whatever words they want to include in their performance.The texts that they have to make the dialogues from bring some pictures like cartoons, representations in which they may use their imagination to create a narrative from. First, they are going to have a pre-task moment to plan **what** and **how** to say their speech, individually, for one of the tasks(task A). After that, students are going to perform the task, also individually, according to what they have planned in the pre-task stage. For the second task(task B), students are going to be put in *pairs* to plan their speech in the pre-task moment, and are going to, once more, perform the task individually afterwards. They will be given the same amount of time to plan both tasks, that is, 10 minutes each, and are going to be told to perform the tasks in no more than 1 minute, if possible. Xhafaj, Muck, and D'Ely(2011) did it differently in terms of managing individual and peer task instructions though[4]. The design of both tasks were inspired on Guará Tavares (2008). The reason for choosing this task is that students tend to have better performance to produce language "from scratch" when they have enough time to plan their speech, serving as a guideline prior to task performance, and also because students feel comfortable when they can rely on pictures rather than just written texts. The task demands a certain level of knowledge of the target language, but can be considered low ranked because of the freedom students have to choose whatever vocabulary sets they want to convey specific meaning as well as their expected current level[5] on the target language.

The tasks are going to be performed inside their classroom, during class time. It is important to point out that students participating in this research agreed in having their task recorded for quantitative analysis beforehand and also agreed to respond to the questionnaire fairly. Participants are going to be given the questionnaires after finishing the Tasks A and B. In this questionnaire students are meant to provide information about their thoughts regarding planning alone and with a peer, as well as

---

[4] For analysis purposes, they must perform the task individually. This way, we would perceive relevant data when comparing the groups' fluency and accuracy results.

[5] Students at this subject(English IV)have already studied at least 3 semesters of English subjects. Or either they were leveled to course this discipline based on the leveling test, in which students can skip the English Language subjects if they show that they already have enough knowledge in the language by ranking higher than English 3 level in the aforementioned leveling test.

their satisfaction and perceptions on the tasks given and their own procedures while planning their speech. (see Appendix for questionnaire information)

3.4 Research questions

Taking into consideration the results that are likely to be achieved considering previous studies regarding peer planning, considering the framework aforementioned, this research aims to answer the following questions:

1. Is the performance of the peer-planning group more fluent than the performance of the individual-planning group? 2. What are the two groups' perceptions about the differences in planning alone and planning with a peer?

3.5 Data analysis

Data is going to be analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively. The quantitative results are going to be taken from students' recordings and will serve as a parameter to resolve question number 1. The qualitative results are going to emerge from their answers to the questionnaire and serve as the basis to answer question number 2. The quantitative results are going to emerge from students' recordings and further transcription of the recordings. It is highly recommended for future research in this area that the results should be transcripted the same way they were in Xhafaj, Muck, and D'Ely(2011), using a specific software (e.g.:SPSS 10.0 for Windows). For this particular research, it is not going to be possible due to the fact that they used a paid software and the free version would not bring any relevant data for this particular work. I am going to use a web software to transcript instead and another software to cut the recordings of the participants, those are Transkriptor[6] and Audacity[7], respectively. The gathered data will be analyzed in terms of words per second to register and compare the **fluency** of the participants in each task.[8] For the Research question 2, this research is going to follow the same procedure of Xhafaj, Muck, and D'Ely(2011): "The data gathered through the questionnaires was grouped into categories, which emerged from the answers, and then employed for qualitative analyses in order to answer Research Questions 2".

---

[6] https://app.transkriptor.com/dashboard
[7] https://www.audacityteam.org
[8] "Following D'Ely (2006), among others, for the first measure all words or partial words produced by the speaker are counted and divided by the amount of time the learner spoke." (Xhafaj, Muck, and D'Ely, 2011).

After this section, there will be the results concerning the analysis of the data collected in both settings:performing a task under individual planning pre-task and performing a task under peer planning pre-task.

4 RESULTS

This section presents and discusses the results of the analyzes of this research. The research questions 1 and 2 are going to be answered in turn.

1. Is the performance of the peer-planning group more fluent than the performance of the individual-planning group?

The data analysis of their performance was conducted by doing: a simple transcription(considering only English words recognized by the software), time management through cuts of the recordings(starting and ending points of each presentation/performance), and word count afterwards. The purpose was to investigate how much time participants need to speak in an oral performance related to the amount of words they say.

Table 1. Variables taken from Task A(Pre-task: individual planning)

Students and variables	Student 1	Student 2
Time(in seconds)	45	90
English words	104	184
Average w/s	2,31	2,04

Student 1 performed Task A, the individual planning task, in a matter of 45 seconds. He spoke a total of 104 words during his presentation. Student 2 spoke for 90 seconds, doubling the number of student 1. The latter has a total of 184 words spoken in total for the same task. To simplify, as Table 1 denotes, students 1 and 2 have had an average of 2,31 words per second and 2,04 words per second, respectively.

Table 2. Variables taken from Task B(Pre-task: peer planning)

Students and variables	Student 1	Student 2
Time(in seconds)	89	64
English words	198	167
Words/seconds	2,22	2,61

Student 1 performed Task B, the peer planning task, in 89 seconds. Having spoken this time, 198 words during his performance. The average number when sectioning his words spoken per seconds taken in the presentation, which is 2,22, is lower than the results acquired in Task A(2,31). Student 2, in his turn performing Task B, has achieved a total of 167 words. This time his presentation lasted for 64 seconds, lower than before, in Task A. Student 2 has got the biggest number of all presentations when it comes to words per second(2,61) in Task B.

Although student 2 has performed a better presentation in terms of speech rate in Task B, planning with a peer, than in Task A, planning alone, data suggests that it is not only because of the difference in the individual-peer planning settings from one task to another if we consider the results from student 1. The ladder has done a quicker presentation and with a higher speech rate in Task A, scoring 2,31 words per second against 2,22 in Task B. Results are not statistically significant to assign any relevance in planning with a peer instead of planning alone regarding speech rate. One of the factors that may have been crucial to this result was that students are at an intermediate English level, as occurred in the replied research: "As Mhizuki and Ortega (2008) pointed out, the ones who will probably benefit the most from help while planning are beginners." [...] "Also, Kawauchi (2005) found that learners who are at the high-intermediate level of command of the L2 might profit the most from planning since learners who are at an advanced level might perform well even when they are not given time for planning." [...] "Perhaps if the group was comprised of people who had never been involved in planning there would be a greater difference between the groups since the peer-planners would be able, as suggested by Figueiredo (2007), to share their strategies, enriching the planning of the colleague."(Xhafaj, Muck, and D'Ely, 201, p.52).

By rehearsing the recordings and reading the transcriptions it is clear that students 1 and 2 struggled a bit during their presentation for lacking vocabulary, not only in individual planning but also in the peer planning conditions, at the moment of their performance. Some transcripted citations show those moments where they struggled in vocabulary: "My point, my point of vision is so similar to the others.
I see two persons
Who knows, maybe he's a couple, probably it's a couple.
And I mean if you, you probably hate him because I don't know why, but he is a little man.

He's want to beat up your wife want to kill me however his own through a piece of something maybe the cookie or his food in chip.

Moreover, he moreover his name pops my.

I mean he hates that a lot.

There isn't.

I don't know.

This is my point vision, so it's all similar to the others."(Student 1 in Task A); "...So you can see her expressions is more like, oh this guy again, he's trying again.

He doesn't get it.

I don't want him until the end in the in the final square she looks she looks to him because he is basically saying like oh I got another woman don't you see what you lost?

And and she for me, she has a face like."(Student 2 in Task B).

There might be the case that both students did not plan much about their sentences and focused on the keywords instead, having to rely purely on their impromptu, trying to speak naturally while presenting, disturbing their own speech pace in both Tasks A and B. It might have been that students have not been used to performing activities when they have planning time to speak, explaining why they were so relaxed to speak as if it were those moments of class time when the teacher asks students to help and discuss something about the content. The professor in charge of those students participating in this research uses a Communicative Approach, not exactly focused on tasks as it is in the Task Based Approach, which demands roleplay and turn taking in a higher frequency. "...collaborative work did not yield benefits because it was not collaborative. In Storch's (1999, 2000, 2001a, 2001b, in Swain et al., 2002) investigations, she observed that collaborative work can display different patterns of interaction being that the dominant/dominant and the dominant/passive ones lead to less co-construction, language related episodes, extension of knowledge, provision of scaffolded assistance and language development (grammar and lexis) than the real collaborative interaction or the expert/novice interaction."(Xhafaj, Muck, and D'Ely, 201, p.53.)

As for the peer planning time, it was not recorded. But some kinds of interactions, to say some: "expert/passive or dominant/passive"(Watanabe and Swain, 2007) might be a barrier to meaningful interaction, consequently affecting the results of peer to peer collaboration and equal understanding of a task. It is also relevant that in this

study there are just two students who constitute one pair, having no room for patterning peers and comparing results. As regards to collaborative work, further studies might come with responses if focused on planning time as well. It is true that the studies regarding patterns of interactions may demonstrate and explain the differences of planning alone and with a peer.

2. What are the two groups' perceptions about the differences in planning alone and planning with a peer?

Participants answered a questionnaire regarding their feelings, thoughts and planning details towards the tasks attributed to them. Question number 1 information was split into 4 items, it asked students: 1.if they liked the tasks, 2.if they liked the act of planning alone and 3.together with their partner, and 4.if they preferred one or another(planning alone or in pairs). There were emojis for them to choose in each item,representing feelings: A)Very happy; B)Happy; C)Indifferent; D) Sad; E)Very sad. The questions also counted with blank spaces for them to write why they chose each feeling. For question number 1:1: Student 1 was indifferent about the task while Student 2 was very happy. It might indicate or prepare the floor to a lack of significance when a student does not like the task proposed. On the other hand, if students feel comfortable and immersed in a task, the burden of planning, be it alone or in pairs, becomes as natural as reading an easy book. The question here is a starting point to analyze what could have gone wrong if results do not satisfy the expectations of this research. For question 1.2: Student 1 said he is very happy when the act of planning alone occurs at home, but indifferent when it occurs in the classroom, Student 2 chose the indifferent emoji for this item and didn't comment upon it. For the third item of question 1 students agreed by marking the Happy emoji, but neither of them wrote a word about it(if they liked the act of planning together with their partner). For the last item, when asked about their preference of a pre-task planning they agreed in part: "Alone. Because I have more security working with myself, I don't like working in pairs or groups."(Student 1); "I like alone but in pairs is nice too because together we can make more ideas."(Student 2).

For question number 2 they were asked to describe their experience in planning alone and with their partner, providing as much information as they could remember. In this question, there were five items, a) to e), in which they should elicit what happened in their planning time; a)the information provided for them referred to how

they planned the tasks; b)what they planned; c)what was the emphasis of their plan; d)what were their thoughts while planning; e)if they had something else to say that was not asked in the previous items. When asked about how they planned, student 1 wrote the following: "Has a clash of ideas and I chose the best ideas when pass out of my mind. It came from my mind.; and student 2 wrote: "Alone I thought fast, and with my partner we got more time because we had different opinions but at the end we had a 'acordo'.". For item b), student 1 wrote: "Both with pattern." and student 2 wrote: "My plan to the first one was that the woman was a chef and she was 'avaliando' the food of the man - he was a cook.". For item c), student 1 wrote: "The huge nose in the caractheres. The critcism in cartoons." and student 2 wrote: "I was thinking while making if I was thinking a lot, but was good see that part of my plan was similar to others.". For item d) student 1 wrote: "How to say because I very shy appresentation" and student 2 wrote: "that I can be creative!". For item e) student 1 wrote: "Not yet" while student 2 left it blank.

As regards to level of proficiency, it is clear that they are both at a lower-intermediate level, commiting lexical, orthographic, verb tenses, the use of third person pronouns mistakes and attributing prepositions that do not fit the sentence meaning properly. But they can convey meaning overall, doing a good job when it comes to affirmative clauses ordering parts of speech. The focus on meaning is very apparent indeed, as studies suggest tasks should be, but of course, after the rehearsal and further self corrective feedback, outcomes of these kinds of tasks may improve from simple talks to clear and concise presentations. When analyzing their focus on instructions, perceptive mistakes were made by both students who misunderstood the term 'narrative' and chose to only narrate the story from outside:Oxford languages[9] defines narrative as a spoken or written account of connected events, a story. Students may have understood the activity as a narration instead (the action or process of narrating a story). Their focus of attention was centralized in speaking naturally about perceptions, how they see the development of the story and discourse in their presentations. Students have shown not to sustain a good amount of the effects of planning, this fact relies upon the already discussed lack of vocabulary, might it be related to vocabulary matters or just lack of memory related to their plans. According to these aspects, it is safe to say that both students did not achieve success on their planning time, heighting to the fact that they may

---

[9] https://languages.oup.com/google-dictionary-en/

have not fully understood what the task was about and how they should manage the structure of their task presentation, but there is still room for analysis on their outcome when considering it to be a simple task overall. Resuming what happens in a specific moment is also an important ability to consider for learners to improve on their conversation skills. For the context students were inserted in, one of them did not feel comfortable when having to work with a peer, proving to be an embarrassment instead of helping due to his preferences of studying alone. The other liked both ways of planning, suggesting that in pairs there is room for inserting ideas, a fact that would not be possible planning alone. Their working memory capacity was not the focus of their presentation plans, considering that participants had a few words planned and did not rely on the planning time to choose vocabulary from in order to structurally capacitate them to perform the task, avoiding errors and pauses to think about the connection of topics and words properly.

5. CONCLUSION

The objective of the research was to compare students' opinions and outcomes of planning tasks alone and with a peer as a pre-task, that is, before performance of the task. Students were given 10 minutes to plan what and how to say their performance and have been questioned about their opinions concerning planning time. Results have shown no significant difference between both tasks, proving insufficient for students to just plan in pairs. It may be the case that one more differentiation in the command settings would have changed the results, for example, giving students key words to guide their presentation as Xhafaj, Muck, and D'Ely did in their research with their tasks, but it could not change the fact that results from peer planning has statistically low difference in oral performance results.

As for the opinions of students, one of them did not like activities that involved grouping students for an oral task performance, and the other liked both ways of working for an oral task, be it planning alone or in pairs. Maybe results could be different if there was a bigger scope of pairs of students, or the study were made with different participants. For the overall results, this study has come closer to what Xhafaj, Muck, and D'Ely discovered as their outcome: "Although the overall results of this investigation do not indicate significant differences between peer planning and individual planning, the specificities discussed may hint to some constructive pedagogical implications, in spite of the limitations which are characteristic of a small-scale study." Besides that, students enjoyed the moment of the research, especially in pairs. The present study opens a window for further peer planning pre-task activities and to increase the amount of significant tasks in communicative approach classrooms utilizing meaningful tasks to provide students with all the benefits that it may bring to them.

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO CEARÁ

CENTRO DE HUMANIDADES

DEPARTAMENTO DE ESTUDOS DA LÍNGUA INGLESA,

SUAS LITERATURAS E TRADUÇÃO

CURSO SUPERIOR DE LICENCIATURA EM LÍNGUA INGLESA

QUESTIONNAIRE – PLANNING ALONE AND WITH A PARTNER

Name:

1- **Mark** the face which best represents your **feelings** towards the following:

How much did you like the task?	😊 😊 😐 😟 ☹️
How much did you like the act of planning alone? **Tell us why.**	😊 😊 😐 😟 ☹️
How much did you like the act of planning together with your partner? **Tell us why.**	😊 😊 😐 😟 ☹️
Did you prefer planning alone or in pairs? Why?	😊 😊 😐 😟 ☹️

2-Describe your experience in planning alone and with your partner providing as much information as you can remember:

a)How did you plan?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

b)What did you plan?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

c)What was the emphasis of your plan?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

d)What were your thoughts while planning?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

e)Do you want to say something that was not asked here? What?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

6. REFERENCES

Brown, H. Douglas, **Principles of language learning and teaching/** H. Douglas Brown. - 4th ed. 2000.

FIGUEIREDO, F. J. Q. **A colaboração como uma forma de promover a aprendizagem de língua estrangeira.** In: CONGRESSO INTERNACIONAL DA ABRAPUI, 1., 2007, Belo Horizonte. Anais… Belo Horizonte: Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, 2007.

GUARÁ-TAVARES, M. G. **Pre-task planning, working memory capacity, and L2 speech performance**. Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, 2008.

KAWAUCHI, C. **The effects of strategic planning on the oral narratives of learners with low and high intermediate L2 proficiency.** In: ELLIS, R. (Ed.). Planning and task performance in a second language. Language learning and language teaching. Vol. 11. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2005. p. 143-164.

Kusnadi, Munirah & Muhsin, Muh Arief. **USING TASK-BASED APPROACH IN IMPROVING THE STUDENTS' SPEAKING ACCURACY AND FLUENCY.** 2015.

MOCHIZUKI, N.; ORTEGA, L. **Balancing communication and grammar in beginning-level foreign language classrooms: A study of guided planning and relativization.** Language Teaching Research, v. 12, n. 1, p. 11- 37, 2008.

NASSAJI, H.; SWAIN, M. **A Vygotskyan perspective on corrective feedback in L2: the effect of random versus negotiated help on the learning of English articles.** Language Awareness, v. 9, n. 1, p. 34-51, 2000.

ORTEGA, L. **Planning and focus on form in L2 oral performance.** Studies in Second Language Acquisition, v. 21, p. 109-148, 1999.
_____. **What do learners plan? Learner-driven attention to form during pre-task planning.** In: ELLIS, R. (Ed.). Planning and task performance in a second language.

Language learning and language teaching. Vol. 11. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2005. p. 77-109.

SKEHAN, P. **A framework for the implementation of task-based instruction.** Applied Linguistics, v. 17, p. 38-62, 1996.

_____. **A cognitive approach to language learning.** Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

_____. **Task research and language teaching: reciprocal relationships.** In: FOTOS, S.; NASSAJI, H. (Ed.). Form-focused instruction and teacher education: Studies in honour of Rod Ellis. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007. p. 55-69.

SKEHAN, P.; FOSTER, P. **Strategic and on-line planning: the influence of surprise information and task time on second language performance.** In: ELLIS, R. (Ed.). Planning and task performance in a second language. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2005. p. 193-216.

SWAIN, M.; BROOKS, L.; TOCALLI-BELLER, A. **Peer-peer dialogue as a means of second language learning.** Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, v. 22, p. 171-185, 2002.

SWAIN, M.; LAPKIN, S. **Interaction in second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together.** The Modern Language Journal, v. 82, n. 3, p. 320-337, 1998.

Vasconcelos Neto, J. J. de. **Student teachers' beliefs on oral corrective feedback**. Repositório da Universidade Federal do Ceará, Fortaleza, 2018.

XHAFAJ, D. C. P.; MUCK, K. E.; D'ELY, R. C. S. F. **The impact of individual and peer planning on the oral performance of advanced learners of English as a foreign language.** *Revista Linguagem & Ensino,* Pelotas, v. 14, n. 1, p 39-65, 2011.

WATANABE, Y.; SWAIN, M. **Effects of proficiency differences and patterns of pair interaction on second language learning: collaborative dialogue between adult ESL learners.** Language Teaching Research, v. 11, n. 2, p. 121-142, 2007.