

Información Importante

La Universidad de La Sabana informa que el(los) autor(es) ha(n) autorizado a usuarios internos y externos de la institución a consultar el contenido de este documento a través del Catálogo en línea de la Biblioteca y el Repositorio Institucional en la página Web de la Biblioteca, así como en las redes de información del país y del exterior con las cuales tenga convenio la Universidad de La Sabana.

Se permite la consulta a los usuarios interesados en el contenido de este documento para todos los usos que tengan finalidad académica, nunca para usos comerciales, siempre y cuando mediante la correspondiente cita bibliográfica se le de crédito al documento y a su autor.

De conformidad con lo establecido en el artículo 30 de la Ley 23 de 1982 y el artículo 11 de la Decisión Andina 351 de 1993, La Universidad de La Sabana informa que los derechos sobre los documentos son propiedad de los autores y tienen sobre su obra, entre otros, los derechos morales a que hacen referencia los mencionados artículos.

BIBLIOTECA OCTAVIO ARIZMENDI POSADA
UNIVERSIDAD DE LA SABANA
Chía - Cundinamarca

THE INFLUENCE OF GOs IN L2 ARGUMENTATIVE WRITING

The Influence of Graphic Organizers in A1 Sixth Graders' Argumentative Writing Skill
in an EFL Context

Carlos Andrés MORA GONZÁLEZ

Research Report submitted

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master in English Language Teaching – Autonomous Learning Environments

Directed by Carl Edlund ANDERSON

Department of Foreign Languages and Cultures

Universidad de La Sabana

Chía, Colombia

November, 2014

THE INFLUENCE OF GOs IN L2 ARGUMENTATIVE WRITING

Declaration

I hereby declare that my research report entitled:

[The influence of Graphic Organizers in A1 Sixth Graders' Argumentative Writing Skill
in an EFL Context]

- is the result of my own work and includes nothing which is the outcome of work done in collaboration except as declared and specified in the text;
- is neither substantially the same as nor contains substantial portions of any similar work submitted or that is being concurrently submitted for any degree or diploma or other qualification at the Universidad de La Sabana or any other university or similar institution except as declared and specified in the text;
- complies with the word limits and other requirements stipulated by the Research Subcommittee of the Department of Foreign Languages and Cultures;
- has been submitted by or on the required submission date.

Date: Thursday, November 6th

Full Name: Carlos Andrés Mora González

Signature: Carlos A. Mora G.

Acknowledgements

On one side, I would like to thank God for all the blessings, strength, patience, wisdom, and support to be able to start and finish this new professional goal in my life. Also, I would like to thank to my mother who from heaven, has always been my model and inspiration to follow because of her consistency, strength, patience, and advising attitude. In addition, I would like to express my gratitude for all the support provided by my bother and especially, my girlfriend, who stayed up long nights with me and put up with my stress lots of times as well.

On the other side, I would like to show my gratitude for the guidance, shaping, support, encouragement and motivation given by all my tutors throughout the whole process. Especially, professor Liliana Cuesta who always seemed to enjoy reading my papers and from whom, I started to be engaged in researching. Thanks to my director Carl Edlund Anderson, who was the best director I could ever have. He was always willing to help me and I learnt tons from him in terms of academic writing, reducing number of words, Word software tips, and APA references.

My greatest gratitude is to all my students who participated willingly and happily in this project. Their active participation and disposition was the key to carry out the study despite of all the difficulties, stress, and hurries. I have to say that I could not have a better group than this one, all of them always showed their appreciation toward the impact of the project upon them. In fact, they thought this study was really useful because they learnt English and how to express and support their opinions at the same time, and this is the most gratifying feeling I can receive as a teacher.

Abstract

This small-scale qualitative action research study analyzed the influence of using graphic organizers to assist participants in executing problem-based argumentative written tasks. The study was conducted with Basic English level sixth graders as per the CEFR at a private school in Chía, Colombia. Participants revealed difficulties with various linguistic and communicative aspects (vocabulary, enunciative markers/connectors, expressing points of view, constructing arguments, and connecting ideas). Data was collected from surveys, questionnaires, focus groups, a teacher's journal, and participants' artifacts (graphic organizers and written texts) and was analyzed through the grounded theory method.

The results revealed that graphic organizers had a positive influence on the learners' argumentative writing skills; specifically, they helped foster the development of strategic information planning and argumentative linearization during the pre- and while- argumentative writing stages. This influence occurred through the enhancement of information processing skills and the fosterage of a basic argumentative written structure. This study advances second-language writing research by extending the understanding of how younger learners can develop complex argumentative writing skills in a second language, and offers significant lessons for teachers of language—and content—in both the first and additional languages.

Key words: Graphic organizers; problem-based tasks; argumentative writing skill; strategic planning and linearization.

Resumen

En este estudio de investigación cualitativa en pequeña escala, se analizó la influencia del uso de organizadores gráficos para ayudar a los participantes en el proceso de realizar textos escritos basados en resolución de problemas. El estudio se llevó a cabo con estudiantes de grado sexto del nivel básico de Inglés según el Marco Común Europeo para las Lenguas en un colegio del sector privado ubicado en Chía, Colombia. Los participantes demostraron dificultades en varios aspectos lingüísticos y comunicativos (vocabulario, conectores, expresiones para dar un punto de vista, dar argumentos, y conectar ideas). Los datos fueron recolectados usando diversos instrumentos como encuestas, cuestionarios, grupos focales, diario docente, y los artefactos de los participantes (organizadores y los textos escritos) y fueron analizados usando el método de teoría fundamentada.

Los resultados revelaron que los organizadores gráficos tuvieron una influencia positiva en las habilidades argumentativas de escritura de los participantes. Específicamente, los organizadores ayudaron a promover el desarrollo estratégico de la planeación de la información y linearización argumentativa durante las etapas de planeación y escritura. Esta influencia se debió al mejoramiento de las habilidades de procesamiento de la información y al fomento de la estructura argumentativa escrita. En conclusión, este estudio fomenta la investigación en la escritura en la lengua inglesa ya que extiende nuestro entendimiento sobre cómo los aprendices más jóvenes desarrollan habilidades argumentativas de escritura, y ofrece lecciones significativas para docentes de idiomas—y contenido—en la lengua materna o idiomas adicionales.

Palabras claves: Organizadores gráficos; actividades sobre resolución de problemas; habilidad argumentativa escrita; planeación y linearización estratégica.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	i
Abstract.....	ii
Resumen.....	iii
Table of Figures	vii
Table of Tables	viii
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
1.1 Introduction to the study.....	1
1.2 Rationale of the study	1
1.2.1 Needs analysis and problem statement	2
1.2.2 Justification of problem’s significance	3
1.2.3 Strategy proposed to address problem	3
1.3 Research question and objective.....	4
1.4 Conclusion	4
Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework.....	6
2.1 Introduction.....	6
2.2 Definitions.....	6
2.2.1 Argumentation.....	6
2.2.2 Argumentative writing skill	7
2.2.3 Graphical argumentation aids	9
2.2.4 Webbing graphic organizers	12
2.2.5 Problem solving	12
2.3 State of the art	13

2.4	Conclusion	14
Chapter 3: Research Design.....		16
3.1	Introduction.....	16
3.2	Type of study	16
3.3	Context.....	16
3.3.1	Participants	17
3.3.2	Researcher's role.....	18
3.3.3	Ethical considerations	19
3.4	Data collection instruments.....	19
3.4.1	Description	19
3.4.1.1	Surveys.....	19
3.4.1.2	Questionnaires.....	20
3.4.1.3	Focus group.....	20
3.4.1.4	Teacher's journal	21
3.4.1.5	Artifacts.....	21
3.4.2	Validation and piloting.....	22
3.5	Conclusion	23
Chapter 4: Chapter Four: Pedagogical Intervention and Implementation		24
4.1	Introduction.....	24
4.2	Visions of language, learning, and curriculum	24
4.2.1	Vision of language	24
4.2.2	Vision of learning.....	25
4.2.3	Vision of curriculum	26

4.3	Instructional design.....	26
4.3.1	Lesson planning	26
4.3.2	Implementation	27
4.4	Conclusion	28
Chapter 5: Results and Data Analysis.....		30
5.1	Introduction.....	30
5.2	Data management procedures	30
5.2.1	Validation.....	30
5.2.2	Data analysis methodology	31
5.3	Categories	32
5.3.1	Introduction.....	32
5.3.1.1	Category mapping.....	32
5.3.1.2	Identification of core category	33
5.3.2	Analysis of categories	34
5.3.2.1	Description of categories	34
5.3.2.1.1	Graphic organizers enhance information processing skills	35
	Focusing skills.....	35
	Analyzing skills.....	37
	Organizing skills	38
5.3.2.1.2	Graphic organizers foster argumentative written structure.....	40
	Positioning and supporting a claim	41
	Selecting and retrieving words.....	42
	Supporting coherence and cohesion.....	44

5.3.2.1.3	Other findings	46
	Graphic organizers provide a sense of confidence when writing	46
5.3.2.2	Core category	48
5.4	Conclusion	49
Chapter 6: Conclusions and Pedagogical Implications.....		50
6.1	Introduction.....	50
6.2	Comparison of results with previous studies' results	50
6.3	Significance of the results.....	52
6.4	Pedagogical implications	53
6.5	Limitations of the present study.....	56
6.6	Further research	58
6.7	Conclusion	60
References.....		61

Table of Figures

Figure 1. Preliminary categories and subcategories after the axial coding procedure.....	33
Figure 2. Final subcategories and categories after the selective coding procedure.	34
Figure 3. Focusing skills illustrated in a GO and a written composition by participant G.	36
Figure 4. Solution and arguments on a GO provided by participant G.....	38
Figure 5. Sequence of organization in a GO provided by participant O.....	39
Figure 6. Written text structure provided by participant O.....	40
Figure 7. Organizational structure of a GO provided by participant K.	44

Figure 8. Coherence and cohesion evidenced in a GO and a written text by participant R.	46
Figure 9. Example of completed student graphic organizer.	83
Figure 10. Example of student argumentative text based on working with graphic organizer.	83
Figure 12. Example of student vocabulary and definition of a problem-based topic.	89
Figure 13. Example of student KWL Chart about a problem-based topic.....	90
Figure 11. List of problems identified at the school by one of the participants.....	94
Figure 14. Model of a webbing graphic organizer retrieved from the web.	95
Figure 15. Example of student graphic organizer checklist.....	97
Figure 16. Example of student argumentative composition checklist.	98
Figure 17. Example of student English folder front cover.....	99

Table of Tables

Table 1. Initial codes after the open coding procedure.	33
--	----

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Introduction to the study

Today's learners are increasingly required to examine current societal, political, behavioral, and cultural issues critically from different points of view to form reasoned opinions. For this reason, one important aim of schools should be to develop argumentation skill that students need to participate successfully in different daily academic activities (Graff, 2004; Hillocks, 2010, 2011; Kuhn, 2005) to write essays, papers, and reports, and; indeed, that would likely be useful in their professional lives—and as participant citizens in a democracy. This skill requires the processes of forming reasons, justifying beliefs, and drawing conclusions (Nordquist, 2012). Also, it is implicated in all beliefs that students hold, the judgments they make, and the conclusions they come to. In other words, argumentation is the means by which people rationally resolve questions, issues, disputes, and solve problems (Jonassen & Kim, 2010).

Unfortunately, the students' ability to be engaged in argumentative writing is not self-evident. Often, schools do not offer learners opportunities to develop their argumentative writing skill within the curriculum, and, even more worryingly, some teachers do not provide those chances inside the classrooms either because the main emphasis in classes is to fulfill the content proposed in the syllabus rather than developing lifelong skills such as argumentation. Thus, in this study, participants were prompted to propose solutions, with the supporting arguments, for different problems at school in written compositions.

1.2 Rationale of the study

It is important for educators to help students develop effective argumentation skills because research suggests that these skills are often poor (Applebee, Langer, Mullis, Latham, &

Gentile, 1994; Kuhn, 1991). Thus, this study used the English language teaching and learning processes as tools to develop other life skills such as argumentation.

One important task for schools is to teach and expose students to different tools to foster their argumentation skills, considering that these skills grow between childhood and adolescence (Kuhn, 1991). Indeed, it appears to be beneficial to approach argumentative text types by middle school to give students the opportunity to learn how to support their own opinions and organize their ideas (De Bernardi & Antonili, 2007).

Similarly, argumentative writing should be included in school curricula for a number of reasons: precursors of argument appear in the writing of very young children, even poor persuasive writing shows embryonic forms of argument, and children's social and educational experiences offer abundant opportunities for contextually relevant writing (Crowhurst, 1990). Therefore, sixth graders represent a good population with which to carry out this study, taking advantage of their age and stage in the developmental process.

1.2.1 Needs analysis and problem statement

This project was conducted with a group of twenty students from sixth grade at a private school in Chía, Colombia. According to the National Basic Standards of the Ministry of Education in Colombia (MEN, 2006), students at this level are expected to make short descriptions, provide basic personal information, and use expressions to discuss contrasts between, additions to, and cause and effect in relation to different ideas when writing. Likewise, the school syllabus for that grade states that students are expected to write short texts describing routines, actions in progress, past events, and abilities. Thus, nor the national or the school standards include the development or the production of argumentative written texts what reveals

that the lack of the curriculum support for these skills may have impacted participants' results when writing argumentative texts combined with other factors.

In addition to the lack of curriculum support, these students revealed linguistic and cognitive needs related to their argumentative writing skills. These needs were confirmed by a needs analysis in which a survey and the participants' artifacts (see 3.4.2) were used. It showed participants had difficulties expressing their opinions, clarifying, organizing, and connecting ideas, providing arguments, and having a sufficient word repertoire to write. These findings support the claim that argumentative writing is more cognitively demanding than other types of writing, such as narrative writing (Bereiter, 1980; Fredman & Pringle, 1984).

1.2.2 Justification of problem's significance

In consideration of the argumentation skill importance in the participants' academic, professional, and personal lives, it is necessary to start taking the first steps to foster the development of this skill in the classroom. This study used the English class as a vehicle to prompt the development of argumentative writing skill through the use of organizers to assist learners in the processes of expressing and providing arguments to support their opinions. Acquisition of these two basic processes of argumentation is necessary for learners to become better arguers (Herrenkohl & Guerra, 1998; Sadler, 2004).

1.2.3 Strategy proposed to address problem

Writing argumentatively requires learners to have a clear structure of argumentative texts. This structure includes two main components: conceptual or referencing planning and translating (Coirier, Andriessen, & Chanquoy, 1999). The former refers to the planning process for the resulting outcome while the latter concerns with the transposing process of the plan into a linear text. This structure requires different cognitive processes and the deliberate use of specific

linguistic forms and structures to write an argumentative text effectively (Alamargot & Chanquoy, 2001). Therefore, this study selected the organizers to assist A1 L2 participants with learning the structure of an argumentative text because this tool has been shown to help learners structure and organize information and ideas in an easily understood visual way (Bromley, Irwin-DeVitis, & Modlo, 1995; Brovero, 2004; Ellis and Howard, 2007; Ruddell, 2001).

1.3 Research question and objective

Accordingly, this study's research objective was *to analyze the influence of graphic organizers on A1 sixth graders' argumentative writing skill in an EFL context*, and the corresponding research question was *how might the use of graphic organizers on problem-based tasks influence A1 sixth graders' argumentative writing skill in an EFL context?*

1.4 Conclusion

As has been shown, argumentation skills are a very important part of learners' lives because every day they have different opinions and debate about how things should be, how things should be done, and how problems should be solved among other situations which are crucial elements in decision-making (Byrnes, 1998; Halpern 1998; Klaczynski, 2004). Hence, these skills help learners present and support their standpoints to negotiate, persuade, convince, or refute others, which turn argumentation as a lifelong skill that may prompt learners to have a better quality of life through accomplishing their academic, personal, and professional ambitions.

In addition, two elements for learners' success are covered simultaneously in this study, the L2 learners need to compete in a globalized world where English is the language for communication, and the argumentation skills required to confront multiple perspectives on unclear and controversial issues to promote critical thinkers in a complex society with many different agendas, facts, and perspectives. These elements are not only important for assuring

students are equipped to compete in the marketplace of ideas but also to maximize their own cognitive development more broadly.

Under those circumstances, it is necessary to review the work in this area, especially with relation to the use of organizers as potential tools to assist the development/fostering of argumentative writing skills in L2 high school graders, to provide a sound basis for the design and implementation of the study.

Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework

2.1 Introduction

After discussing the importance of argumentation as a lifelong skill, in a globalized context which demands English language skills and critical thinkers, it is necessary to review the specific relevant constructs such as argumentation, argumentative writing skill, problem solving and previous research on them but especially with relation to the use of organizers as learning tools to help foster argumentative writing skill in a L2 high school context, to provide a sound basis for the design and implementation of this study.

2.2 Definitions

2.2.1 Argumentation

Argumentation is the ability people have to form and support an opinion related to any topic (Nordquist, 2012). It is as a constellation of statements a language user tries to use to justify an opinion (Van Eemeren, 1987). The present study aimed to improve argumentative writing skill by prompting participants to present their opinions and the arguments that support those opinions in written compositions.

There are three cognitive and contextual requirements for argumentation to be developed (Antaki & Leudar, 1990; Stein & Miller, 1993b; Van Eemeren & Grootendorst, 1984): familiarity with the topic and the situation, a minimal level of subjective involvement and some perspective of gain, and the data of the problem must be understandable and memorable. When such requirements are met, children from eight years old and onwards can produce sound reasons in favor of their standpoints. In this study, the three requirements were met by using problem-based tasks. These tasks were based on four common problems (see Chapter 4:) identified at the school and previously selected with the participants. These problems were characterized by

having unfixed solutions that allowed participants to conduct an internal debate aimed at selecting individual justifiable solutions for each problem.

For a more detailed reviews of argumentation theories, consult the classical theories (Ven Eemeren, 1987; Wong, 1992), Toulmin's uses of argument (Toulmin, 1958), and the new rhetoric (Perelman & Olbretchts-Tyteca, 1969).

2.2.2 Argumentative writing skill

Argumentative writing involves identification of a thesis (a claim), supporting evidence (empirical or experiential), and the assessment of warrants connecting the thesis, evidence, and situation constituting an argument (Newell, Beach, Smith, & VanDerHeide, 2011; Toulmin, 1958). With this kind of writing, students are given the opportunity to express their opinions and discuss their ideas, which can lead to a development of maturity in their thinking and writing processes (Dent-Young, 1993). This study prompted participants to write simple argumentative texts in which they could express their opinions by selecting and supporting the solutions for particular problems at the school.

The ability to write argumentative texts requires the capacity to follow a model which underlies the argumentative text writing activity. This model requires two basic processes: conceptual or referential planning, and translating (Coirier, Andriessen, & Chanquoy, 1999). The former comprises three sub-processes: idea generation and retrieval, idea selection and evaluation, and idea organization, while the latter comprises two sub-processes: linearizing and linguistic coding (Hayes & Flower, 1980).

The conceptual or referential planning is related to the nature of the outcome of the planning process and to the specific characteristics of the knowledge to be retrieved. In this study, this process was fostered by using organizers to assist learners during the pre-writing stage

to generate, select, and organize information strategically, as well as during the while-writing stage to assist the process of recovering specific information. Idea selection and evaluation essentially involves using the appropriate criteria to select and evaluate relevant arguments, considering the goals of the task. In this study, the use of organizers was intended to help participants in the process of selecting and evaluating the most relevant and appropriate arguments to include in accordance with the chosen solutions for each problem. Idea organization refers to relating ideas to each other in a hierarchical structure as basis for a coherent text structure. For this study, the use of this visual schema was intended to provide participants with the micro- and macro-structure of an argumentative text.

The translating process refers to transposing the elaborated plan into a grammatically correct and pragmatically adequate linear text. In this study, this process was supported by teaching enunciative involvement markers (I think ...) and connectives (because ...) to help participants translate the information from the organizers to a coherent and cohesive text. Linearization refers to the process of expressing a cognitive representation (the visual representation of information provided by the organizers) into a linear sequence of information (the argumentative written text). In other words, the task for participants at this point was to linearize the arguments, to put them in the order as they would appear in the actual text. Then they could code the resulting sequence linguistically by specifying the relationships between arguments to form a coherent structure of sentences. Linguistic coding implies the complex process of relating successive sentences by means of textualizing operations (Apotheloz, 1990; Bronckart, 1985; Fayol & Schneuwly, 1987; Schneuwly, 1988) and organization devices (Boscolo, 1995) as syntax, punctuation, and connectives. This process is crucial for the linguistic structure and realization of the text plan. For this study, text structuring was supported by using

cohesion devices (enunciative involvement markers and connectives) that allowed participants to connect the solutions to the arguments planned in the organizers.

2.2.3 Graphical argumentation aids

One of the most common methods for engaging, developing, and scaffolding the writing argumentative skill is the use of graphical argumentation aids. These tools help learners visualize arguments to improve their construction (Kirschner, 2003). The simplest form of graphic support is a graphic organizer, which is often used to help represent children's conceptual understanding (Novak, 1991). For this study, the easiest, simplest, and most user-friendly tool to assist and support the participants' argumentative writing skill was the webbing graphic organizer (Brovero, 2004), the structure of which helped participants to plan their solutions and arguments

2.2.4

There exist different definitions of organizers provided by literature. For example, they are defined as visual devices that depict information in a variety of ways (Ellis & Howard, 2007), as well as visual representations of knowledge and ways of structuring information or arranging essential aspects of an idea or topic into a pattern using labels (Bromley, Irwin-DeVitis, & Modlo, 1995). In this study, organizers were used as tools to assist the writing of argumentative compositions.

There are three components of a successful organizer (Baxendell, 2003): consistency, coherence, and creativity. Although there are many different formats and types of organizers, consistency is important since students benefit from routine and structure. The same type of organizers should be used for the same type of writing activity (Baxendell, 2003). In this study, the webbing graphic organizer was used to assist the writing of argumentative written texts. Thus, consistency helps students become familiar with the layout of the organizer so that they

can process information without the added element of processing format. Consequently, internalization and generalization of information are more likely to occur when students are already comfortable with the layout. Coherence is related to the presentation of information in a fluid, understandable manner, and aiding the reduction of cognitive load. Thus, a coherent organizer should not be visually distracting or contain too much information, and it should have clear labels. Creativity does not refer to stylistic choices in making the organizers themselves; rather, it refers to how organizers are implemented by the teacher. This study integrated the first two of these components by using the webbing graphic organizer throughout the whole process (consistency) and ensuring a repeated use of familiar structures (coherence). However, in terms of creativity, this study departed from Baxendell's approach by giving participants the opportunity to customize the designs of their organizers based on an initial structure provided by the teacher.

The existing research literature also has illustrated the diverse benefits of using organizers to assist writing processes. For instance, organizers direct writers' attentions to the task, specific order, and details needed to write proficiently (Miller, 2011). Moreover, organizers are effective tools for structuring written discourse (Ellis & Howard, 2007) and are designed to help extract salient information and eliminate extraneous information (Ellis & Howard, 2007; Kim, Vaughn, Wanzek, & Wei, 2004). Additionally, organizers present students with an overall view of a topic which allow them to "place new information inside a bigger picture" since "the whole and the parts that make up the whole are present at the same time" (Caviglioli & Harris, 2003, p.16). Organizers can provide a preliminary organizational plan which shows the ideas students select as most meaningful, how these ideas are connected, and the supporting details for each (Ruddell, 2001). Visual learning tools such as organizers can reduce the cognitive load (Adcock, 2000),

which helps students concentrate on comparing, diagnosing, and operating what they want to write to the rhetorical problem they are trying to answer (Flower & Hayes, 1981). Finally, organizers can help writers keep to the topic by having their ideas in front of them as they are writing as well as help them to keep information in the correct sequential order (Meyer, 1995). For this study, the benefits of using organizers were related to the enhancement of argumentative writing skill by helping participants plan the standpoints to be justified before writing the texts and serving as information resources while writing the composition.

Existing work also suggests two main elements that are required for success when implementing organizers: modelling and training. The former refers to the need to exemplify how to apply organizers before students actually use them. In fact, teachers should model for learners how a paragraph is developed by using one strand of the organizer and having learners make up sentences to correlate with the phrase in the map (Washington, 1988). Additionally, before expecting learners to use organizers, teachers must first help them understand the main idea and supporting details of a topic (Sakta, 1992). This facilitates the proper usage of organizers by helping students recognize their usefulness by applying them meaningfully. Thus, training familiarizes students with the form and function of the organizers (Lee, 2007). In this study, the modelling and training processes were conducted in the learners' training stage of the implementation, in which the teacher explained what an organizer was, its benefits, and modelled how to fill in it with the solution and the arguments.

For a more detailed review of organizers, revise the study conducted by Ellis (2005) and the summary of major organizer research findings carried out by Ellis and Howard (2007).

2.2.4 Webbing graphic organizers

Webbing graphic organizers consist of a large circle in the center of a page, with smaller circles branching off, connecting to the central circle by lines or arrows. The larger middle web is designed to hold the main idea or the topic. The branches of the web are intended to hold the details about the main idea and topic (Brovero, 2004). This type of organizer was chosen for the implementation because it supported the two main elements of a basic argumentative text: the claim (the solution for each problem) in the large circle in the center, and the supporting evidence (the arguments to support each solution proposed) branching from the central circle.

2.2.5 Problem solving

One instructional approach that engages students in argumentation is problem-based learning (Gallagher, 1992; Hmelo-Silver, 2004). In this approach, students are presented with ill-structured problems, which are characterized as having alternative solutions to problems, vaguely defined or unclear goals and constraints, multiple solution paths, and multiple criteria for evaluating solutions (Jonassen, 2000).

After defining the problem, students need to determine and gather the information necessary to develop and defend a possible solution (Barrows 1985; Hmelo-Silver 2004). Although problems may differ in structuredness, complexity, and context (Jonassen & Hungb, 2008), success in problem-based learning requires argumentation ability, as solutions must have evidential support. In other words, learners must be able to construct arguments that justify their own solutions (Jonassen, 1997; Voss & Post 1988). In this study, problem-based tasks were formulated on common problems at school that were characterized by lacking agreed upon solutions; accordingly, participants were expected to provide arguments to justify the solutions they proposed to those problems.

2.3 State of the art

Although numerous studies have looked at approaches to teaching argumentative writing and the use of organizers as tools to aid the writing process, little specific work has been done on the efficacy of organizers as aids to fostering argumentative writing in an L2 context amongst young learners—as the present study does.

With regard to the use of organizers to improve L1 learners' argumentative writing skills, one study examined the effects of using organizers on L1 learners' integration of arguments and counterarguments when writing opinion essays (Nussman & Schraw, 2007). One limitation of the study was the combination of two tools (organizers and criteria instruction) which augmented the cognitive load of participants; another limitation was the complexity of the organizer's layout. Other study revealed that online mapping tools (such as organizers) could serve to organize visually argumentative discussions (Dowell, Tschool, Gladish, & Asgari-Targhi, 2009). One limitation of the study was that participants were expected to maintain a dialogue with a chat tool and managing a collaborative argument diagram tool concurrently. To fill in the gaps of the two studies presented above, the current study purposefully selected one specific and easily handled organizer that helped foster argumentative writing skill. This study understood this skill as involving the abilities to present a standpoint and provide support evidence for that position. These abilities set the bases for enhancing higher argumentative skills and, consequently, writing more sophisticated argumentative written texts as essays for L2 writers.

Other studies have focused on the use of organizers to improve certain aspects of general writing, though these are also often relevant to argumentative writing: organization (Capretz, Ricker, & Sasak, 2003; Del Rose, 2011; Meyer, 1995; Miller, 2011; Myrick & Siders, 2007), guidance of learners through the four writing stages (Meyer, 1995), increasing word choice and

usage (Lancaster, 2013; Myrick & Siders, 2007), producing more complex written sentences (Del Rose, 2011), making writing structure more accessible (Hawkins, 2011), and rewriting short texts and summaries (Roa, 2012; Reyes, 2011).

A number of other tools and strategies have also been shown to help improve argumentative writing skill, depending on the context, learners' age, type of argumentative text, and whether they have English as a first language. These include the use of connection logs (Belland, 2010), educational intervention programs (De Bernardi & Antonili, 2007), Assessment Tools for Teaching and Learning (Harland, 2003), chat room discussions (Morgan & Beaumont, 2003), and direct argumentative instruction (Lui, 1995). Newell, Beach, Smith, and VanDerHeide (2011) provide a useful summary of studies on argumentative writing skills. Yet while the previous research has illustrated how different strategies can help foster argumentative writing skills based on the context and students' needs amongst L1 learners, there has been a lack of work on how these strategies might help foster L2 learners' argumentative writing skills, particularly at the middle-school level. Thus, this study chose the webbing graphic organizer as the tool to help this type of learners write basic argumentative texts.

2.4 Conclusion

The theories presented above and the previous research related to these main constructs have shown that argumentative writing is a lifelong skill that can be improved by different tools. Also, theory has illustrated that organizers are effective in engaging, developing, and scaffolding argumentative writing skills due to the relationship between their visual structure and the structure of argumentative writing. Furthermore, previous studies have demonstrated the value of using organizers to improve argumentative skill of L2 writers, and the need to design a study

which permits to see the effectiveness of this tool in the classroom when writing argumentative texts as is explained in detail in the next chapter.

Chapter 3: Research Design

3.1 Introduction

The existing research on this topic illustrated the importance of providing students with learning tools that help improve their argumentative writing skill. Consequently, this study used the webbing graphic organizers as aids to assist participants tackle their difficulties when writing basic argumentative written texts. To analyze the impact and effectiveness of the tool in this context, the study designed and used a pre and a final survey, a questionnaire, a teacher's journal, focus group, and participants' artifacts. Subsequently, these instruments were piloted and planned to be applied and collected in three stages: before, during, and after the pedagogical implementation.

3.2 Type of study

This study was a small-scale qualitative action research study characterized by being contextualized. In such studies, teaching and learning issues that teachers feel could be improved, or that would benefit the learners are investigated within a specific social situation, such as the school or the classroom, to develop new ideas and alternatives. This study used the action research method because it attempts to make sense of, or to interpret, phenomena in terms of the meaning participants bring to them (Burns, 2010; Denzin & Lincoln, 2003; Patton, 2001). In this case; the current study was conducted with a particular group and in a specific context in which students revealed difficulties with their argumentative writing skill and the researcher determined that organizers would be an effective means of helping them improve in this area.

3.3 Context

This study was carried out at Bosques de Sherwood School in Chía, Cundinamarca, Colombia. This is a private school that has a single branch for kindergarden, primary, and high

school students. The school's main purpose is to offer a holistic education to the population in this community and its surroundings. Its philosophy is to develop critical thinkers and autonomous leaders in problem solving by having happy students and families.

The school offers seven hours a week of English language instruction. Students from sixth to eleventh grades are divided into English levels based on the results from a placement test applied at the beginning of each year. The Proyecto Integral de Área (PIA) for English language teaching and learning requirements draws on the Common European Framework References (CEFR, 2011) and the Ministry of Education standards (MEN, 2006) as its basis. The English syllabus is based on the topics presented in the textbooks used for each level, and there is no single teaching methodology demanded by the school. Rather, teachers have the freedom to decide on the most suitable methodology, taking into the consideration the themes stated in the textbooks.

3.3.1 Participants

A group of twenty students from sixth grade: twelve girls and eight boys, aged 10-11 participated in the study. They belong to upper-middle socioeconomic levels, and come not only from Chía, but also from surrounding towns such as Cajicá, Tocancipá, Zipaquirá, and Bogotá.

The placement test results placed these students in the school's most advanced level group, which corresponds to A1-A2 in the Common European Framework (CEFR, 2011).

With regards to their writing abilities, the participants were able to write isolated utterances related to personal details and familiar topics, such as their names, ages, nationality, family members, and daily routines. However, the needs analysis showed that they had difficulties writing texts in which they presented and supported a standpoint.

With regards to their affective needs, this group faces a transition from middle to high school in which they may experience a lack of confidence about expressing their points of view. The needs analysis illustrated two aspects related to this fact: students felt embarrassed when expressing their opinions, feeling they needed the approval of others when saying what they thought, and they often just said what they thought without giving arguments for their choices. Finally, participants evidenced a lack of experience when looking for possible solutions and supporting their choices.

In terms of the participants' cognitive needs, this group seemed to need to move from simple descriptive skills to more demanding cognitive skills as self-assessing, supporting ideas with reasons, and considering different alternatives to analyze and select the most suitable option. In other words, these participants needed to be prompted to develop higher thinking skills (Anderson, Krathwohl, Airasian, Cruikshank, Mayer, Pintrich, & Wittrock, M, 2000; Bloom, Engelhart, Furst, Hill, & Krathwohl, 1956) as decision making, problem solving, and argumentation.

3.3.2 Researcher's role

The role of the researcher was primarily of participant-as-observer, as one of the features of action research. This role implied the researcher be part of the participants' educational lives (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007; Patton, 2001) as the real world is subject to change and, therefore the researcher should be present during the changes to record them. In this study, the researcher was immersed in observation of the participants' reactions toward the tool implemented so as to be able to make necessary adjustments to the data collection instruments and procedures.

3.3.3 Ethical considerations

Research ethics relate to conducting investigations in moral and responsible ways (Burns, 2010). To achieve this, three main issues were considered: students' willing participation, students' anonymity, and the researcher bias. For the students' willing participation issue, two types of permission were taken into consideration: firstly, permission from the school board through a consent letter to inform the school principal about the research project and to obtain approval and secondly, consent to inform and gain the students' participation through a consent form to notify the participants about the research project and gain their (and their parents') consent to participate. The participants' anonymity was handled by using letters for each student when analyzing the data or using samples (example: Participant A, B, etc). The researcher bias issue was tackled by piloting and implementing different research instruments, and by using specific data analysis techniques and methods in accordance to the research method (see Chapter 5:).

3.4 Data collection instruments

The data collection instruments were designed to gather information on the participants' perceptions toward the use of organizers to foster their argumentative writing skill, the researcher's perceptions upon the effectiveness of the organizer tool, and the participants' work to observe the real influence of the tool implemented.

3.4.1 Description

3.4.1.1 Surveys

Surveys are used to obtain information related to specific issues and may invite either factual or attitudinal responses (Burns, 2003). For this study, surveys were used to collect, compare, and contrast information related to the needs and improvements that participants

presented regarding their abilities to present and support their standpoints. Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2007) note that “surveys gather data at a particular point in time with the intention of describing the nature of existing conditions, or identifying standards against which existing conditions can be compared, or determining the relationships that exist between specific events” (p. 205). In this study, surveys were applied at two different points—before and after the implementation—allowing the comparison of the participants’ initial and final perceptions about their argumentative writing skill.

3.4.1.2 Questionnaires

Questionnaires are used to collect survey information, provide structured data, are administered without the presence of the researcher, and are comparatively straightforward to analyze (Wilson & McLean, 1994). Questionnaires provide three types of information (Dornyei, 2003): factual or demographic (who the participants are and their background and/or experience), behavioral (what they do), and attitudinal (their attitudes, opinions, beliefs, interests, and values). The layout of these instruments is important; they must have clear sequencing so that respondents know what to do (Burns, 2010). This study used a questionnaire to gather attitudinal information that detailed participants’ opinions about the effects of using organizers to assist their argumentative writing skill.

3.4.1.3 Focus group

Focus groups are an exploratory research tool, a structured group process used to explore people’s thoughts and feelings so as to obtain detailed information about a particular topic or issue. They are employed as means of disentangling the complex web of relations and processes, meaning and representation that comprise the social world (Cameron, 2005).

Interaction between members of the group is a key characteristic of this instrument; in fact, the group setting is generally characterized by dynamism and energy as people respond to the contributions of others. This type of interaction has been described as the ‘synergistic’ effect of focus groups and some propose that it results in far more information being generated than in other research methods (Berg 1989; Stewart & Shamdasani 1990).

In this study, participants were divided in four focus groups of five students each with the purpose of collecting information about participants’ thoughts and feelings toward the whole project. There were eight questions focused on the influence of organizers on the participants’ argumentative writing skill.

3.4.1.4 *Teacher’s journal*

Teacher’s journals provide continuing accounts of perceptions and thought processes, as well as critical events or issues that could be observed in the classroom (Burns, 2003). There are four approaches about how to observe: observe and record everything, which gives the observer a broad look at the environment, observe and look for nothing in particular, which may lead the observer to notice unusual happenings, look for paradoxes so that observers might notice if a student who is generally very quiet in the classroom suddenly becomes talkative, and identify the key problem facing a group (McKay & Marshall, 2001). In this study, observation and note-taking were directed towards the participants’ performance when using the organizers and writing the texts. This process of taking notes on actions, behaviors, and attitudes of the participants allowed the researcher to reflect upon the influence of organizers in action.

3.4.1.5 *Artifacts*

Craig (2009) defines artifacts as “items that are readily available in the research setting, relate to the setting of the action research, and inform the inquiry and provide insight into the

situational milieu” (p. 154). In this study, the organizers and the compositions informed the researcher about the effectiveness of the tool and also about the participants’ argumentative written performance. Furthermore, these instruments were useful in identifying direct tendencies and patterns related to the research question and objective because they provided concrete evidence that helped reveal the influence of the organizers on short argumentative written texts.

3.4.2 Validation and piloting

The data was collected in three specific stages: the pre-planning stage, the while stage, and the post stage. During the first stage, two consent letters were designed and sent to (respectively) the principal of the school and to the students’ parents (see Consent letters). These two letters requested authorization from the individuals to be involved in the study and, following ethical considerations, informed the participants about the type of study, the objectives, intended results, benefits for the community, and sought evidence of their willing approval to participate.

Thereafter, an initial survey (see Initial SurveyB) was applied during the needs analysis stage to identify the participants’ argumentative writing skill difficulties objectively. This survey validated the preliminary researcher’s observations of the participants’ problems expressing their opinions and providing arguments to support them. The survey results allowed the researcher to start selecting and designing (or redefining) the different data collection instruments to be applied during the while and post stages.

During the second stage, the teacher’s journal (see Teacher’s journal) and artifacts (see Artifacts’ samples) were the main data collection instruments. The teacher’s journal was used only when participants designed the organizers and when they made reference to them while writing their texts. These artifacts were used to collect evidence about development in the

participants' argumentative writing skill. As the process of modeling, training, and implementing the use of organizers and the enunciative markers and linkers progressed, the data collection instruments were also piloted to identify aspects needing improvement or correction, such as the pertinence of questions, clearness of questions and instructions, avoidance of ambiguity, and time quantity.

During the last stage, the questionnaire (see Questionnaire), the final survey (see Final Survey), and the focus groups (see Focus group questions) were implemented to observe the final opinions of the participants about the impact of using the organizers to assist them with writing argumentative compositions.

3.5 Conclusion

Previous research provided the basis for a sound research design of the study. This design was characterized by placing the project into a type of study that was contextualized, small-scaled, and specific based on the participants' backgrounds and needs, and the purpose of the project. This type of study was systematic which allowed a step-by-step design taking into consideration the permission of the school and participants to take part willingly in the study, the role of the researcher, the planning and piloting of the data collection instruments, and the stages to implement and collect the data. Hence, the previous studies on this topic and this research design set the grounds for a sound implementation design as is described in the next chapter.

Chapter 4: Chapter Four: Pedagogical Intervention and Implementation

4.1 Introduction

Implementing the use of organizers successfully in the classroom requires two main elements from the planning and intervention: modelling (Washington, 1988) and training (Lee, 2007). Hence, the intervention and implementation of this study considered the planning, training, modelling, and assessing of the problem-based tasks as well as the organizers and the final written texts in two phases: the learners' training and the implementation phases. In addition, during these phases, the data collection process took place concurrently.

4.2 Visions of language, learning, and curriculum

4.2.1 Vision of language

This study conceives language within a constructivist approach that serves to mediate higher order thinking (Vygotsky, 1978; Wertsch, 1979). Language serves as a psychological tool that causes a fundamental change in mental functions (Vygotsky, 1978). In this respect, the current study used the target language to foster argumentative thinking skills such as argumentation. This process was influenced by the participants' L2 mental functions to process and structure information to analyze and evaluate different possible solutions and arguments in order to select and support a viable solution for the problem at hand, to arrange visually the information in the organizer, and to apply and transfer information from the organizers into linear texts.

Furthermore, language is understood as a tool for talking about nonlinguistic reality, as opposed to using language to talk about language, which is decontextualized and a metalinguistic reflection (Wertsch, 1985). In addition, language is viewed as a communicative instrument to achieve an outcome. This characteristic of language implies selecting engaging topics for

learners that catch their attention and present a degree of intellectual challenge that promotes their language development (Willis & Willis, 2008). Accordingly, this study used the target language to talk about the participants' realities with regards to the main problems they faced at the school and for which they could propose justifiable solutions. These written solutions challenged participants about the selection and organization of information using the target language.

4.2.2 Vision of learning

Learning is the active process of constructing rather than passively acquiring knowledge (Brooks & Brooks, 1993). Students must be allowed to become actively involved in their learning acquisition (Flynn, Mesibov, Vermette, & Smith, 2004; Foote, Vermette, & Battaglia, 2001; Forman, Minick, & Stone, 1993; Reid & Stone, 1991). In this study, participants received modelling and were trained about the use of organizers and linguistic devices such as markers and linkers to help them construct basic argumentative compositions on their individual problem solutions.

Furthermore, this study recognizes that language learning may take place through the introduction of new concepts that use complex real-world problems to motivate, focus, and initiate students' learning (Dutch, 1996). Learning tasks should, as far as possible, be embedded in the target context and require the kind of thinking that would be done in real life (Brown, Collins & Duguid, 1989; Lave & Wenger, 1991). Thus, this study relied on a problem-based learning approach for the selection and implementation of the topics. These topics integrated with themes identified in the school syllabus were planned to encourage participants to use the target language to talk about their context's real problems and, consequently; learn more of that language while they were using it.

4.2.3 Vision of curriculum

An innovative curriculum should promote active learning in which learners have opportunities to inquire, explore, collaborate, experiment, and discover (Tobias, 1990). This study considers that an innovative curriculum should provide those opportunities in terms of developing students' argumentative skill.

The curriculum at Bosques de Sherwood School was designed considering the standards for English language teaching established by the Common European Framework References (CEFR, 2011) and the standards provided by the Ministry of Education (MEN, 2006). However, the syllabus is book-based, which implies that contents, objectives, and outcomes are based on the topics proposed by the books. In the curriculum, the goals for teaching the target language at the school over a period of four years was established having as main purposes the development of communicative competences concerning current global demands in terms of science, technology, communication, culture, and job opportunities. The school aims at developing skills to integrate knowledge, to understand, and to take a position of the global circumstances and their impact on the local Colombian context. At the end of the process each year, students are expected to move to a higher language proficiency level.

4.3 Instructional design

4.3.1 Lesson planning

The process of lesson planning and implementation was developed around three steps proposed by the problem-based learning approach (Mathews-Aydinli, 2007): being introduced to the problem, exploring what learners do and do not know about the problem, and generating possible solutions to the problem. For the first step, videos, short texts, and pictures were used to introduce each problem. After this, participants were asked to work on the vocabulary related to

each problem and write its definition (see **¡Error! No se encuentra el origen de la referencia..**). For the second step, participants had to complete a KWL chart (Billmeyer & Barton, 1998) to make them aware of what they did and did not know about each problem (see KWL Chart). The last step required participants to use the organizer to help them think of a viable solution for each problem and the arguments needed to support that solution choice.

4.3.2 Implementation

The pedagogical intervention was carried out during the second semester of 2013—between September 12 and November 13—according to the study’s action plan and time line chart (see Action plan and timeline chart for implementation). This implementation was divided in two different phases: a learner training phase and an implementation phase.

In the first phase, the teacher-researcher asked the participants to write a list of the most common problems they identified at the school (see Common problems at school identified by participants). After this, the whole class formed a consensus about the most relevant problems and selected four on which to work during the implementation. The chosen problems were bullying, littering, food waste, and bad language.

During the learner training phase, the teacher-researcher offered participants a variety of organizers’ layouts (Gibbons, 2013) that they could select, adapt, or create (see Graphic organizer model) to elaborate their own organizers, modeling the process of creating an organizer and including the right types of information in it. He also modeled how to write a paragraph about the solution and the arguments needed to support that solution. For the English-language expressions required to present a viewpoint and appropriate linkers, participants received a chart with that information to be used when necessary (see Viewpoint expressions and linkers chart).

In the second stage, participants started to work on the solution for each problem more independently after they became acquainted with the different steps in working on a problem-based task. Once learners were familiarized with the problem (its causes, consequences, definition, vocabulary), they received a checklist (see Graphic organizer checklist) that identified the aspects that should have been included in the organizer. Each aspect was provided in English and Spanish to facilitate understanding; each was also read aloud and questions were answered for the whole class. Once they understood what was expected from their organizers, they moved to designing their own organizers, writing their solutions and the number of arguments they considered necessary. After this, they received another checklist (see Writing solution checklist) identifying elements that should have been included in the written text. As with the organizer checklist, each element was provided in English and Spanish to facilitate understanding, and was also read aloud to the whole class to address any doubts. Finally, participants were asked to write their solutions in a linear text using the information from their organizers, as well as the viewpoint expressions and linkers. After they completed this process, they had to place the activities in their English folders (see Students' English folders) which were a folded sheet of cardboard for holding and compiling all the organizers, compositions, and checklists, as in a file.

4.4 Conclusion

The intervention and implementation allowed participants to use independently a writing tool that helped them think of a possible solution for each problem and, in that way, engage the participants in the process of expressing their opinions. Furthermore, due to its structure, this tool offered participants visual representations of their arguments. This structure engaged participants in the process of considering and providing arguments to support their standpoints. The topics also prompted participants to reach broader perspectives when thinking about the most suitable

solution for each problem. These solutions were based on the individual experiences, beliefs, and feelings of each participant and promoted argumentation through the unfixed-answer characteristic of the problem-based learning approach in which learners need to support their point of view. During the implementation, data was collected using the instruments and procedures described in **¡Error! No se encuentra el origen de la referencia.** The results of the intervention illustrates the impact and effectiveness of organizers as tools to foster L2 high school learners' argumentative writing skill, as is discussed in detail in the next chapter.

Chapter 5: Results and Data Analysis

5.1 Introduction

After the process of collecting data throughout the intervention stage, it was organized using charts, the process of reducing data was begun by applying a color-coding strategy to find relationships between different kinds of data, which was then grouped by coding data to establish the categories which led to an answer to the study's research question. The results demonstrated the positive influence of webbing graphic organizers as learning tools that assist the pre—and while—writing stages of basic argumentative texts.

5.2 Data management procedures

The data collected through the initial and final surveys, the questionnaire, the focus groups (see Focus group chart), and the teacher's journal was assembled in MS Word charts designed for each instrument to facilitate the process of management when analyzing the data. The artifacts were collected in a physical folder and the analysis of each participant's artifacts was assembled in a chart as well (see Artifacts' chart). The participants' responses and artifacts were classified using letters (for example, "participant A") to maintain the participants' anonymity and confidentiality.

5.2.1 Validation

The data was validated through the data-driven approach (thematic analysis), characterized by its flexibility and openness to the discovery of themes or ideas that have not been previously stated, resulting in theory that is "grounded" in the data (Sitko, 2013). Thus, validity was provided by a triangulation strategy consisting of collecting information from a diverse range of participants (20 students) and using a variety of methods (Sitko, 2013); in this case, a diversity of instruments. Triangulation refers to gathering "information from multiple

perspectives on the same situation studied” (Burns, 2003, p. 163). Through this approach, this study compared and contrasted different perceptions regarding the influence of organizers on argumentative writing skill.

5.2.2 Data analysis methodology

The data analysis method that best fitted this study was grounded theory, which is defined as a “qualitative research method that uses a systematic set of procedures to develop an inductively derived grounded theory about a phenomenon” (Corbin & Strauss, 2008, p. 24). Additionally, Creswell (2013) describes grounded theory as a “systematic, qualitative procedure used to generate a theory that explains, at a broad conceptual level, a process, an action, or an interaction about a substantive topic” (p. 423). In this study, a step-by-step procedure was followed to collect and analyze data and to generate theory from the participants’ perspective that explains the influence of organizers on argumentative writing.

Moreover, Babbie (2010) considers it is necessary to examine, analyze, and establish connections and relationships between concepts in terms of their properties and dimensions because “concepts form the basis for generating common understanding” (Corbin & Strauss, 2008, p. 20). Concepts are defined as “words that stand for groups or classes of objects, events, and actions that share some major common property(ies)” (Corbin & Strauss, 2008, p. 45). Examples of concepts from this study are organization, understanding, clarification, and specification. What they all share in common could be understood as the notion of “focusing skills”. Once concepts and categories are identified, the process of establishing relationships between the concepts (propositions) is generated.

5.3 Categories

5.3.1 Introduction

Three systematic steps—open, axial, and selective coding (Corbin & Strauss, 2008)—were used to identify and select categories, subcategories, and the core category.

5.3.1.1 *Category mapping*

The open coding stage focused on identifying, labeling, and classifying information into initial categories from all instruments. It was designed to “break open the data to consider all possible meanings” (Corbin & Strauss, 2008, p. 59). To manage data at this stage, information from each instrument was organized in charts and a color-coding technique (see Color coding technique) was used to identify the initial categories. The initial codes identified throughout data from all the instruments were as follows:

<p>How might the use of graphic organizers on problem-based tasks influence argumentative writing skill?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Organizing ideas ➤ Understanding a topic ➤ Clarifying ideas ➤ Justifying a point of view ➤ Concretizing information ➤ Completing ideas ➤ Keeping focus ➤ Selecting a main idea ➤ Selecting words ➤ Learning new words ➤ Resorting on planning ideas ➤ Supporting writing ➤ Guiding writing ➤ Reducing help ➤ Joining ideas ➤ Feeling assurance when writing ➤ Expressing a point of view
--	--

Table 1. Initial codes after the open coding procedure.

In the axial coding stage, the open codes were grouped so that their categories (and properties) were related to each other. In other words, broad patterns and key elements were examined, classified, and compared by making connections between categories.




Figure 1. Preliminary categories and subcategories after the axial coding procedure.

5.3.1.2 Identification of core category

In the selective coding stage, the categories were systematically related, and relationships were validated with the purpose of generating a storyline to complete the grounding of the theory

of the study. In other words, the final core category, the categories, and subcategories needed to provide answers to the research question of the study were identified.




Figure 2. Final subcategories and categories after the selective coding procedure.

5.3.2 Analysis of categories

5.3.2.1 Description of categories

After the open and axial coding, two mid-level categories emerged: **graphic organizers enhance information processing skills** such as focusing, analyzing, and organizing skills needed to receive and access information to plan and structure an argumentative written text, and **graphic organizers foster argumentative written structure**. As organizers aided to select, examine, integrate, and arrange information, concurrently; they provided a visual-micro and macro written structure of an argumentative text by prompting the claim and support of a

position, the selection and retrieval of words, and the integration and connection of information into a whole.

This relation between how organizers facilitated the processes of receiving and accessing information and how they promoted the planning and structuring of that information, led to the development of strategic argumentative writing by turning them into pre and while writing tools which assisted the information planning and linearization of basic argumentative written compositions.

5.3.2.1.1 Graphic organizers enhance information processing skills

Findings reveal that participants' improved the information processing skills that helped them receive and access information (Marzano, 1988). Organizers enhanced three types of information processing skills that are used when planning and writing an argumentative standpoint: focusing, analyzing, and organizing skills.

Focusing skills

The results indicate that using organizers enhanced the participants' abilities to select the most important information they needed to include in the organizer by focusing on one possible solution and a maximum of four possible arguments to support that choice, as shown in Excerpt 1.

“A mí me parece que nos ayudó porque te ayudaban para que tú te centraras en lo que tenías que escribir en el gráfico.” (Participant E)
“For me, they (organizers) helped to be focus on what you had to write on the organizer.” (Participant E)

Excerpt 1. Focus group. November 12th, 2013.

This example indicates that organizers reduced the cognitive demands on learners by helping them concentrate on writing precise and concrete information. This finding is related to Ellis' assertion (2001) that organizers help learners separate important information from what

might be interesting but not essential information. Additionally, Meyer (1995) claims that organizers can help writers keep to the topic by having their ideas in front of them as they are writing.

Also, the present findings show that participants were able to discard irrelevant information when using the organizers while writing texts by concentrating on what information was useful to add or leave out, as seen in

Figure 3. Focusing skills illustrated in a GO and a written composition by participant G.




Figure 3. Focusing skills illustrated in a GO and a written composition by participant G.

This example suggests that the visual and spatial arrangements provided by organizers helped participants prioritize information and decide where each item should be placed. This finding supports Delrose's (2011) claim that "graphic charts are designed to extract salient information and eliminate extraneous information" (p. 5). The sample also shows that organizers allow participants to discard information even from the same organizer at the moment of writing the text, depending on the structure and organization intended by the writer. Furthermore, focusing skills prompt participants to direct their attention to finding and choosing the most appropriate words to express their ideas, as demonstrated in Excerpt 2. Final survey. November 13th, 2013

“Si me pareció fácil escribir las razones porque ya teníamos más vocabulario para las soluciones y ya teníamos el vocabulario correcto” (Participant E).

“It was easy to write the arguments because we already had more vocabulary for the solutions and we already had the right vocabulary.” (Participant E).

Excerpt 2. Final survey. November 13th, 2013

This example shows that the organizers serve as tools that help participants select key and cue words (and information) containing the main idea they want to express. Thus, participants need to be selective in terms of the words and phrases to include. These key and cue words and phrases, work as semantic cues that activate participants’ lexical backgrounds to help them recall the meanings of words more easily. This finding is similar to Miller’s (2011) claims that the format of key words found in organizers allows learners to focus more on the meanings and, in that way, facilitates vocabulary knowledge acquisition.

Analyzing skills

It was found that organizers facilitated learners’ abilities to define, clarify, and concretize their ideas when planning in relation to selecting possible solutions for the various problems, possible arguments to support their solutions, and possible ways of organizing those arguments. Thus, organizers helped participants analyze their existing information and how to use it when writing their argumentative texts, as demonstrated in Excerpt 3. Final survey. November 13th, 2013.

“Me pareció que si fue fácil escribir la solución porque tenía el concepto claro en el organizador” (Participant C)

“It was was easy to write the solution because I had the concept clear on the organizer.” (Participant C)

Excerpt 3. Final survey. November 13th, 2013.

This finding demonstrates that organizers work as effective pre-writing tools that help participants analyze and narrow their ideas. This result is related to Marzano’s claim (1988) that analyzing skills are used to clarify existing information by examining parts and relationships.

However, the results also indicate that this process of clarifying information by analyzing its parts was nevertheless not used by the majority of the participants. The arguments proposed to support their solutions were often mere extensions or descriptions of the same solutions or, in other cases, entirely different proposals of solutions to the problems, as seen in Figure 4.

Solution and arguments on a GO provided by participant G. This may have occurred because the participants did not have enough clarity, understanding, and experience with distinguishing *solutions* from *arguments* in support of those solutions.




Figure 4. Solution and arguments on a GO provided by participant G.

Organizing skills

The results showed that organizers aided participants in the creation of structures to arrange their solutions and arguments in sequenced and consistent ways. This corresponds to Marzano's (1988) finding that "through organizing skills, we impose structure on information and experience by matching similarities, noting differences, or indicating sequences" (p. 93). Participants became familiar with the easily parsed structure provided by the organizer, in which they placed the solution in the middle and the arguments on either side. This simple and

consistent structure helped participants generate a chronological order for their arguments through numbering each one based on their relevance or relationship, and, in this way, create a coherent organizational sequence for the information, as demonstrated in Figure 5. Sequence of organization in a GO provided by participant O.




Figure 5. Sequence of organization in a GO provided by participant O.

This example is related to Grabe and Jiang's claim (2007) that the organizational patterns of organizers provide scaffolding devices that are beneficial to writers, especially beginners. This finding also showed that organizers help participants organize information in a visual-logical way and in an easy-to-read-format. Likewise, the results showed that the organizational structure followed in the organizer influenced the way participants organized the information when writing their texts, as seen in **¡Error! No se encuentra el origen de la referencia.**

“Yo creo que los organizadores si me ayudaron a mejorar mi habilidad argumentativa porque al tener mis ideas organizadas es más fácil de argumentar” (Participant I).
“I think that the organizers did help me improve my argumentative skill because if the ideas are organized, it is easier to argue.” (Participant I).

Excerpt 4. Focus group. November 12th, 2013.

Participants presented their solutions using expressions for giving opinions and then introduced their arguments by using a linker, as illustrated in Figure 6. Written text structure provided by participant O.




Figure 6. Written text structure provided by participant O.

This pattern of organization followed the minimal argumentation structure proposed by Toulmin (1958), in which two sequenced steps are used to present an argument: a claim is made, and supportive evidence is given. This example demonstrated that organizers offer a visual argumentative structure which strongly influences the way information is organized when writing linear texts. In other words, the way information is distributed in the organizers affects the organizational processing of information as displayed in the accompanying written texts.

5.3.2.1.2 *Graphic organizers foster argumentative written structure*

The results indicate that organizers influence the structure of argumentative texts by providing an organized and consistent sequence of information comprising a claim and supporting evidence (Toulmin, 1958). This structure was represented through the presentation of the solution for each problem and the arguments that justified that solution choice. Participants became aware of the processes needed to present and support their opinions by using markers, linkers, appropriate selection of words for constructing and connecting arguments, and putting all the information together in a coherent linear text.

These findings support the notion that argumentative written discourse awareness is characterized by presenting an opinion about a topic and supporting and justifying that opinion with reasonable arguments (Dent-Young, 1993). Moreover, organizers serve as effective

preliminary organizational plans that help participants identify which ideas are the most meaningful, how these ideas are connected, and what are the relevant supporting details for each (Ruddell, 2001).

Positioning and supporting a claim

It was found that organizers facilitate the participants' competences in expressing their opinions. Participants felt free to think of an individual solution for each problem, giving them the opportunity to take a specific position toward a topic for which there was no fixed answer. Organizers encouraged participants to focus their attention on providing a solution for each problem as the first step and, in that way, to contextualize and define their main ideas in writing, as observed in Excerpt 5. Final survey. November 13th, 2013.

“Con el gráfico ya podía expresar mis ideas concretas y mis opiniones mucho mejor”
(Participant O)
“With the organizer, I could express my concrete ideas and my opinions much better.”
(Participant O)

Excerpt 5. Final survey. November 13th, 2013.

This is similar to the claim that argumentative writing requires the skills needed to embrace a particular point of view (Nippold, Ward-Lonergan, & Fanning, 2005). Likewise, Harland (2003) argues that the ability to present a clear thesis or position provides writers with the context. Additionally, Dent-Young (1993) claims that, as the writer expresses their opinion(s), the reader (usually in school contexts, the teacher) learns something about the writer that was not known before: their opinion.

The findings also reveal that organizers helped participants write the most appropriate arguments needed to justify each chosen solution. This may be because the organizers helped identify a concrete and precise main idea to write about. This aspect helped participants concentrate on what information to seek and select, as well as how to make a tentative visual

organization of their arguments based on an individual logical sequence, as illustrated in Excerpt

6. Final survey. November 13th, 2013.

“Si me ayudó a escribir la solución porque el organizador ya tenía sus razones ordenadas, su idea principal” (Participant N)
“The organizers did help me write the solution because they already had the arguments organized, their main idea.” (Participant N)

Excerpt 6. Final survey. November 13th, 2013.

This example is similar to Ellis and Howard’s (2005) claim that organizers are an effective tool for structuring written discourse. This structure helps learners improve their constructions by helping them visualize their arguments (Kirschner, 2003). Furthermore, Van Eemeren (1996) argues that written argumentation requires writers to be skillful at “putting forward a constellation of propositions intended to justify the standpoint” (p. 5). In this sense, organizers encourage recognition of the need for supporting opinions and explanations of why a certain position was taken in relation to a particular topic, as shown in Excerpt 7. Focus group. November 12th, 2013

“Ahora tenemos algo mucho más concreto que podemos escribir un párrafo y tú me puedes preguntar qué porque escogí esa solución y yo te puedo decir porque así es y yo te puedo explicar” (Participant E)
“Now, we have something more concrete to write a paragraph and you can ask me why I chose that solution and I can tell you because it is like that and I can explain.” (Participant E)

Excerpt 7. Focus group. November 12th, 2013

Selecting and retrieving words

The results showed that organizers aided participants in the processes of identifying and selecting the most appropriate words in accordance with the intended purpose of their message to make their opinion and arguments understandable, as demonstrated in Excerpt 8. Focus group. November 12th, 2013.

“Pues a mí me parece que si nos ayudó a escribir nuestras razones porque nosotros al comienzo estábamos muy confundidos y eso nos ayudaba a que buscáramos las palabras correctas, a que buscáramos las uniones y cómo comenzar.” (Participant E)
“Well, It looks to me that the organizers did help us write our arguments because at the beginning, we were very confused and they helped us search the correct words and the connectors, and how to start.” (Participant E)

Excerpt 8. Focus group. November 12th, 2013.

This may have occurred because organizers, as a pre-writing tool, helped participants focus their attention on searching for key vocabulary for the most appropriate connection between words when planning the construction of their ideas. Similarly, Coirier, Andriessen, and Chanquoy (1999) discuss the crucial role of finding the appropriate words and establishing the right connections between words for understanding argumentative written texts.

Furthermore, the results indicate that organizers facilitated participants' abilities to retrieve words when reconstructing linear texts by activating their attentional processes. This helped participants recall the meanings of words by their selection of strategically specific key and cue vocabulary that facilitated the recovery process, as observed in Excerpt 9. Questionnaire. November 08th, 2013.

“Si me ayudaron (organizadores) porque tenía vocabulario y podía escoger las palabras para organizar mis ideas.” (Participant M)
“They helped me (organizers) because I had vocabulary and I could choose the words to organize my ideas.” (Participant M)

Excerpt 9. Questionnaire. November 08th, 2013.

This sample recalls Coirier, Andriessen, and Chanquoy's (1999) suggestion that “at the level of retrieval, getting one precise idea thus will often suppose to get the precise words which allows specifying this idea” (p. 16). Similarly, in the current study, organizers helped participants select and make relationships between particular words to express specific ideas that facilitated the process of retrieving words.

Supporting coherence and cohesion

From the findings, it was seen that organizers assisted participants in the pre-writing stage by helping them plan and organize their ideas in relation to a supportive solution for each problem, as illustrated in Figure 7. Organizational structure of a GO provided by participant K.




Figure 7. Organizational structure of a GO provided by participant K.

This example shows that organizers provided support to the process of writing logical sequences of ideas with clear meanings based on their sequential structural characteristics. This finding is similar to Santangelo and Olinghouse's (2009) suggestion that organizers encourage the generation of ideas and improve the organizational structure of students' writing. Additionally, this finding supports Bamberg's (1984) definition of coherence as the ability to organize the overall structure, plan, or schema of the writer's propositions and ideas into an integrated whole.

The results also showed that organizers prompted the use of lexical cohesive ties, such as enunciative markers and linkers, as shown in Excerpt 10. Focus group. November 12th, 2013.

“A mí me ayudó porque pues ya era la solución, sus razones, y ya estaba organizado y pues ya no más era utilizar los conectores que el Mister nos dió para hacer una solución concreta.” (Participant K)
“Well, the organizer helped me because the solution was there, its arguments, and it was already organized and it was just to use the connectors that the Mister gave us to write the concrete solution.” (Participant K)

Excerpt 10. Focus group. November 12th, 2013.

This sample illustrates that organizers encouraged the use of transitional expressions and other devices (cohesive cues) to show how the parts of a composition—in this case, the claim (the solution) and the supportive evidence (arguments)—were connected and related to one another to provide an understandable message. This result is in line with Van Eemeren’s (2002) claim that the use of discourse markers as linkers provides guiding information regarding the relationship between the argumentative structure and the elements. In addition, this finding supports Halliday and Hassan’s (1976) understanding of cohesion as the ability to use lexical cohesive ties to create connections between sentences and ideas.

These two elements (coherence and cohesion) are important properties of argumentative written texts (Coirier & Chanquoy, 1999). These elements allow participants to structure planned and arranged pieces of writing showing sequenced, logical, and connected ideas which help participants express and support their opinions and also translate visual information into a comprehensible linear text by using appropriate expressions to connect ideas. This result supports Connor and Lauer’s (1988) assertion that the nature of argumentative writing requires writers to be coherent and cohesive, as illustrated in Figure 8. Coherence and cohesion evidenced in a GO and a written text by participant R..




Figure 8. Coherence and cohesion evidenced in a GO and a written text by participant R.

5.3.2.1.3 Other findings

The data analysis process also revealed certain results that were not directly related to answering the research question but that nevertheless seemed important and significant. These other findings were mainly derived from the participants' perceptions.

Graphic organizers provide a sense of confidence when writing

Firstly, it was observed that participants felt more comfortable and relaxed at the moment of writing because they already had the needed information and could resort to it at any time while composing their linear texts, as evidenced in Excerpt 11. Questionnaire. November 08th, 2013

"Si estaba más tranquilo para escribir mi solución porque podía mirar los organizadores." (Participant D)

"I was calmer to write my solution because I could look at the organizers." (Participant D)

Excerpt 11. Questionnaire. November 08th, 2013

In addition, participants signaled that organizers were tools that assisted their independent access to information and reduced the need for help from others. Indeed, organizers seemed to help participants find and organize all the needed information to write an argumentative linear text, as observed in Excerpt 12. Final survey. November 13th, 2013.

“Me pareció muy Buenos porque organizarón nuestras ideas con base a eso y ya no necesitábamos tanta ayuda.” (Participant D)

“I think they are good because they organized our ideas and with that, we did not need too much help .” (Participant D)

Excerpt 12. Final survey. November 13th, 2013.

These findings are related to Caviglioli’s (2002) study, in which he found that children felt reassured by the structure organizers offer them. In the present study, the user-friendly and consistent structure of organizers helped participants make them part of a familiar routine. This result supports Baxendell’s (2003) argument that consistency is a critical component of a successful organizer: “consistency allows the students to become familiar with the layout of the organizer, so that they may process the information without the added burden of processing format” (p. 7).

Secondly, it was found that organizers helped participants understand information better by regulating the process of organizing that information. In other words, as participants were organizing their ideas, they were also improving their understanding of what they were writing, as illustrated by Excerpt 13. Focus group. November 12th, 2013

“Si me ayudaron porque entendí mejor el tema antes de escribir la solución.”

(Participant A)

“They did help me because I understood the topic better before writing the solution.”

(Participant A)

Excerpt 13. Focus group. November 12th, 2013

This example supports Meyen’s idea (1996) that organizers provide visual displays for organizing information in a manner that makes that information easier to understand. Similarly, Ellis (2001) states that one benefit of organizers is that they make content easier to understand.

Finally, it was also found that organizers raised participants’ awareness about summarization. Participants believed that organizers would be useful tools that could help them summarize information in other subjects, as shown in Excerpt 14. Questionnaire. November 08th, 2013.

“Si los puedo utilizar en otras materias porque entiendo mejor los temas y me ayuda a resumir las cosas.” (Participant O)

“I can use them in other subjects because I understand the topics better and they help me summarize things.” (Participant O)

Excerpt 14. Questionnaire. November 08th, 2013.

This sample showed that participants noticed they could transfer their knowledge of how to use the organizers into other contexts with the specific purpose of reducing the amount of information they had to write or memorize. Participants found organizers to be useful in helping them focus on the most important information they needed to recall and, thus, to retrieve as needed. This finding is related to the claim that organizers help users condense presented textual information into a more concise form (Cochrane, 2010).

5.3.2.2 Core category

After analyzing and reducing data through the coding process, the main category corresponding to the present study was identified as: *graphic organizers foster the development of strategic information planning and argumentative linearization*. Writing argumentatively requires specific skills in claiming a position on a topic (Coirier & Golder, 1993; Golder & Coirier, 1994; Stein & Miller, 1993b; Van Eemeren & Grootendorst, 1984) and providing evidence that supports that position (Adam, 1992; Antaki & Leudar, 1990; Apotheloz & Mieville, 1989; Coirier & Golder, 1993; Grize, 1982; Stein & Miller, 1990). These abilities include cognitive skills for processing information and structuring written discourse. Hence, the process of argumentative writing has an architectural model that includes two main components: conceptual or referential planning and translating. The former refers to the nature of the outcome of the planning process and to the specific characteristics of the knowledge to be retrieved (). The latter concerns with the translation of the elaborated plan into a grammatically correct and pragmatically adequate linear text (Hayes & Nash, 1996; Kellogg, 1993). Therefore, organizers

served as scaffolding devices that facilitated the processes of planning and linearization when writing argumentative texts.

5.4 Conclusion

The results of this study have shown that organizers are effective strategic tools for use before and while performing the complex process of argumentative writing by helping L2 writers structure and linearize supportive standpoints about different topics of debate in problem solving tasks. It was seen that organizers enhanced participants' specific information processing skills and fostered argumentative written structure, as well as intertwining these abilities in the ways that are necessary for the development of more advanced argumentative writing skills. Hypothesizing, these effects on participants' L2 argumentative writing skill could also benefit their L1 argumentative written discourse. Nevertheless; these results extend our understanding, as a point of departure, of how younger learners can develop such skills in and through a second language, and offer significant lessons for teachers of language—and content—in both the first and any additional languages, as is discussed in detail in the final chapter of this report.

Chapter 6: Conclusions and Pedagogical Implications

6.1 Introduction

This study examined the role organizers play in helping L2 sixth-graders plan and execute problem-based argumentative writing tasks. The structure of such tasks requires the effective performance of two main components: planning and translating (Coirier, Andriessen, & Chanquoy, 1999). This use of organizers encouraged participants to become more strategic argumentative writers when planning ideas and translating those plans into the production of a linear text. Organizers helped participants overcome their difficulties by helping them present a point of view and—perhaps more importantly—by supporting it with arguments.

6.2 Comparison of results with previous studies' results

Organizers helped participants in both the pre-writing and while-writing stages. In the pre-writing stage (planning), participants used organizers to help them generate ideas, find a focus, decide what to write about, try out ideas and language (including vocabulary) in which to express them, and organize those ideas. This finding supports previous research in which organizers were found to be effective pre-writing tools that encourage planning and preparation of ideas before writing a final piece (Emerson & Maxwell, 2011; Lancaster, 2013; Reyes, 2011).

During the pre-writing stage, organizers supported participants' information processing skills, such as focusing, analyzing, and organizing. These skills allowed participants to search strategically, find, and select the appropriate words to specify their ideas, focus on a concrete idea, analyze what information was relevant to include, and arrange the information in a sequenced way. This conclusion supports findings from a number of different studies in which organizers helped learners increase word usage (Myrick & Siders, 2007) and keep ideas in the

correct sequential order while improving organizational writing skills (Capretz, Ricker, & Sasak, 2003; Meyer, 1995; Miller, 2011).

In the while-writing stage (linearization), organizers assisted participants by providing a visual representation of their thoughts, illustrating how information was organized and connected. This visual aid facilitated the process of writing an argumentative text strategically by retrieving, selecting, and relating different pieces of information (and vocabulary) when transforming that information into a linear text (linearization), following or rearranging the sequential ordering of information constructed in the organizers. Indeed, considering that the organization of information forms the basis for a coherent text structure (Coirier, Andriessen, & Chanquoy, 1999), organizers provided a particular appropriate means for participants to produce a suitable organizational structure. Moreover, organizers assist in generating a repeating writing strategy (Victori, 1995) through which participants were able to repeat chunks of language (key words and phrases) in the course of composing, either when reviewing the text or when transcribing ideas.

Throughout the while-writing stage, organizers helped foster participants' argumentative written discourse and made its structure more accessible to them when writing (Hawkins, 2011) by prompting participants to claim a position (think of a possible solution for each problem) and to provide evidence to support that claim (provide arguments to support the chosen solution). Furthermore, this argumentative written structure was complemented by the use of specific linguistic coding to present a standpoint and connect supportive arguments using enunciative involvement markers. This conclusion confirms Sinatra and Pizzo's (1992) claim that providing participants with a list of transitional words and phrases is a good technique to help the organizational style of writing. Thus, with simple organizers, participants were better able to turn

their writing samples into logical, sequential, organized, well-developed pieces of writing which converged towards the main communicative goal: to put forward a coherent, cohesive, and well-supported standpoint.

One of the key elements that favored strategic information planning and argumentative linearization was the freedom participants had to design their own organizers based on each topic but following a simple, user-friendly, easy, and consistent structure made of a core idea in the middle and the arguments organized either side the main idea. This arrangement allowed participants to explore and transform a simple structure in personal scenarios and styles, which enhanced their autonomy, motivation, confidence, and self-efficacy when using the organizers. This conclusion supports similar findings from some other studies (Emerson & Maxwell, 2011; Reyes, 2011), though it contrasts with other studies which found that participants could feel frustrated and confused because of the variety of organizers used (Capretz, Ricker, & Sasak, 2003) and a lack of knowledge about what organizers are and how to use them (Lee & Tan, 2010), resulting in, as a consequence, presentation of ideas that did not flow in a coherent manner. The reason why the current study found positive the user customization of organizers was that participants first gained knowledge about what organizers are and how to use them, and this previous knowledge prevented frustration and confusion when confronted with a variety of organizer designs.

6.3 Significance of the results

The implications of the study at the school demonstrate that the use of organizers (and similar types of visual aids) should be taught and implemented in all subjects to help learners become independent users of organizers, depending on their learning needs (with regards to understanding, summarizing, or reviewing information). Moreover, the basic structures

argumentative discourse should be included in school syllabi when teaching both the first and any additional language from an early age. The present study illustrates how organizer tools can be implemented effectively to assist the pre- and while- stages of writing basic argumentative texts.

In terms of Colombian national language teaching policies established by the MEN (2006), this study fills a gap in which the skills needed to develop effective argumentation seem to be unobservable. In fact, students are expected to achieve certain language competences that require little more than lower thinking skills (Anderson, Krathwohl, Airasian, Cruikshank, Mayer, Pintrich, & Wittrock, M, 2000; Bloom, Engelhart, Furst, Hill, & Krathwohl, 1956) such as describing. However, this study has illustrated the need and relevance of helping students in fostering higher thinking skills (Anderson, Krathwohl, Airasian, Cruikshank, Mayer, Pintrich, & Wittrock, M, 2000; Bloom, Engelhart, Furst, Hill, & Krathwohl, 1956), as required for argumentation, itself a critical lifelong skill in personal, academic, professional, and democratic citizenship contexts.

More broadly, this study contributes to the wider international ELT community by offering a scaffolding process consisting of the modelling, training, and implementation of organizers as tools to support and assist the development of children's argumentative writing skills in L2 contexts. The ELT community should consider integrating strategies, tools, and topics that encourage the development of argumentation skills within syllabuses and at the lesson planning stage.

6.4 Pedagogical implications

Although it seems clear that, in the present study, organizers had a positive influence on participants' argumentative writing, it also seems clear that in order to achieve such results

instructors must take into account the rigorous and strict scaffolding, training, and modelling processes they demand to show learners their usefulness and how to apply them meaningfully in their language learning process. These teaching processes may help learners prevent and/or reduce the frustration and confusion despite the variety and purposes of using different organizers.

These processes also include the selection of the most suitable organizer in accordance with the teaching and learning objectives. It is important to have consistency in the use of same organizer during training to allow learners to get acquainted with its structure and essential functions. The chosen organizer should have an easy, friendly, and simple structure that can be followed and/or modified based on individual preferences and needs. Thus, it is crucial to allow learners to interact and familiarize themselves with the layout of the chosen organizer to create an atmosphere of confidence, self-efficacy, autonomy, motivation, and personalization before they embark on their own redesign of the organizer. This atmosphere might be achieved by providing learners with self-assessments tools that assist with monitoring the way they design and use the organizers such as checklists or rubrics.

After this familiarization process, learners need to be explicitly told the purpose and structure of the organizer to make them aware of the tangible and concrete purpose and benefits of using that type of tool for their learning process. Then, opportunities need to be provided if learners are actually to explore, manipulate, and establish a habit of using the organizer to gain experience of how to use it properly and (most importantly) how to take advantage of it. This exposure to organizers implies developing a process of evaluation and feedback to see the effectiveness of their usage. For example, if organizers are intended to be used to foster argumentative writing, it is necessary to provide feedback on the information students have

included in the organizers in consideration of the fact that most of this information will be subsequently translated into a linear text. Hence, the more focused and organized is the information in the organizers, the better and more effective the argumentative text will be.

In addition, this process of assessing and providing feedback has to be accompanied by drafting and editing elaboration stages. This means that learners need to have a drafting stage to brainstorm and explore ideas, organization, and information. After drafting, learners move to an editing stage in which they improve their draft, including any feedback provided. This filtering of information may provide learners with more effective and meaningful visual support as they translate the information from the organizer into a linear text.

Moreover, it is important to consider the selection of topics on which learners are to produce argumentative texts. The development of argumentation skills can be aided by selecting familiar, realistic, and debatable topics about which to argue, such as problem solving; “if the issue is engaging and perhaps personal to them (learners) or their interests, they will be more enthusiastic” (Loertscher, Koechlin, & Zwaan, 2005, p. 94). In fact, children are used to argue about questions in which they are subjectively involved and where the issue of arguing is most often an issue of material or moral gain (Chanquoy, 1996; De Bernardi, 1996; Stein & Miller, 1993a, 1993b). When such requirements are met, learners are more likely to be able to take a position toward the topic and justify or defend their position by providing sound arguments in favor of their standpoint. Furthermore, this topic selection process needs to consider thematics that do not have a single, homogeneous, or fixed answer. Conversely, the thematics have to allow learners to hold and express different views on the same issue and to have a variety of options from which to choose. This feature of topics may lead learners to be better able to present a standpoint and provide support for their point of view—a process which implies

argumentation. Nevertheless, there are topics for which the community may not allow disagreement (such as racism or revisionism). There are also topics which may be understood as unquestionable, or at least difficult to engage with (within smaller social areas, for example: within a given social or religious group, or within the family). Thus, it is important to plan and select topics in advance, considering both general and specific features of the given population and to focus on a common frame of reference: common knowledge, common general beliefs and opinions.

6.5 Limitations of the present study

When considering how to implement the use of organizers to foster argumentative writing skills, teachers may face certain limitations in the training, implementation, and uses of these tools. Regarding the training phase in the present study, time was a constraint that limited the effectiveness of the tool usage. As in any aspect of learning, learners need time to explore, familiarize themselves with, and incorporate a strategy or tool into their learning routines. In this regard, research shows that training in and familiarity with the use of organizers needs to be developed over a period of time (Alvermann & Boothby, 1986; Ellis, 2004; Glover, Bullock & Dietzer, 1990; Mannes & Kintsch, 1987; Robinson & Kiewra, 1995). Despite this limitation, time can be used wisely if an effective and consistent modelling stage takes place. To ensure learners understand what an organizer is, how it works, and what is expected from learners when using them, modelling should be provided before moving to the construction of organizers.

In addition, the present study showed the considerable vocabulary demands placed on participants when they needed to write the information on the organizers. In fact, participants may have felt they had a clear idea of what they wanted to write but that they could not express it in the target language due to a noticeable lack of vocabulary throughout the scaffolding

presentation of the topic. Therefore, learners should be provided with cognitively based (for example, using dictionaries, about which learners may need to be trained) and/or memory-based (for example, making lists of unknown words) vocabulary learning strategies, as appropriate.

Likewise, during the training phase, participants need explicit training on and explanation of what a *solution* is and what *arguments* are until they are better able to differentiate one from the other. If this happens, learners may be better able to plan a concrete solution with clear arguments to tackle the issues of writing more solutions as arguments or deeper descriptions of the solutions as arguments. For this reason, it is important to work on exercises such as matching, unscrambling, inserting, separating, connecting, completing, comparing, contrasting, correcting, classifying, evaluating, identifying, and organizing. This practice may provide learners with better understanding of and differentiation between *claims* and *arguments*. This differentiation can also be tackled during the implementation stage by using a color-coding strategy in which learners use one color to underline the *claim* and a different color to underline each *argument* in the organizer (and/or in the writing text).

Similarly, during the implementation stage, learners need to receive feedback to identify their strengths and weaknesses when designing the organizers. Even when using a self-assessment checklist to facilitate this process, learners need comments and suggestions from other perspectives (such as peers' and teachers') due to the fact that learners' perceptions may not align with their performance. This assessment process may give learners a broader scope to compare and contrast what they think they can do with what they actually do to make the necessary adjustments and improve the elaboration of the organizers (and accompanying texts). This feedback should focus on two main categories: presenting a solution and supporting that solution. In this regard, learners should have the opportunity to make drafts and improve them by

taking into account feedback intended to augment their abilities to identify relevant information in the organizers. Therefore, if feedback is given after the drafting process, learners may be more willing to accept the comments and take the opportunity to make changes and improve the content and organization of information on the organizers (and accompanying texts).

6.6 Further research

Despite the clear *linguistic* difficulties participants revealed when planning their ideas using the organizers and writing the argumentative texts, these difficulties in fact concealed the most significant *cognitive* issues related to participants' abilities to write basic argumentative texts that included a claim and the corresponding supportive arguments. Thus, it is suggested that further research should investigate the transfer of using organizers into L1 argumentative writing or how cognitive skills developed through one language might be transferred to contexts in which an additional language is used.

To have a wider scope of the study, it is suggested to conduct a cross-linguistic study in which argumentative writing skill can be fostered in both L1 and L2 concurrently to understand the impact of using organizers not only as tools to foster linguistic skills but mainly to enhance cognitive and lifelong skills. The similarities and differences between the effects on both languages would be really beneficial for students, especially in the Colombian context, where the L1 and L2 language policies and planning (also previous studies) do not favor explicitly the development of those types of skills.

Similarly, it is also suggested that computer-based tools such as Popplet, Cmap tools, Bubbl.us, and MindMeister could be used to facilitate the design of organizers, and a word-processing software could be used to facilitate the composition of argumentative written texts at home. These computer-based tools may assist learners by providing quickly and easily achieved

formats for the organizers and with time-saving automatic correction of grammar and spelling issues. Consequently, as argumentation skills start being taught explicitly, digital aids can be widely used to support their development. Furthermore, the inclusion of technological tools may have an encouraging and motivating effect for this 21st century learners (Oblinger, D, Oblinger, J & Lippincot, 2005; Prensky, 2001; White & Le Cornu, 2011).

Likewise, it is recommended to start the process of writing argumentative texts collaboratively in the classroom using computer-based tools that allow learners to make organizers collaboratively, such as Popplet, or to share documents when writing an argumentative text, such as Google Docs. These tools help learners not only with taking and justifying a position but also with defending it by refuting counterarguments, supporting the claim that: “When engaging in critical argumentative discussion, one has to be able to present well-grounded arguments for one’s opinions, put forward counterarguments and refute criticism by others” (Van Eemeren & Grootendorst, 1999, p. 366).

Finally, it is advisable to implement self- and peer-assessment practices to provide learners with immediate feedback and assist them with the identification of strengths and weaknesses related to the structure of the organizers and the structure of basic argumentative written texts. Furthermore, these assessment practices may encourage learners to design action plans for the improvement of their organizers’ contents and the written structure of their argumentative texts. In other words, self- and peer-assessment may encourage learners to set their own goals when using organizers to plan the use of information and to translate that planning from the organizers into linear texts.

6.7 Conclusion

Today's learners need to form reasoned opinions and find solutions to problems. Accordingly, argumentation skills should be fostered in school from very early ages to take advantage of young learners' particular cognitive developmental processes. In the present study, participants were required to write reasoned solutions for everyday problems encountered at school. Nevertheless, participants had difficulties with following the basic structures and using the appropriate language coding of basic argumentative texts. These needs prompted the researcher to seek a tool that would help participants plan their ideas and the language required before writing, as well as provide a visual structure appropriate to a basic argumentative text. Thus, this study examined the effects of using webbing graphic organizers to assist the development of argumentative writing skills. The results revealed that organizers assisted the pre- and while- argumentative writing stages, thereby fostering the development of strategic argumentative writers. Furthermore, this study sheds light on understanding how a learning tool can assist the development of this complex skill in a second language and offers significant and applicable lessons for teachers on the implementation of organizers beyond the context of merely "English as a foreign language" classrooms.

To sum up, this study illustrates the importance of providing students with simple learning tools to prompt them become more autonomous writers and learners. In addition, the current study shows the positive impact and influence of using organizers to develop/foster argumentative writing skill as a lifelong skill in L2 educational communities to prompt more critical and argumentative learners.

References

- Adam, J. (1992). *Les textes: types et prototypes - Récit, description, argumentation et dialogue* [*Texts: types and prototypes - Narration, description, argumentation and dialogue*]. Paris, France: Nathan.
- Adcock, A. (2000). *Effects of cognitive load on processing and performance*. Unpublished manuscript, Instructional Media Lab, University of Memphis, Memphis, TN.
- Alamargot, D., & Chanquoy, L. (2001). *Through the models of writing: With commentaries by Ronald T. Kellogg & John R. Hayes* (Vol. 9). New York, NY: Springer.
- Alvermann, D. E., & Boothby, P. R. (1986). Children's transfer of graphic organizer instruction. *Reading Psychology: An International Quarterly*, 7(2), 87-100.
- Anderson, L. W., Krathwohl, D. R., Airasian, P. W., Cruikshank, K. A., Mayer, R. E., Pintrich, P., & Wittrock, M. (2000). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Antaki, C., & Leudar, I. (1990). Claim-backing and other explanatory genres in talk. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 9(4), 279-292.
- Apotheloz, D., & Mieville, P. (1989). Cohérence et discours argumenté [Coherence and the argumentative discourse]. In M. Charolles (Ed.), *The resolution of discourse* (pp. 68-87). Hamburg, Germany: Buske Verlag.
- Apothéloz, D. (1990). The development of cohesion in writing: Preliminary research on anaphoric procedures and thematic planning in texts by children. In M. Spoelders (Ed.) *Literacy acquisition* (pp. 53-70). Lier, Belgium: J. Van In.
- Applebee, A., Langer, J., Mullis, I., Latham, A., & Gentile, C. (1994). *National Assessment of Educational Progress 1992: Writing Report Card*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.

- Babbie, E. (2010). *The practice of social research*. (12 ed). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Bamberg, B. (1984). Assessing coherence: A reanalysis of essays written for the National Assessment of Educational Progress, 1969-1979. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 18(3), 305-319.
- Barrows, H. S. (1985). *How to design a problem-based curriculum for the preclinical years*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Baxendell, B. W. (2003). Consistent, coherent, creative. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 35(3), 46-53.
- Belland, B. R. (2010). Portraits of middle school students constructing evidence-based arguments during problem-based learning: The impact of computer-based scaffolds. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 58(3), 285-309.
- Bereiter, C. (1980). Development in writing. In L. W. Gregg & E. R. Steinberg (Eds.), *Cognitive processes in writing*, (pp. 73-93). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Berg, B. (1989). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Billmeyer, R., & Barton, M. L. (1998). *Teaching reading in the content areas: If not me, then who? (2nd ed.)*. Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory.
- Bloom, B. S., Engelhart, M. D., Furst, E. J., Hill, W. H., & Krathwohl, D. R. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals, Handbook I: Cognitive Domain*. London, England: Longmans, Green and Co.
- Boscolo, P. (1995). The cognitive approach to writing and writing instruction: A contribution to a critical appraisal. *Cahiers de psychologie cognitive*, 14(4), 343-366.

- Brooks, J. G., & Brooks, M. G. (1993). *In search of understanding: The case for the constructivist classroom*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Brovero, M. D., (2004). For a clearer view. *Book Links*, 13(5), 45-46.
- Bromley, K. D. A., Irwin-DeVitis, L., & Modlo, M. (1995). *Graphic organizers: Visual strategies for active learning*. New York, NY: Scholastic Professional Books.
- Bronckart, J.P., Bain, D., Schneuwly, B., Davaud, C., & Pasquier, A. (1985). *Le fonctionnement du discours*. [The functioning of discourse]. Neuchâtel, France: Delachaux et Niestlé.
- Brown, J. S., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational Researcher*, 18(1), 32-42.
- Burns, A. (2003). *Collaborative action research for English language teachers*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Burns, A. (2010). *Doing action research in English language teaching: A guide for practitioners*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Byrnes, J. (1998). *The nature and development of decision making*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cameron, J. (2005). Focussing on the focus group. In I, Hay (Ed), *Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography* (pp. 83-101). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Capretz, K., Ricker, B., & Sasak, A. (2003). *Improving organizational skills through the use of graphic organizers* (Unpublished Master's thesis). Saint Xavier University, Chicago, IL. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED473056.pdf>
- Caviglioli, O. (2002). *Thinking skills & eye Q*. London, England: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Caviglioli, O., & Harris, I. (2003). *Thinking visually: Step-by-step exercises that promote visual, auditory and kinesthetic learning*. Markham, Canada: Pembroke Publishers.

- Chanquoy, L. (1996). *Connectives and argumentative text: A developmental study*. Paper presented at the First International Workshop on Argumentative Text Processing, Barcelona, Spain.
- Cochrane, V. (2010). Top level structure: Why use graphic organizers to scaffold developing writers. *Practically Primary*, 15(3), 34-37.
- Cohen, L. Manion, I. & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Coirier, P., & Golder, C. (1993). Writing argumentative text: A developmental study of the acquisition of supporting structures. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 8(2), 169-181.
- Coirier, P., Andriessen, J., & Chanquoy, L. (1999). From planning to translating: The specificity of argumentative writing. In P. Coirier & J. Andriessen (Eds.), *Foundations of argumentative text processing* (pp.1-28). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Amsterdam University Press.
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Connor, U., & Lauer, J. (1988). Cross-cultural variation in persuasive student writing. In A. C. Purves (Ed.), *Writing across languages and cultures: Issues in contrastive rhetoric* (pp. 138-159). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Council of Europe (2011). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, and assessment*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Craig, D. V. (2009). *Action research essentials* (Vol. 11). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Crowhurst, M. (1990). The development of persuasive/argumentative writing. In R. Beach & S. Hynds (Eds.), *Developing discourse practices in adolescence and adulthood* (pp. 200-223). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- De Bernardi, B. (1996). *Interestingness and argumentative text production*. Paper presented at the First International Workshop on Argumentative Texts. University of Barcelona, Spain.
- De Bernardi, B., & Antolini, E. (2007). Fostering students' willingness and interest in argumentative writing: an intervention study. In P. Boscolo & S. Hidi (Eds.), *Studies in Writing: Writing and motivation* (Vol. 19, pp. 183-201). Oxford, England: Elsevier.
- Delrose, L. N. (2011). *Investigating the use of graphic organizers for writing* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, Baton Rouge, LA. Retrieved from <http://etd.lsu.edu/docs/available/etd-04122011-182849/unrestricted/THESIS.pdf>
- Dent-Young, J. (1993). *Write away: For use of English*. Hong, Kong, China: Longman.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2003). *Strategies of qualitative inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dornyei, Z. (2003). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration and processing*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Dowell, J., Tscholl, M., Gladisch, T., & Asgari-Targhi, M. (2009). Argumentation scheme and shared online diagramming in case-based collaborative learning. In O'Malley, C., Suthers, D., Reimann, P., & Dimitracopoulou, A. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 9th*

- international conference on computer supported collaborative learning* (Vol.1, pp. 567-575). Chicago, IL: International Society of the Learning Sciences.
- Duch, B. (1996). Problems: A key factor in PBL. *About teaching*, 50, 78.
- Ellis, E. S., & Rock, M. L. (2001). *Makes sense strategies: Connecting teaching, learning, and assessment*. Tuscaloosa, AL: Masterminds.
- Ellis, E. (2004). *Q&A: What's the big deal with graphic organizers?* Retrieved from <http://www.graphicorganizers.com/Sara/ArticlesAbout/Q&A%20Graphic%20Organizers.pdf>
- Ellis, E. S. (2005). *Makes sense strategies* (Version 4.0) [Computer software]. Tuscaloosa, AL: Masterminds Publishing.
- Ellis, E., & Howard, P. (2007). Graphic organizers: Power tools for teaching students with learning disabilities. *Current Practice Alerts*, 13, 1-4.
- Emerson, K. & Maxwell T.W. (2011). Graphic organisers and writing performance: Improving undergraduate competence using action research in a workplace internship, *Work based Learning E-Journal*, 2(1), 5-23.
- Fayol, M., & Schneuwly, B. (1987). La mise en texte et ses problèmes [Textual formulation and its problems]. In J.L. Chiss, J.P. Laurent, J.C. Meyer, H. Romian & B. Schneuwly (Eds.), *Apprendre/enseigner à produire des textes écrits* (pp. 223-240). Brussels, Belgium: De Boeck.
- Flynn, P., Mesibov, D., Vermette, P.J. & Smith, M. (2004). *Applying standards based on constructivism: A two-step guide for motivating middle and high school students*. Larchmont, NY: Eye-on-Education.

- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32(4), 365-387.
- Foote, C. J., Vermette, P. J., & Battaglia, C. (2001). *Constructivist strategies: Meeting standards and engaging adolescent minds*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.
- Forman, E. A., Minick, N. E., & Stone, C. (1993). *Contexts for learning: Sociocultural dynamics in children's development*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Freedman, A., & Pringle, I. (1984). Why students can't write arguments. *English in Education*, 18(2), 73-84.
- Gallagher, S. A., Stepien, W. J., & Rosenthal, H. (1992). The effects of problem-based learning on problem solving. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 36(4), 195-200.
- Gibbons, D. (2013). Graphic organizers & technology [online image]. Retrieved February 13, 2013 from <http://esinedgibbons.blogspot.com/>
- Glover, J. A., Bullock, R. G., & Dietzer, M. L. (1990). Advance organizers: Delay hypotheses. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82(2), 291.
- Golder, C., & Coirier, P. (1994). Argumentative text writing: Developmental trends. *Discourse Processes*, 18(2), 187-210.
- Grabe, W. & Jiang, X. (2007). Graphic organizers in reading instruction: Research findings and issues. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 19(1), 34-55.
- Graff, G. (2004). *Clueless in academe: How schooling obscures the life of the mind*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Grize, J. B. (1982). *De la logique à l'argumentation*. Geneva, Switzerland: Librairie Droz.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & Hassan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London, England: Longman.

- Harland, D. (2003). *Using asTTle persuasive writing: A case study of teaching argument writing* (asTTle Technical Report 29). Auckland, Australia: University of Auckland/Ministry of Education.
- Halpern, D. (1998). Teaching critical thinking for transfer across domains. *American Psychologist*, 53(4), 449-455.
- Hawkins, L. (2011). *The use of graphic organizers in supporting primary aged students in genre specific writing tasks* (Unpublished Master's thesis). State University of New York College at Brockport, Brockport, NY. Retrieved from:
http://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/ehd_theses
- Hayes, J.R., & Flower, L.S. (1980). Identifying the organization of writing processes. In L.W. Gregg & E.R. Steinberg (Eds.), *Cognitive process in writing* (pp. 3-30). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hayes, J.R., & Nash, J.G. (1996). On the nature of planning in writing. In C.M. Levy & S. Ransdell (Eds.), *The Science of writing* (pp. 29-55). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Hmelo-Silver, C. E. (2004). Problem-based learning: What and how do students learn? *Educational Psychology Review*, 16(3), 235-266.
- Herrenkohl, L. R., & Guerra, M. R. (1998). Participant structures, scientific discourse, and student engagement in fourth grade. *Cognition and Instruction*, 16(4), 431-473.
- Hillocks, G. (2011). *Teaching argument writing, grades 6-12: Supporting claims with relevant evidence and clear reasoning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Hillocks, G. (2010). "EJ" in focus: Teaching argument for critical thinking and writing: An introduction. *English Journal*, 99(6), 24-32.

- Jonassen, D. H. (1997). Instructional design models for well-structured and III-structured problem-solving learning outcomes. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 45(1), 65-94.
- Jonassen, D. H. (2000). Toward a design theory of problem solving. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 48(4), 63-85.
- Jonassen, D. H. (2007). What makes scientific problems difficult? In D. H. Jonassen (Ed.), *Learning to solve complex, scientific problems* (pp. 3-23). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Jonassen, D. H., & Hung, W. (2008). All problems are not equal: Implications for problem-based learning. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-based Learning*, 2(2), 4.
- Jonassen, D. H., & Kim, B. (2010). Arguing to learn and learning to argue: Design justifications and guidelines. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 58(4), 439-457.
- Kellogg, R. T. (1993). Observations on the psychology of thinking and writing. *Composition Studies/Freshman English News*, 21(1), 3-41.
- Kim, A. H., Vaughn, S., Wanzek, J., & Wei, S. (2004). Graphic organizers and their effects on the reading comprehension of students with LD: A synthesis of research. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 37(2), 105-118.
- Kirschner, P. A., Buckingham-Shum, S. J., & Carr, C. S. (2003). *Visualizing argumentation: Software tools for collaborative and educational sense-making*. London, England: Springer.
- Klaczynski, P. A. (2004). A dual-process model of adolescent development: Implications for decision making, reasoning, and identity. In R. V. Kail (Ed.), *Advances in child development and behavior*, (Vol. 31, pp. 73-123). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

- Kuhn, D. (2005). *Education for thinking*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kuhn, D. (1991). *The skills of argument*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lancaster, K. (2013). An examination of using graphic organizers to teach writing: A case study. *Research in Action*, 2, 1-42. Retrieved from http://www.eiu.edu/researchinaction/pdf/Katie_Lancaster_Paper.pdf
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, C.C. & Tan, S. C. (2010). Graphical representations and transfer of ideas between multi-draft pre-writing stages. In C.H. Steel, M.J. Keppell, P. Gerbic & S. Housego (Eds.), *Curriculum, technology & transformation for an unknown future. Proceedings Ascilite Sydney 2010* (pp. 528-538). Brisbane, Australia: University of Queensland. Retrieved from <http://ascilite.org.au/conferences/sydney10/procs/Leechienching-full.pdf>
- Lee, C.C. (2007). Graphic organisers as scaffolding for students' revision in the pre-writing stage. In Atkinson, R.J., McBeath, C., Soong, S. K. A. & Cheers, C. (Eds.), *ICT: Providing choices for learners and learning. Proceedings ascilite Singapore 2007*. Singapore, Singapore: Australasian Society for Computers in Learning in Tertiary Education. Retrieved from <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/singapore07/procs/lee-cc.pdf>
- Loertscher, D., Koechlin, C., & Zwaan, S. (2005). *Ban Those Bird Units! 15 models for teaching and learning in information-rich and technology-rich environments*. Salt Lake City, UT: Hi Willow Research and Publishing.
- Lui, C. L. (1995). *Developing the argumentative writing skills of sixth formers in a Hong Kong Secondary school* (Unpublished Master's thesis), University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong,

Hong Kong. Retrieved from

<http://hub.hku.hk/bitstream/10722/29151/1/FullText.pdf?accept=1>

Mannes, S. M., & Kintsch, W. (1987). Knowledge organization and text organization. *Cognition and Instruction*, 4(2), 91-115.

Marzano, R.J., Brandt, R.S., Hughes, C.S., Jones, B.F., Pressiesen, B.Z., Rankin, S.C., & Suhor, C. (1988). *Dimensions of thinking: A framework for curriculum and instruction*.

Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Mathews-Aydinli, J. (2006). *Problem-based learning and adult English language learners*.

Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics. Retrieved from

<http://www.cal.org/adultesl/pdfs/problem-based-learning-and-adult-english-language-learners.pdf>

McKay, J., & Marshall, P. (2001). The dual imperatives of action research. *Information Technology & People*, 14(1), 46-59.

Meyen, E.L., Vergason, G.A., & Whelan, R.J. (1996). *Strategies for teaching exceptional children in inclusive settings*. Denver, CO: Love Publishing.

Meyer, D. J. (1995). *The effects of graphic organizers on the creative writing of third grade students* (Unpublished Master's thesis). Kean College of New Jersey, Union, NJ. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED380803.pdf>

Miller, S. A. (2011). *Using graphic organizers to increase writing performance* (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation). State University of New York at Fredonia, Fredonia, NY. Retrieved from

https://dspace.sunyconnect.suny.edu/bitstream/handle/1951/57455/Stephanie_Miller_Mate_rs_Project_December2011.pdf?sequence=1

- Ministerio de Educación Nacional. (2006). *Estándares básicos de competencias en lenguas extranjeras: Inglés. Formar en lenguas extranjeras: ¡El reto! lo que necesitamos saber y saber hacer* (Serie Guías N° 22). Bogotá, Colombia: Imprenta Nacional.
- Morgan, W., & Beaumont, G. (2003). A dialogic approach to argumentation: Using a chat room to develop early adolescent students' argumentative writing. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 47*(2), 146-57.
- Myrick, J., & Siders, J. (2007). Comparison of the effectiveness of learning styles using graphic organizers versus traditional text-based teaching on vocabulary development. *The University of Alabama McNair Journal, 7*, 115-128.
- Namey, E., Guest, G., Thairu, L., & Johnson, L. (2007). *Data reduction techniques for large qualitative data sets. Handbook for team-based qualitative research*, Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.
- Newell, G. E., Beach, R., Smith, J., & VanDerHeide, J. (2011). Teaching and learning argumentative reading and writing: A review of research. *Reading Research Quarterly, 46*(3), 273-304.
- Nippold, M. A., Ward-Lonergan, J. M., & Fanning, J. L. (2005). Persuasive writing in children, adolescents, and adults a study of syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic development. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 36* (2), 125-138.
- Nordquist, R. (2012). *Argumentation. About.com*. Retrieved from <http://grammar.about.com/od/ab/g/argumentationterm.htm>.
- Novak, J. (1991). Clarify with concept maps. *Science Teacher, 58*(7), 44-49.
- Nussbaum, E. M., & Schraw, G. (2007). Promoting argument-counterargument integration in students' writing. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 76*(1), 59-92.

- Oblinger, D., Oblinger, J.; & Lippincott, J. (2005). *Educating the Net Generation*. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/bookshelf/272>
- Patton, M. (2001). *Qualitative research and evaluation method* (3rd Ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Perelman, C., & Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1969). *The new rhetoric: A treatise on argumentation*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Prensky, M. (2001). *Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants*. Retrieved December 27, 2006, from <http://www.marcprensky.com/writing/Prensky%20%20Digital%20Natives,%20Digital20Immigrants%20-%20Part1.pdf#search=%22prensky%22digital%20native%22%22>
- Reid, D. K., & Stone, C. A. (1991). Why is cognitive instruction effective? Underlying learning mechanisms. *Remedial and Special Education, 12*(3), 8-19.
- Reyes, E. C. (2011). Connecting knowledge for text construction through the use of graphic organizers. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal, 13*(1), 7-19.
- Roa Pinzón, M.A. (2012). *Making connections: impact of graphic organizers in reading comprehension and summarization* (Unpublished Master's thesis). Universidad de La Sabana, Chía, Colombia. Retrieved from http://intellectum.unisabana.edu.co:8080/jspui/bitstream/10818/3348/1/Mar_a_Alejandra_Roa_Pinz_n.pdf
- Robinson, D. H., & Kiewra, K. A. (1995). Visual argument: Graphic organizers are superior to outlines in improving learning from text. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 87*(3), 455-467.
- Ruddell, M. R. (2001). *Teaching content reading and writing* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

- Sadler, T. D. (2004). Informal reasoning regarding socio-scientific issues: A critical review of research. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 41(5), 513-536.
- Sakta, C. G. (1992). The graphic organizer: A blueprint for taking lecture notes. *Journal of Reading*, 35(6), 482-484.
- Santangelo, T., & Olinghouse, N. G. (2009). Effective writing instruction for students who have writing difficulties. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 42(4), 1-20.
- Schneuwly, B. (1988). *Le langage écrit chez l'enfant*. [Children's written language] Neuchâtel, France: Delachaux et Niestlé.
- Sinatra, R. C., & Pizzo, J. (1992). Mapping the road to reading comprehension. *Teaching Pre K-8*(23), 102-105.
- Sitko, N. J. (2013). *Qualitative methods: Data analysis and validation*. Paper presented at Zambia Food Security Research Project in support of the Indaba Agricultural Policy Research Institute, Lusaka, Zambia.
- Stein, N., & Miller, C.A. (1993a). The development of memory and reasoning skill in argumentative contexts: Evaluating, explaining, and generating evidence. In R. Glaser (Ed.), *Advances in instructional psychology*, (Vol. 4, pp. 285-235). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Stein, N. L., & Miller, C. A. (1993b). A theory of argumentative understanding: Relationships among position preference, judgments of goodness, memory and reasoning. *Argumentation*, 7(2), 183-204.
- Stein, N., & Miller, C.A. (1990). I win... you lose: the development of argumentative thinking. In J.F. Voss, D.N. Perkins & J. Segal (Eds.), *Informal reasoning and Instruction* (pp. 265-290). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Stewart, D. W. & Shamdasani, P. N. (1990). *Focus groups: Theory and practice*. California, CA: Sage Publications.
- Tobias, S. (1990). They're not dumb, they're different: A new "tier of talent" for science. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 22(4), 11-30.
- Toulmin, S.E. (1958). *The uses of argument*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (1984). *Speech acts in argumentative discussions: A theoretical model for the analysis of discussions directed towards solving conflicts of opinion*. Cinnaminson, NJ: Foris Publications.
- Van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (1987). Fallacies in pragma-dialectical perspective. *Argumentation*, 1(3), 283-301.
- Van Eemeren, F.H., Grootensdorst, R., & Henkemans, F.S. (1996). *Fundamentals of argumentation theory: A handbook of historical backgrounds and contemporary developments*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (1999). Developments in argumentation theory. In R. Andriessen & P. Coirier (Eds.), *Foundations of argumentative text processing* (pp. 43-57). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Amsterdam University Press.
- Van Eemeren, F.H., Grootensdorst, R., & Henkemans, F.S. (2002). *Argumentation: Analysis, evaluation, and presentation*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Veerman, A. L., & Treasure-Jones, T. (1999). Software for problem solving through collaborative argumentation. *Foundations of argumentative text processing*, Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Amsterdam University Press.

- White, D., & Le Cornu, A. (2011). Visitors and Residents: A new typology for online engagement. *First Monday*, 16(9). doi:10.5210/fm.v16i9.3171. Retrieved from <http://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/3171/3049>
- Victori, M. (1995). *EFL writing knowledge and strategies: An interactive study* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Universitat Autònoma, Barcelona, Spain.
- Voss, J. F., & Post, T. A. (1988). On the solving of ill-structured problems. In M. H. Chi, R. Glaser, & M. J. Farr (Eds.), *The nature of expertise* (pp. 261-285). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associate.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Tool and symbol in child development. In M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman (Eds.), *Mind in Society: The development of higher psychological processes* (pp. 1-294). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Washington, V. M. (1988). Report writing: A practical application of semantic mapping. *The Teacher Educator*, 24(1), 24-30.
- Wertsch, J. V. (1979). From social interaction to higher psychological processes. A clarification and application of Vygotsky's theory. *Human Development*, 22(1), 1-22.
- Wertsch, J. V. (1985). *Vygotsky and the social formation of mind*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Willis, D., & Willis, J. (2008). *Doing task-based teaching*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Wilson, N., & McClean, S. I. (1994). *Questionnaire design: a practical introduction*. Newton Abbey, UK: University of Ulster Press.

Wong, Y. K. (1992). *Instruction in argumentative writing in Hong Kong secondary schools: A contrastive study of Chinese-English rhetoric* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation).

Georgetown University, Washington, DC.

Appendix A: Consent letters

Investigación conducida por: Mr. Carlos Andrés Mora González
Estudiante Maestría en Didáctica del Inglés con Énfasis en Ambientes de
Aprendizaje Autónomo
Universidad de la Sabana

Título del proyecto: “Graphic organizers: an alternative to enhance argumentative writing skill on problem-based tasks.”

Ms. Zulma Morán
Rectora Colegio Bosques de Sherwood
Respetada rectora:

Actualmente me encuentro realizando la maestría “Didáctica del Inglés con énfasis en ambientes de aprendizaje autónomo”. Para cumplir satisfactoriamente con todos los requisitos establecidos por el programa de la maestría, debo realizar un proyecto de investigación que me permita evidenciar el impacto y la aplicación de lo aprendido durante el programa en mi quehacer pedagógico y principalmente beneficiar el proceso de aprendizaje de los estudiantes a mi cargo.

Para tal fin, me permito muy respetuosamente, solicitar su consentimiento para poder llevar a cabo este proyecto dentro de su institución con los estudiantes de grado sexto (A, B, C) nivel avanzado con el propósito de mejorar la habilidad argumentativa de los estudiantes en la resolución de situaciones problemáticas cotidianas. Esta habilidad no sólo les ayudará en la clase de inglés sino también en sus ámbitos académicos, profesionales, y personales. Las actividades realizadas durante el proyecto no afectarán las temáticas de la clase ni las notas de los estudiantes.

Por último, es importante aclarar que los datos personales de los estudiantes serán mantenidos en total confidencialidad y la información recogida durante el proyecto será usada única y exclusivamente con fines académicos.

Ms. Zulma Morán
Rectora

Investigación conducida por: Mr. Carlos Andrés Mora González

Estudiante Maestría en Didáctica del Inglés con
Énfasis en Ambientes de Aprendizaje Autónomo
Universidad de la Sabana

Título del proyecto: “Graphic organizers: an alternative to enhance argumentative writing skill on problem-based tasks.”

Respetados padres de familia y/o acudientes,

Los estudiantes de grado sexto (A, B, C) de nivel avanzado están invitados a participar dentro de un proyecto de investigación que se realizará con el fin de mejorar la habilidad argumentativa en Inglés de los estudiantes en la resolución de situaciones problemáticas. Esta habilidad no sólo les ayudará en la clase de inglés sino también para su vida académica, profesional, y personal. Las actividades realizadas durante el proyecto no afectarán las temáticas de la clase ni las notas de los estudiantes. por último, es importante aclarar que los datos personales de los estudiantes serán mantenidos en confidencialidad y la información recogida durante el proyecto será usada única y exclusivamente con fines académicos.

Mr. Carlos Mora
Docente de Inglés

Ms. Zulma Morán
Rectora

Yo, _____ autorizo a mi hijo/a
_____ del grado 6 _____ a participar en el proyecto de investigación
titulado “Graphic organizers: an alternative to enhance students’ argumentative writing skill on problem-based
tasks.”

Firma del Estudiante: _____

Firma del Padre y/o Acudiente: _____

Appendix B: Initial Survey

Queridos estudiantes:

El objetivo de esta encuesta es obtener información sobre tus sensaciones acerca de dar tu opinión y proponer una solución para el problema propuesto. Realmente, apreciaría tu honestidad al momento de responder la encuesta. Solo tomará entre 5 y 7 minutos de tu valioso tiempo. La información que se recolecte a través de esta encuesta será utilizada confidencialmente y tu nombre no será revelado. Agradezco tu colaboración y tiempo dedicado.

1. ¿Te pareció fácil escribir tu solución para el problema dado?
SI _____ NO _____ Por qué? _____
2. (Responde si tu respuesta fue NO en la pregunta anterior) Si te pareció difícil escribir la solución para el problema propuesto, selecciona una (o más si es necesario) de las posibles causas:
 - a. Falta de vocabulario relacionado con el problema propuesto.
 - b. Falta de expresiones en Inglés para escribir tu opinión.
 - c. Falta de estrategias para organizar tus ideas.
 - d. Dificultad para encontrar una solución adecuada.
 - e. Otro _____
3. ¿Te pareció fácil escribir las razones para la solución del problema que propusiste?
SI _____ NO _____ Por qué? _____
4. (Responde si tu respuesta fue NO en la pregunta anterior) Si te pareció difícil escribir las razones para justificar la solución que seleccionaste, escoge una (o más si es necesario) de las posibles causas:
 - a. Falta de vocabulario para respaldar tu posible solución.
 - b. Falta de conectores en Inglés para unir tus ideas.
 - c. Falta de estrategias para organizar tus razones.
 - d. Otro _____
5. ¿Necesitaste la ayuda de tu profesor o compañeros para escribir la solución que propusiste?
SI _____ NO _____ ¿Por qué?

6. ¿Qué sabes acerca de los diagramas de conceptos?

Thank you!

Appendix C: Teacher’s journal

This data collection instrument is implemented to gather information on student’s performance using graphic organizers and writing argumentative thesis statements about problem solving tasks.

Research question: *How might the use of graphic organizers on problem- based tasks influence A1 sixth graders’ argumentative writing skill?*

Journal Date: October 17th/ 2013	
Activity: Students do their graphic organizer individually about their solution for the food waste problem at the school.	
Facts gathered	Reflection
Participants’ performance on using graphic organizers.	<p>Most of the participants had a clear idea of what solution they wanted to focus on. However, some of them forgot to write their solution in the middle, instead they wrote the problem addressed (e.g. Food waste).</p> <p>I decided to monitor each participant when they were writing the arguments for their solution on the GOs, what called my attention was that most of the participants were writing like the steps to make their solution and in other cases like other solutions. Also, the majority used the numbers to organize the sequence of the arguments while few did not do it (participants B, D, N, and R).</p> <p>As participants were doing their GOs, they asked me about some specific words each one needed. What I found interesting is that I returned the question to the class, and in some cases, the classmates were able to answer.</p>

Participants' self-assessment.

All the participants seemed to be clear in relation to each aspect of the graphic organizer stated in the self-assessment checklist and were able to tick them. Some participants seemed to be better able to identify what was missing and wrote a concrete action to improve next time (Participants A, H, J, K, M, N, Q, T). Few cases (participant D, and L), ticked the NO tab but they did not write an action to improve it next time. Only one participant (B) forgot to check all the aspects.

Appendix D: Artifacts' samples



Figure 9. Example of completed student graphic organizer.

Solomon

To my mind, the food waste is a general problem in the world because the people don't like the food or do to the people ask someone food and they don't eat. Owing to this my solution is do a campaign with the people and can say NO! to the food waste, we can identify why students not eat all food, we can identify what is the favorite food to the students, we can give less food for some students and we can see what students having the food and asked why he does.

Figure 10. Example of student argumentative text based on working with graphic organizer.

Appendix E: Questionnaire

Queridos estudiantes:

Este cuestionario ha sido diseñado con el fin de recolectar información sobre tus sensaciones con relación al proyecto realizado en la clase de Inglés. Las respuestas dadas en este cuestionario serán usadas sólo con fines académicos y tu nombre no será revelado en ningún momento. El tiempo estimado para responderlo es de 20 minutos. Gracias por tu colaboración.

Cordialmente,
Mr. Carlos Mora.
Docente de Inglés 2013.

1. ¿Crees que los organizadores gráficos fueron una herramienta útil? ¿Por qué?

2. ¿Consideras que el uso de los organizadores gráficos te ayudo a mejorar tu habilidad argumentativa? ¿Por qué?

3. ¿Cómo es tu habilidad argumentativa al escribir ahora comparada a como era antes de realizar el proyecto?

4. ¿Crees que puedes usar los organizadores gráficos en otras materias? ¿Por qué? ¿Cómo?


5. Durante el proyecto, ¿te sentiste con más confianza para escribir la solución que escogiste para cada uno de los problemas trabajados en las clases? ¿Por qué?




6. ¿Consideras que el uso de los organizadores gráficos te ayudó a estar más tranquilo cuando ibas a escribir tu solución para el problema propuesto? ¿Por qué?




7. ¿Qué opinas sobre la autoevaluación después de usar el organizador gráfico y después de escribir tu solución?



8. ~~¿Crees que al usar un organizador gráfico te ayudó para escoger una posible solución para el problema dado?~~
¿Por qué?



9. ¿Consideras que al usar problemas relacionados con el colegio te ayudó a expresar más fácil tu opinión (en este caso solución y justificación)? ¿Por qué?



10. Después de finalizar el proyecto, ¿crees que es más sencillo encontrar la solución para un problema dado? ¿Por qué?



Thank you!

Appendix F: Final Survey

Queridos estudiantes:

El objetivo de esta encuesta es obtener información sobre cómo te sentiste dando tu opinión y proponiendo una solución para cada uno de los problemas trabajados en clase. Realmente, apreciaría tu honestidad al momento de responder la encuesta. Solo tomará 20 minutos de tu valioso tiempo. La información recolectada en esta encuesta será utilizada confidencialmente y tu nombre no será revelado. Agradezco tu colaboración y tiempo dedicado.

1. Al final del proyecto, ¿te pareció fácil escribir tu solución para cada problema propuesto en las clases?
SI _____ NO _____ ¿Por qué? _____

2. (Responde si tu respuesta fue NO en la pregunta anterior) si te pareció difícil escribir la solución para los problemas propuestos, selecciona una (o más si es necesario) de las posibles causas:
 - a. Falta de vocabulario relacionado con el problema propuesto.
 - b. Falta de expresiones en Inglés para escribir tu opinión.
 - c. Falta de estrategias para organizar tus ideas.
 - d. Dificultad para encontrar una solución adecuada
 - e. Otro _____

3. Al final del proyecto, ¿te pareció fácil escribir las razones para justificar tu propuesta para solucionar cada problema dado?
SI _____ NO _____ ¿Por qué? _____

4. (Responde si tu respuesta fue NO en la pregunta anterior) Si te pareció difícil escribir el argumento para justificar la solución que seleccionaste, escoge una (o más si es necesario) de las posibles causas:
 - a. Falta de vocabulario para respaldar tu posible solución.
 - b. Falta de conectores en Inglés para unir tus ideas.
 - c. Falta de estrategias para organizar tus razones.
 - d. Otro _____

7. ¿Necesitaste la ayuda de tu profesor o compañeros para escribir la solución que propusiste?
SI _____ NO _____ ¿Por qué?

8. Al final del proyecto, ¿cómo podrías definir un mapa de conceptos?

Thank you!

Appendix G: Focus group questions

1. Did you find easy or difficult to use graphic organizers? Why?
(¿Te pareció fácil o difícil usar los diagramas de conceptos? ¿Por qué?)
2. Did the graphic organizers help you organize your ideas before writing your thesis statement? Why?
(¿Los gráficos te ayudaron a organizar tus ideas antes de escribir tu solución? ¿Por qué?)
3. Did the organizers help you write the justifications for the solutions you proposed??
Why?
(¿Los gráficos te ayudaron a escribir las razones para justificar tus soluciones? ¿Por qué?)
4. Did the organizers help you write your solution? How?
¿Los gráficos te ayudaron a escribir tus soluciones? ¿Cómo?
5. What are your thoughts about the self-assessment process we did after doing the organizers and after writing the solution?
(¿Cuál es tu opinión sobre la autoevaluación que se hizo después de realizar los organizadores y después de escribir las soluciones?)
6. Do you think that you can use the organizers in other subjects? How?
(¿Crees que puedes usar los organizadores en otras materias? ¿Cómo?)
7. Do you think that your writing skill remains the same or has changed? How?
(¿Consideras que tu habilidad de escritura es la misma que antes de participar en este proyecto o ha cambiado? ¿Cómo?)
8. Do you consider that the GOs have enhanced your argumentative writing skill? How?
(¿Crees que los organizadores te han ayudado a mejorar tu habilidad argumentativa?
¿Cómo?)

Thank you!


Appendix H: Vocabulary and definition of each problem

Figure 11. Example of student vocabulary and definition of a problem-based topic.

Appendix I: KWL Chart

Complete what you know (K column) and what you want to know (W column) about food waste.

My class objective is learn to no waste and make comparisons about no food waste for how conscious for financial food waste.

Topic food waste.

K (What I know)	W (What I want to know)	L (What I learnt)
I know that food waste is in the restaurants and different places of food and the people waste and contaminated the world.	I want to know because throwing or wasted the food while other suffer and don't have the food and die. And don't assume consequences.	I learn about of the global warming and of climate change in the world and the percentages about the food waste in the world.

Figure 12. Example of student KWL Chart about a problem-based topic.

Appendix J: Action plan and timeline chart for implementation

PHASE	DATE	TASK
Learners' training phase	Wednesday, September 11 th	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - List of common problems at the school. - Selection of the problems to work during the intervention. - Presenting bullying problem.
	Thursday, September 12 th	<p style="text-align: center;">Bullying</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Objective - Definition - Causes/consequences - Vocabulary list - Solution - Checklist - Initial survey
	Friday, September 13 th to Tuesday, September 17 th	<p style="text-align: center;">Littering</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Objective - Littering materials - Littering facts - Causes/ consequences - KWL Chart - Vocabulary list - Definition - Introducing expressions for opinions and connectors of reasons - Cover page
	Wednesday, September 18 th	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Littering graphic organizer - Checklist
	Thursday, September 19 th	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Littering writing solution - Checklist - Cover page
	Friday, September 20 th	NO CLASS (Educative Municipal Forum)
	Tuesday, September 24 th	NO CLASS (4 th Educational, Artistic, and Cultural Encounter)

Implementation phase	Wednesday, September 25 th to October 16 th	<p style="text-align: center;">Food waste</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Objective - Video - Song - KWL chart - Vocabulary list - Causes/ consequences - Poster - Presentations - Causes/ consequences (in the school)
	Wednesday, October 2 nd	<p>NO CLASS</p> <p>(Mathematics Contest)</p>
	Monday, October 7 th to Friday, October 11 th	<p>NO CLASS</p> <p>(Academic Week off)</p>
	Thursday, October 17 th	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Food waste graphic organizer - Checklist
	Friday, October 18 th	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Food waste writing solution - Checklist - Cover page
	Monday, October 21 st to Thursday, October 31 st	<p style="text-align: center;">Bad language</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Objective - Images - Video - KWL Chart - Vocabulary list - Definition - Causes/ reasons/ consequences - Presentations
	Friday, October 25 th	<p>NO CLASS</p> <p>(Cultural activity)</p>
	Wednesday, October 30 th	<p>NO CLASS</p>

		(Children's day celebration)
	Friday, November 1st	NO CLASS (Knowledge contest- Final round)
	Tuesday, November 5 th	NO CLASS (Teaching practice observation)
	Thursday, November 7 th	- Bad language graphic organizer - Checklist
	Friday, November 8th	- Bad language writing solution - Checklist
	Tuesday, November 12th	- Final interview
	Wednesday, November 13th	- Revision of folders - Final survey


Appendix K: Common problems at school identified by participants

Figure 13. List of problems identified at the school by one of the participants.

Appendix L: Graphic organizer model




Figure 14. Model of a webbing graphic organizer retrieved from the web.

Appendix M: Viewpoint expressions and linkers chart**EXPRESSIONS TO PRESENT MY POINT OF VIEW**

I think...	Yo creo...
To my mind, ...	A mi modo de ver...
I consider that...	Yo considero que...
As I see it...	Como yo lo veo...
In my opinion...	En mi opinión...
From my point of view...	Desde mi punto de vista...
My personal view is that...	My opinión personal es que...
In my experience...	En mi experiencia...

LINKERS (TO EXPLAIN MY REASONS)

Because...	Porque...
Due to...	Debido a...
Owing to...	debido a...
Seeing that...	Considerando que...

Appendix N: Graphic organizer checklist

Dear student,

👋 👋 👋

CHECK with a TICK (✓) if you have followed the STEPS when using your GRAPHIC ORGANIZER.

MY GRAPHIC ORGANIZER	Yes	No
I selected a graphic organizer from the samples provided by the teacher. <i>(Escogí un mapa de conceptos de los modelos dados por el docente.)</i>	✓	
I wrote the TITLE of my graphic organizer (in this case my proposal solution for the littering at school). <i>(Escribí el título de mi mapa de conceptos- en este caso mi posible solución para la bota de basura en el colegio.)</i>	✓	
I wrote the reasons why I selected that solution into my graphic organizer. <i>(Escribí las razones por las cuales escogí esa solución en el mapa de conceptos.)</i>		✓
I organized those reasons in a sequential order (using numbers or letters). <i>(Organicé las razones por las cuales escogí esa solución siguiendo un orden. Ej: usando números o letras.)</i>		✓
I compared my graphic organizer to another classmate and check if mine was complete. <i>(Comparé mi mapa de conceptos con otro compañero para revisar que este completo.)</i>	✓	
<p>MY ACTION PLAN:</p> <p>For the aspects you SELECTED NO (if there is any), write a concrete ACTION you will do for next time you use a graphic organizer. <i>Para los aspectos que seccionaste NO (si hay alguno), escribe una acción concreta que vas a usar la próxima vez que uses un mapa de conceptos.)</i></p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">I must organize better my ideas</p>		

Thank you!

Figure 15. Example of student graphic organizer checklist.

Appendix O: Writing solution checklist

Dear student,

👋👋👋

CHECK with a TICK (✓) if you have followed the STEPS when writing your THESIS STATEMENT about your solution for food waste in the school.

Writing my argument	Yes	No
I used the information I had on my graphic organizer to write my possible solution for the problem at hand. <i>(Utilicé la información que tenía en mi mapa de conceptos para escribir mi posible solución para el problema a tratar.)</i>	✓	
I used an expression to state my point of view about the problem at hand. (Example: I think...) <i>(Usé alguna expresión vista en clase para exponer mi punto de vista sobre el problema a tratar. Ejemplo: yo creo que...)</i>		✓
I used a connector to present the reasons of my chosen solution. (For example: seeing that...) <i>(Usé algún conector para unir mi solución con sus justificaciones. Ejemplo: Considerando que...)</i>	✓	
I compared my writing piece to another classmate and check if mine was complete. <i>(Comparé mi escrito con otro compañero para revisar que este completo.)</i>		✓

MY ACTION PLAN:
For the aspects you SELECTED NO (if there is any), write a concrete ACTION you will do for next time you write your thesis statement.
Para los aspectos que seccionaste NO (si hay alguno), escribe una acción concreta que vas a usar la próxima vez que hagas tu escrito.)

use the points of view about the problem example: think because my solution to be best and compared my writing piece to another classmate

Thank you!

Figure 16. Example of student argumentative composition checklist.

Appendix P: Students' English folders



Figure 17. Example of student English folder front cover.

Appendix Q: Focus group chart

Question	Participants' replies
<p>1. Did you find easy or difficult to use GOs? Why?</p>	<p>St A: Para mí fue fácil porque me parece que pude pensar muy bien todo.</p> <p>St B: Pues si me pareció fácil porque pues nos ayudaba cuando había alguna actividad dentro de lo que investigábamos.</p> <p>St C: Fácil, porque en cada organizador uno aprendía cada cosa y uno aprendía del tema. Si uno tiene hartas razones del tema pues queda más fácil.</p> <p>St D: Para mí fue fácil porque entendí los temas concretamente.</p> <p>St E: Pues a mí parece que los organizadores gráficos nos han ayudado a organizarnos. Pues fue un poquito difícil cambiar los métodos pero uno se va acostumbrando y pues me parece que lo que hicimos fue para organizar nuestro tiempo mucho mejor y para aprender más rápido sobre el tiempo.</p> <p>St G: Pues para mí fue regular porque yo no sé mucho Inglés entonces estoy aprendiendo. Entonces pues ya voy más adelantada.</p> <p>St H: A mí me pareció fácil porque escribíamos las razones.</p> <p>St I: Pues fácil pero difícil. Fácil porque podíamos organizar bien las ideas y tener un concepto más de lo que podemos decir. Y difícil porque no teníamos las palabras claras en Inglés para decir lo que queríamos expresar.</p> <p>St K: Pues a mí si se me dificultó pues porque yo no sabía organizar mis argumentos en un escrito y pues mucho menos sabía organizar un gráfico, pero pues ya después con esas autoevaluaciones que hicimos supe ya organizarlas mejor.</p> <p>St L: Me pareció fácil ya que pues tú nos dabas consejos, nos decías cómo hacerlo y pues ya de clases pasadas teníamos una idea de cómo hacerlo.</p> <p>St M: Fácil porque uno puede organizar las ideas, las razones con las opiniones que tiene frente al tema.</p> <p>St N: A mí también me pareció fácil porque daba una idea concreta, porque solo era buscar los conectores y ya.</p> <p>St O: Fácil porque eran ideas que ya teníamos preparadas.</p> <p>St P: Para mí fue pues fácil porque era la manera de organizar las ideas en base a una idea principal.</p> <p>St Q: A mí me pareció pues regular también porque no podía bien hacerlos, porque no podía sacar una idea de lo que hacía en el gráfico no podía sacar más ideas.</p> <p>St S: Me pareció sencillo, eh, el gráfico me ayudó a que yo pudiera organizar mis ideas mucho más claro, eh, mis razones, y porque esta es la mejor solución para el problema que tenemos. Así que creo que si me ayudó bastante y me pareció sencillo para los temas que estábamos viendo.</p> <p>St T: A mí al principio se me dificultó porque pues no sabía</p>

	organizar mis ideas, ya después con los conectores y las ideas ya podía hacer mejor el gráfico.
2. Did the GOs help you organize your ideas before writing the solution? How?	<p>St A: Pues me ayudó a entender más el tema.</p> <p>St B: Si porque pues para explicar de pronto uno no sabía, entonces el gráfico le ayudaba pues para guiarse más en el tema.</p> <p>St C: Si pues con el organizador uno se iba ayudando, era como un apoyo para lograr hacer la solución.</p> <p>St D: Me pareció muy buena porque organizaba nuestras ideas con base a eso y ya no necesitábamos tanta ayuda.</p> <p>St E: A mí me parece que nos ayudó bastante porque pues esos eran como unos tips para hacerlo así y entonces tú podías escribir lo que dijiste, pero eso también te ayudaba para que tú te centraras en lo que tenías que escribir en la gráfica. Me ayudó a entender.</p> <p>St G: Pues uno podía dar una solución concreta usando lo que tenía en el organizador.</p> <p>St H: Pues si porque ya en el organizador ya teníamos la solución entonces podía ser más completa.</p> <p>St I: Pues si porque era como una guía para nosotros hacer nuestro escrito o texto y así podíamos unir ideas y hacer una idea más concreta.</p> <p>St K: Eh, pues, a mí me ayudó pues porque yo no sabía organizar mis ideas, y pues ahí ya teníamos ideas para poder organizarlas y conectarlas.</p> <p>St L: Pues si me ayudó porque uno ya tiene la idea en el organizador, o sea, ya tiene la idea ahí, lo que tienes que hacer es usar los conectores que tú nos diste y ponerlo todo en un papel.</p> <p>St M: A mí me pareció que si porque era fácil, teníamos conceptos claros, pero lo único que nos faltaba era para unir los conectores, para unir todas las palabras y todas las ideas.</p> <p>St N: Si porque los organizadores, como te dije, son una idea concreta que tiene diferentes razones sobre diferentes temas. Si me ayudó porque antes las soluciones sin ese mapa no tenían la idea, o las razones.</p> <p>St O: Si porque antes de escribir, ya teníamos en el organizador una idea para escribir la solución.</p> <p>St P: Si porque antes de escribir pues uno puede escribir la solución en base a las ideas y después organizarlo para dar una solución.</p> <p>St Q: Pues para mí fue un poquito regular porque a veces no podía hacerlos bien.</p> <p>St S: A mí me colaboró, porque ahí en el gráfico ya tenía la solución y mis razones, ahora era solo organizarlas mejor, que mejorar, o que agregar, para que quede una buena, eh, solución concreta. Entonces si me ayudó.</p> <p>St T: A mí me ayudó mucho porque pues ya podía hacer la solución en el gráfico y pues una idea concreta, que la idea</p>

	principal.
3. Did the GOs help you write the justifications for the solution you proposed?	<p>St A: Pues sí, nos ayudaron porque pues de una manera más creativa podemos aprender.</p> <p>St B: Si, había una conexión para elegir las palabras pues como para complementar más el tema y buscar más acerca de eso.</p> <p>St C: Pues la solución era como, eh ya lo tengo, ya no lo habíamos aprendido y era fácil sacar razones de nuestra solución.</p> <p>St D: Si porque eso nos ayudaba para hacer algo más creativo no solo lo de siempre que es copiar y copiar. Fácil escribir las razones por el graphic organizer porque podíamos hacer algo más concreto, algo muy específico.</p> <p>St E: Pues a mí me parece que si nos ayudó a escribir nuestras razones porque nosotros al comienzo estábamos muy confundidos y eso nos ayudaba a que buscáramos las palabras correctas, a que buscáramos las uniones y cómo comenzar. Entonces habían unas de “I think”, otras “because, así uniones, entonces a mí me parece también que fue una muy buena elección porque nos ayudó mucho.</p> <p>St G: Si porque ya tenía las ideas anteriores pues para terminar mi argumento pues yo las usé, me sirvió mucho.</p> <p>St H: Pues porque ahí teníamos más razones para escribir nuestra solución.</p> <p>St I: Pues es que era fácil y bueno porque ya teníamos la idea concreta, solo nos faltaba argumentar un poco más nuestra idea de lo que ya íbamos a hacer.</p> <p>St K: A mí se me complicó porque pues yo no sabía argumentar y yo no podía dar razones a lo que yo escribía y con el gráfico pues y me guiaba y por ejemplo a tener razones de mis argumentos.</p> <p>St L: Pues sí, pues me ayudó ya que pues una con la idea y con todo ya listo, crear más argumentos ya sería más sencillo. No sería tan complicado como sería sin los organizadores gráficos.</p> <p>St M: A mí me pareció que si porque eran las razones que teníamos frente al tema en el organizador y de ahí podíamos sacar más ideas que se acercaban más hacia el tema.</p> <p>St N: Si porque eh, pues era solo buscar las razones antes y a mí se me complicaba mucho eso.</p> <p>St O: Porque con eso ya sabía cuál era mi idea y aparte entendí más como argumentar mis palabras.</p> <p>St P: Pues si porque con base en eso uno ponía “I think”, “because”, entonces a uno le daba una idea.</p> <p>St Q: Pues a mí pareció algo divertido y una buena estrategia para aprender más vocabulario en Inglés y formar oraciones.</p> <p>St S: Si, si me ayudaron porque teniendo las razones podía unir las en una razón justa para la solución totalmente principal y concreta. Entonces si me colaboraron con las justificaciones y así cada parte del tema.</p> <p>St T: A mí me ayudaron bastante, mucho ¿porque? Porque ya en el</p>

	gráfico ya tenía una solución, una medio solución, ya era pasarla a una hoja y escribir la más concreta, más principal.
4. Did the GOs help you write your solution? How?	<p>St A: Pues yo creería que si nos ayudó porque pues era las razones, ¿no? Entonces pues nosotros hacíamos como varias y o sea, de lo que habíamos copiado podíamos sacar una, unir las, o eso, y eso nos podía ayudar más.</p> <p>St B: Si porque pues para escribir la solución pues ayudaba más con las palabras.St C: Pues eran las ideas y uno las tenía claras para hacer la solución y era fácil tener ya las razones usar los conectores.</p> <p>St D: Si porque las ideas que hacíamos nos ayudaban a escribir la solución sabiendo sobre el tema.</p> <p>St E: Pues a mí me parece que si nos ayudó porque como cuando te vuelvo a decir, encontrábamos las palabras y las uniones ahí aparecía pues puedes utilizar esto. También me parece que fue una forma fácil de aprender usando nuestros gráficos y para como tener más fluidez en lo que se estaba hablando.</p> <p>St G: Si pues porque un poco porque con mi razón sacaba otras conclusiones, pero también podía coger todo lo del gráfico y lo podía unir y argumentarlo en una sola solución.</p> <p>St H: Pues me ayudó porque ya teníamos las ideas.</p> <p>St I: Pues ayudó ya que los organizadores organizaban nuestras ideas para poder entenderlas un poco mejor.</p> <p>St K: A mí me ayudó porque pues ya era la solución, sus razones, y ya estaba organizado y pues ya no más era utilizar los conectores que el Mister nos dió para hacer una solución concreta.</p> <p>St L: Si me ayudó a escribir la solución porque ya conocía el problema, causas del problema, consecuencias del problema, uno ya va a tener una idea de cómo quería hacer la solución, qué hay que hacer, hay que hacer esto, hay que ayudar a esto, no hay que hacer esto.</p> <p>St M: Pues me pareció que si porque uno ya tenía las ideas frente al tema en el organizador y ya podía hacer la solución con esas ideas que uno ya tenía a priori.</p> <p>St N: Si me ayudó porque el organizador ya tenía sus razones, su idea principal, sólo era escribir la solución en una hoja.</p> <p>St O: Porque el organizador ya tenía un orden, ya sabía cómo era que lo iba a hacer, lo que iba a escribir, solo faltaban los conectores.</p> <p>St P: Si porque pues eh los argumentos que estaban en el gráfico nos ayudaban para escribir la solución o el problema o algo así, o lo que nos pedía.</p> <p>St Q: Si me ayudó porque antes de hacer la solución teníamos que tener el gráfico para poder hacerlo bien.</p> <p>St S: Eh si, si me ayudó porque así yo podía primero tomar todo lo que había hecho en el gráfico, después pasarlo a una mejor solución, ya con un resumen, mucho más concreto, con conectores,</p>

	<p>con justificadores, del porque y pues ya conociendo mejor el problema, que es, por qué, causas, consecuencias, etc. Entonces ahí ya tomaba todo esto en cuenta, y hacia mi resumen de una solución principal para el tema.</p> <p>St T: A mí me ayudó porque ya en el organizador tenía, era solo los conectores, utilizar los conectores, escribirla. El gráfico me ayudó mucho porque ya tenía una idea.</p>
<p>5. What are your thoughts about the self-assessment process we did after doing the GO and after writing the solution?</p>	<p>St A: Pues yo pienso que nos ayudaba porque pues por ejemplo ahí decía que para los aspectos que habíamos puesto que colocáramos abajo como una solución para tenerlo en cuenta la próxima vez o para mejorarlo.</p> <p>St B: Si porque se podía comparar con un compañero pues para complementar y pues terminar esa idea o complementar más el gráfico.</p> <p>St C: La autoevaluación me ayudó a digamos que me faltó algo, y si hacia otro organizador ya le agregaba eso.</p> <p>St D: Me pareció muy buena porque en clase nosotros hacíamos el tema y podíamos colocar algo que podíamos usar la próxima vez para ir mejorando.</p> <p>St E: Pues a mí me parece que esa autoevaluación nos ayudó mucho porque cuando hacíamos el gráfico podíamos tener cosas bien y cosas mal, entonces pues nos decías revisen la autoevaluación para saber cómo esta y nosotros chuleábamos y abajo aparecía algo que si tu ponías que no que respondieras. Uno respondía que no porque no colocaba el titulo como debía, o las razones que debía escribir. Nosotros escribíamos, no, no utilizamos las conexiones correctas, entonces fue de mucha ayuda.</p> <p>St G: A mí me pareció muy chévere pues esa autoevaluación porque pues nos tenía las cosas concretas para hacer nuestro trabajo.</p> <p>St H: Pues la autoevaluación me ayudó porque no tenía claro otros temas y pues los solucioné.</p> <p>St I: Pues ayudó ya que lo que no hacíamos pues podíamos corregirlo y hacerlo, por ejemplo, una vez que yo no pude comparar y a la próxima vez y las próximas pude ir comparando para ver si todo lo que yo tenía estaba completo.</p> <p>St K: Pues a mí como decía, a mí se me complicó mucho al comienzo eh, hacer las gráficas pero ya con la autoevaluación yo podía tener en cuenta que era lo que necesitaba para la próxima gráfica y como mejorarla.</p> <p>St L: Pues me parece una buena idea ya que uno tenía una idea de cómo hacer lo que tenía que hacer, uno no se perdía tanto, uno ya sabía qué hacer, que mejorar, que no hacer, uno ya...ya era más fácil hacerlo.</p> <p>St M: Yo estoy de acuerdo con (Student O) porque me parece que uno se puede autoevaluar y pensar que me hace falta para el</p>

	<p>próximo organizador hacerlo mejor.</p> <p>St N: Eh, pues a me pareció un poquito fácil y complicado por la dinámica. Al principio se me dificultaba y con la autoevaluación uno ya sabía, bueno pues hasta sé que me tocaba mejorar y que me faltaba.</p> <p>St O: Pues esa autoevaluación me ayudó porque tenía unas cosas malas y me ayudó a corregirlas.</p> <p>St P: Pues nos ayudó porque ahí abajo decía que si habíamos comparado nuestra gráfica con otro, con un compañero y en base a eso podíamos completar, o quitarle partes.</p> <p>St Q: A mí pareció como buena táctica para hacer como ajustes digámoslo así no, entonces ahí decía que si uno no hizo una cosa con el gráfico y si no, podía comparar con otra persona.</p> <p>St S: Eh, la hoja de autoevaluación me ayudó ¿por qué? Porque primero, eh, pues así yo ya tenía todo lo que era del tema y ya sabía cómo autoevaluar todo lo que había hecho antes, o sea, eh, que me faltó para hacer mejor, eh, porque lo hice así, que le falta, tal vez mejorar, quitar, agregar, etc. Entonces creo que si fue una muy buena idea, eh, para así concretar y así pues tomar en cuenta otras consideraciones para tomar mi opinión propia.</p> <p>St T: A mí me ayudó mucho porque pues en el gráfico, pues yo podía mirar en la autoevaluación en que estoy mal o en que estoy bien. Eso me ayudó ha pues, en lo que estoy mal a mejorarlo, y en lo que estoy bien pues dejarlo así, y pues tratar de ser mejor.</p>
<p>6. Do you think that you can use the GOs in other subjects? How?</p>	<p>St A: Yo creería que si los podríamos utilizar en otras materias porque pues mmm son como mapas conceptuales ¿no? Pues eso lo podemos cuando lo hagamos en base a un tema lo podemos analizar bien para encontrar algo más fácil ¿no?</p> <p>St B: Es algo más dinámico como minimizar más los temas, y que no queden como temas tan largos.</p> <p>St C: Si se puede utilizar porque como dice (Student O), con el mapa uno ya entiende mejor el tema y hace más fácil porque son solo oraciones.</p> <p>St D: Si porque digamos que en otras materias nosotros escribimos muchas cosas pero la mayoría de lo que escribimos no entendemos nada. En cambio, un graphic organizer son ideas que nos pueden ayudar a entender algo más concreto.</p> <p>St E: Pues si se puede utilizar en otras materias digamos como en biología, matemáticas. Para que no nos hagan copiar tanto, pues que el Mister nos diera el libro o qué nos explicara y dijera saquen un cuadro de esto para que sea más corto y para que sea más rápido el aprendizaje. Yo creo que en todas las materias se puede utilizar eso. Se puede hacer en forma de juegos, en forma de escribir, o en forma de memoria.</p> <p>St G: Si porque también, obviamente usar en otras materias porque podemos coger un tema y sacar las razones buenas y que tenemos</p>

	<p>que aprender de ese tema.</p> <p>St H: Pues a mí me parece que si lo puedo utilizar en otras clases porque nos ayuda a entender más el tema y completar lo que nos falta.</p> <p>St I: Pues si porque podríamos organizar nuestras ideas y dar muchas más ideas a lo que tenemos.</p> <p>St K: Pues a mí me gustaría que estuviera en más materias porque pues a mí se me dificulta aprender demasiado al tiempo, entonces pues sería mejor utilizar una gráfica para organizarlo y pues mejorar mi aprendizaje.</p> <p>St L: Pues ya hemos visto que los organizadores no los han mostrado en otras clases. Y para que, para recordar algunas cosas, para facilitarnos otras cosas. No aprendernos por decir lo que 10 páginas completas sino que podemos organizar todas colocar en 6 cuadros. Nos parece mucho más fácil ya que de la otra manera es mucho más complicado.</p> <p>St M: Si sirve para las demás clases porque uno ya tendría claro unas ideas organizadas frente al tema y podría pensar, no esto me hace falta, o esto ya lo completé.</p> <p>St N: Pues si me gustaría que estuviera en más materias porque tiene una idea principal y otras ideas también muy fáciles de organizar.</p> <p>St O: Pues a mí me parece que si lo puedo utilizar porque por ejemplo yo entendí más el tema con el organizador, y ya.</p> <p>St P: Si porque voy a dar un ejemplo. Por ejemplo en matemáticas a veces el Mister nos pone a copiar y copiar y pues sería mejor con una gráfica aquí para sacar el resumen y acá los números para hacer la operación.</p> <p>St Q: Pues si porque es como una manera de salirse de lo de siempre de estar escribiendo, escribiendo y podemos aprender mejor.</p> <p>St S: La dinámica me pareció buena así que si me gustaría que la aplicaran, no en algunas, sino en todas las materias para así poder nosotros por ejemplo cuando hay exámenes o evaluaciones, etc., tener una idea principal y eh, en el gráfico ya nosotros tenemos como para responder y hacerlo mejor y entonces mejorarlo. Pues si me gustaría para así nosotros poder tener una buena memoria además de eso y tener nuestras ideas totalmente claras a la hora de responder cualquier cosa sobre el tema que estemos viendo.</p> <p>St T: Pues sería chévere poner esos gráficos en las materias porque uno puede sacar la idea completa, como dice mi amigo (Student L), que 10 páginas que uno lea, lea, y lea pues no. En un gráfico uno puede leer lo principal.</p>
7. Do you think that your writing skill remains the	<p>St A: Pues a mí me parece que es diferente algunas veces porque antes pues normalmente hacíamos una actividad o algo así pero ahora me parece que estamos en base a otros temas entonces me</p>

<p>same or has changed? How?</p>	<p>parece que aprende uno más. Me parece que tal vez mi escritura mejoró un poco porque había palabras que no las sabía escribir muy bien, no sabía cómo se decían algunas cosas.</p> <p>St B: Pues claro porque al principio pues no entendía casi, pues ha cambiado porque he aprendido más palabras, he aprendido todos los temas.</p> <p>St C: Pues si porque yo antes no tenía mucho vocabulario y utilizando los organizadores fui aprendiendo más vocabulario y pues oraciones.</p> <p>St D: Si creo que he mejorado mi escritura a partir de las temáticas que hemos visto en la clase y las actividades propuestas en clase. Pues porque yo antes no entendía mucho, si entendía pero no mucho. Ahora se algunas palabras, nuevas conjugaciones.</p> <p>St E: Primero que todo no es igual, es diferente y ha cambiado porque cuando comenzamos el año era como acá está mi objetivo pero todos eran como Mister como se dice “how do you say” nadie entendía, tenía que buscar muchas palabras, tenía que usar el diccionario, y bueno los medios. Pero ahora preguntamos solo las palabras como difíciles que no hemos visto. Ya se nos facilita los temas como teacher finish, cosas así, porque ha cambiado mucho del primer periodo a este. Hay mucha más fluidez en el idioma y la escritura en el idioma, entonces se puede utilizar en esta materia pero hay mucha gente que dice que si se ve el cambio, otra que no se ve porque hay que es un poco más lento el proceso y van aprendiendo, pero hay otra gente más rápido que puede de un día para otro sacarlo. Digamos que en mi caso fue muy rápido porque yo tengo mucha fluidez en el Inglés, entonces, pues para mí me pareció fácil, pero me dio un poco duro porque algunas palabras no las entendía, me tocaba esforzarme más, pero ahí voy.</p> <p>St G: Pues si porque al principio de año cuando estábamos en avanzado pues no entendía muchas cosas pues siempre teníamos un tema fijo en el periodo. Pero en el último periodo usamos hartos temas pero con una solución, un argumento. Entonces si porque y también yo me siento que no sabía mucho de Inglés pero ya he mejorado y siento que he aprendido mucho.</p> <p>St H: Pues me parece como más fácil ahora porque antes yo no sabía unas cosas y pues ahora ya puedo completar mis ideas.</p> <p>St I: Pues muy buena la idea del organizador gráfico ya que poníamos nuestras ideas y antes cuando lo escribíamos no podíamos escribirlas muy bien ya que no teníamos como un apoyo o las palabras que no sabíamos en Inglés.</p> <p>St K: Pues yo no sabía argumentar una idea, y pues la aprendí a argumentar con los conectores y pues esto también me ayudó a mejorar el vocabulario eh, en general, y pues redactar mejor y conectar mejor mis ideas.</p> <p>St L: No, es diferente. Ha mejorado ya que cuando empezamos el</p>
----------------------------------	--

	<p>proyecto no teníamos mucho por decir, vocabulario, ideas de palabras que utilizábamos para crear oraciones, frases. Después de todo lo que nos has enseñado y de cómo utilizarlo creo que ya tenemos la idea más clara de cómo hacer todo.</p> <p>St M: Bueno, a mí parece que a mí antes me pasaba lo mismo, que me faltaban palabras que no sabía las palabras en Inglés entonces no sabía cómo complementar mis argumentos.</p> <p>St N: Yo mejoré mucho. Porque yo al principio del año cuando llegue ha avanzado pues fui aprendiendo más Inglés y se me facilito.</p> <p>St O: Es muy diferente porque al principio no sabía cómo hacerlo y me quedaba en blanco y pues ahora ya sé cómo hacer más argumentaciones y ya sé cómo organizarlo.</p> <p>St P: Pues antes no sabía el significado de unas palabras o no sabía con qué frases usarlas. Entonces ahora ya aprendí y en lo de la escritura digamos palabras como “understand” pues uno la entendía de una forma y se escribía de otra. Entonces he aprendido a cómo escribirlas.</p> <p>St Q: Si pues porque antes no sabía nada y pues he mejorado harto.</p> <p>St S: Tal vez a mí me iba mejor en hablar Inglés que escribirlo porque para mí la escritura es mucho más difícil porque necesitamos conectores, las palabras precisas y muchas veces no sabemos cómo expresar lo que queremos verdaderamente, así que si mejoró mi escritura en Inglés y además ahora sé cómo dar un argumento, o explicación del porqué, entonces me ayudó muchísimo ahora con los gráficos, con base en pequeñas partes, en pequeñas justificaciones o razones y se me facilita totalmente.</p> <p>St T: A mí antes se me dificultaba pues mucho, mucho, mucho. Porque antes no sabía algunas palabras. Ahorita que estamos en el gráfico ya podemos sacar, pues ya sabemos algunas más palabras que las pues que anteriormente. Ahorita ya tenemos conectores, tenemos razones, etc.</p>
<p>8. Do you consider that the GOs have enhanced your argumentative writing skill?</p>	<p>St A: Yo creería que si me ayudó porque aprendimos más palabras, cosas y todo eso. Entonces con eso ya sabíamos después cuando necesitemos dar una razón o algo así.</p> <p>St B: Si me parece que hemos mejorado mucho, ya ahora es mucho más fácil como entender.</p> <p>St C: Yo antes pues no sabía así mucho argumentar y pues aprendí a argumentar con conectores, y uno va aprendiendo más.</p> <p>St D: El proyecto si me ha ayudado porque yo casi me distraigo mucho y como el proyecto es divertido y distinto y cambia la dinámica y es mucho más chévere y aprendo más.</p> <p>St E: Si nos ha ayudado en eso y bastante cómo te lo he dicho en las anteriores preguntas porque digamos antes nosotros éramos como eh because y Mister como se dice esto. Ahora tenemos algo</p>

	<p>mucho más concreto que podemos escribir un párrafo y tú me puedes preguntar qué porque escogí esa solución y yo te puedo decir porque así es y yo te puedo explicar y tú me puedes decir que sí. Por otros casos, tu nos puedes decir que no, que tenemos que complementarlo. Y en mi caso, pues si demasiado, y pues yo en la mayoría me han quedado bien pero me faltaba a veces una conexión, o la razón. Entonces ahora, ya tengo mucha más fluidez.</p> <p>St G: Nos ayudó harto para tener una idea inicial, hemos aprendido algunas palabras y eso nos ha ayudado harto con las oraciones, con las soluciones que vamos a hacer, con los tips.</p> <p>St H: Pues si porque antes ponía una parte y ahora puedo complementar mis ideas.</p> <p>St I: Pues si porque antes escribía dos, tres renglones y ahora ya puedo escribir un párrafo completo, ya que tengo los conectores y demás ayudas para escribir toda mi idea.</p> <p>St K: Pues a mí se me hace que he mejorado porque antes yo no tenía ni idea de argumentar, pero pues de zero a como estoy ahora, pues ya es bastante para saber cómo argumentar, como sustentar, y como darme a entender.</p> <p>St L: Pues yo creo que si ya que el proyecto nos ha exigido mucho argumento, muchas razones y en eso hemos mejorado. Antes, yo no tenía ni idea de cómo argumentar una idea, ahora me voy sabiendo que es importante y que más adelante me a servir mucho.</p> <p>St M: Pues a mí me pareció que si porque antes me hacía falta el vocabulario y no sabía cómo completar o argumentar esa solución y como ya fuimos a medida del tiempo aprendiendo palabras, entonces los conectores también nos ayudaban.</p> <p>St N: Yo si tampoco no sabía argumentar muy bien. Bueno, no sabía. Y entonces ya con este tema, ya sé un poquito como argumentar mejor.</p> <p>St O: Si porque cuando antes ya no solo colocaba “I think” porque ahora ya puedo poner “because” porque ya entiendo más las palabras.</p> <p>St P: Si porque me ayudó harto. Digamos para argumentar lo que estoy diciendo. Eh, para antes digamos uno decía “I am play soccer”, ahora puedo agregarlo “going to” y -ing. Y pues si me gustó la temática del proyecto.</p> <p>St Q: Me ha ayudado a organizar las idea y todo eso.</p> <p>St S: Si, por ejemplo en castellano yo argumentaba lo mejor posible, pues ahora en Inglés creo que incluso lo hago mucho mejor porque se cómo argumentar y dar una explicación y además que tengo también conectores y palabras que me colaboran, así que si he mejorado en argumentación gracias a este proyecto.</p> <p>St T: Pues como lo decían ellos, pues a mí antes no sabía argumentar muy bien, pues ahorita ya se argumentar con el gráfico, con los conectores.</p>
--	--

Appendix R: Artifacts' chart

PARTICIPANT	INITIAL PRODUCT (WITHOUT INTERVENTION)	GRAPHIC ORGANIZERS	WRITING PRODUCTS
A	The participant did not use an expression to give his opinion nor a connector to join the ideas.	The three GOs had a clear solution; the first one did not include the arguments while the other two did. The first GO did not have numbers for the arguments while the other two did.	In all the three writing pieces, the participant used an expression to present his opinion, the two first had a connector of reason but the last did not. All of them included a clear solution and arguments. Most of the information used on the GOs was used on the products. All the products showed coherence.
B	This product did not have an expression to give an opinion nor a connector to join ideas.	None of the three GOs had numbers to follow the sequence of the arguments. Only the first showed a clear solution and arguments. On the second, the arguments were provided as different solutions.	The first illustrated an overused of the expressions to give her opinion due to it was presented in isolated sentences. The first two did not have a connector of reason while the last did. The last two did not offer clear arguments. Despite this, all showed coherent information. All of them showed resorted information from the GOs.
C	It presented a clear solution but there were no arguments. Neither an expression to give opinion nor a connector of reason was used.	There was not a clear solution in any of the GOs. Arguments were provided as other possible solutions. The first did not have numbers while the other two included numbers to organize the possible arguments.	All of them had an expression for giving opinion. The first did not have a connector of reason while the last two did. Number 1 and 3 did not have clear arguments while number 2 did. Number 2 showed coherence while number 1 and 3 did not. All of them

			demonstrated the use of the information had on the GOs.
D	It had a clear solution but there were no arguments. None any expression for giving opinion or connector of reason was used.	The first two showed clear solutions. The first illustrated clear arguments while the other two provided the description of the solution instead of an argument. The probable arguments were not numbered in any of the GOs.	All of the products presented clear solutions. Ups and downs when using expressions for giving opinion and connectors. Arguments were clearly provided only on the first. In spite of lacking arguments, the information presented was coherent. Most of information was retrieved from the GOs.
E	It stated a clear solution but did not present arguments. It did not use any expressions for giving opinion or connectors either.	There were no clear solutions and arguments were the extension of other solutions. Ups and downs when numbering the possible arguments.	There was an overused of the expression for giving opinion on the number 1 and 3. This happened because information was presented in isolated sentences. A connector of reason was only used in number 3. None presented supportive arguments. Conversely, they illustrated the description of the solution. Even though, the products showed coherent information displayed.
F	A clear solution was presented. However, there were no supportive arguments, expressions for giving opinion, or connectors.	All GOs had a clear solution. Ups and downs when presenting arguments (description of the solution became arguments in number 1 and 3). Numbering arguments were seen in number 2 and 3.	Use of expressions for giving opinion was evidenced in number 1 and 3. Use of connectors was seen in the last two. Clear solutions were stated in all of them. Arguments were provided as descriptors of the main solution, though; the

			information was coherent. The information on the GOs was used in all the products.
G	It had a clear solution but none arguments. There was no use of expressions for giving opinion or connectors of reason.	The three GOs presented clear solutions and arguments. Arguments were organized by numbering in the last two GOs.	Clear solutions and the use of expressions for giving opinion were presented in all the products. Connectors were used in number 2 and 3. Arguments were well stated in the last two with sufficient coherence. They evidenced that information was transferred from the GOs.
H	The solution was not clear, arguments were not provided, and there were no use of any expressions for giving opinion or connectors.	Clear solutions were stated in the first two GOs as well as the arguments. Possible arguments were numbered in the last two.	Clear solutions were stated in the first two products (the third one was not presented). Arguments were not well developed in any of the products. Consistent use of the expressions for giving opinion while connectors were not used. Evidence of using information from the GOs. Easy to read and understand.
I	Even it was a clear solution; there was no use of expressions for giving opinion or connectors of reason.	All the GOs presented clear solutions and numbering arguments, but only the last offered clear arguments.	All the products showed clear solutions, but only the last offered clear arguments which evidenced the influence of GOs information on the products. However, no use of expressions for giving opinion was observed. A connector of reason was only used in the last piece.
J	A clear solution was	Clear solutions were	Clear solutions were

	states, and ideas were mixed. There were no arguments, expressions for giving opinion, or connectors.	presented in all, but only the last one had clear arguments. Possible arguments were numbered in the last two GOs.	evidenced in all. Issues with arguments were observed in the second. Use of expressions for giving opinion was identified in number 1 and 3. Connectors were utilized in all the writings. The resort on the GOs for information was noticed. Coherence was a feature of all the products.
K	There was no coherence, a clear solution, the use of any expressions for giving opinion, connectors, or arguments.	There were clear solutions; clear arguments were evidenced only in the first. Possible arguments were numbered.	There were clear solutions stated in the first two. Supportive arguments were provided in the first, the other two presented descriptive information of the solution. This illustrated the influence of using the GO. Nevertheless, the information presented in all was very coherent. In all, expressions for giving opinion and connectors were used.
L	A clear solution was introduced but arguments were not. There was no use of expressions for giving opinion or arguments.	Clear solutions were stated. Clear arguments were presented only in number 2. Numbering arguments was used in the last two.	Clear solutions were evidenced. However, no clear arguments were provided. This demonstrated the influence of using the information from the GOs. Use of expressions for giving opinion was clear but a connector was used only in number 2. Despite the absence of supportive arguments, the products were easy to follow and understand.
M	It was a listing of ideas,	There were no clear	Clear solutions appeared

	difficult to understand, the solution was not clear, and expressions of giving opinion and connectors were not used.	and specific solutions, arguments were not observed. The possible arguments were numbered since the second.	since the second to the third, no clear arguments were identified; expressions for giving opinion appeared in number 2 and 3. Connectors were used only in number 3. The use of information on the GOs was evidenced. Good coherence was seen only in number 2.
N	It presented a clear solution, but arguments were not observed. Also, it was missing the use of any expression for giving opinion and connector.	A clear conclusion was observed until number 3 as some clear arguments. The possible arguments were not organized by numbers.	Clear solutions were stated in all the products. Some clear arguments were presented only in number 2. The other intended arguments were stated at random. This evidenced no order on the GOs. The use of any expression for giving opinion was observed in all. A connector was only used in number 2. There was some presence in coherence in the second.
O	A clear solution was introduced. However, there were no arguments, expressions for giving opinion, or connectors.	Clear solutions were stated but no clear arguments. The intended arguments were numbered.	Clear solutions were observed. No clear arguments were provided as happened in the GOs. Use of expressions for giving opinion was consistent. The use of connectors was evidenced only in the last product. Coherence was observed throughout the products.
P	It showed lack of coherence. The proposed solution was not clear, there were no	Solutions were clearly identified. Clear arguments were evidenced in number 1	On the first product, there was no a clear solution, no arguments, no connector (the

	arguments, and expressions for giving opinion or connectors were not observed.	and 3. Arguments were organized by numbers in the second and third.	participant did not use the GO when writing the solution). Clear solutions were observed on the other two, but clear arguments appeared only in the last. Expressions for giving opinion appeared in all while connectors were observed in number 2 and 3. Coherence was more evident in number 2 and 3.
Q	N.A.	Clear solutions were easy observable. However, different solutions were stated as arguments. The intended arguments were organized using numbers since the second.	The use of expressions for giving opinion was observed in all the products. Connectors were used in number 2 and 3. Clear solutions were evidenced in the first two and arguments were not provided as in the GOs. They were very coherent writings.
R	It had a clear solution. Arguments were not observed neither expressions for giving opinion or connectors.	All the GOs evidenced a clear solution but the arguments were presented as different solutions. The numbering strategy was not used to organize the intended arguments.	Clear and concrete solutions were identified as well as arguments. Use of expressions for giving opinion and connector was observed. Information was present coherently and retrieved from the GOs.
S	It presented many possible solutions and without arguments. There was no use of expressions for giving opinion or connectors.	The solutions were clearly observed. Some arguments looked clear while others seemed to be descriptive. All intended arguments were organized by numbering.	Clear solutions were stated but no clear arguments. Consistent use of expressions for giving opinion and connectors. Use of information from the GOs was demonstrated. Coherence was difficult to follow on the last product.

T	A clear solution was stated. Arguments were not provided. The use of expressions for giving opinion and connectors was not observed.	Clear solutions were hard to identify. Clear arguments were not observed. The numbering strategy for the intended arguments was only used in the last GO.	Clear solutions were better identified (except in the last product). Clear arguments were not noticed as in the GOs. Ups and downs when using expressions for giving opinion and connectors. Coherence was somewhat evidenced.
----------	--	---	--

Appendix S: Color coding technique

Initial survey	
“Se me dificultó escribir la solución porque no sabía cómo dar mi opinión” (Participant B)	Difficulty in giving an opinion
“Fue difícil escribir la solución porque no sabía cómo escribir mi opinión” (Participant C)	
“Me pareció un poco difícil escribir mi solución porque no sabía cómo dar mi opinión en Inglés” (Participant S)	
“No me pareció fácil escribir los argumentos para mi solución porque todos son posibles, no tenía una idea concreta” (Participant C)	Issues for clarifying ideas
“No fue fácil escribir mi solución porque no tenía claras mis ideas” (Participant F)	
“Fue un poco difícil escribir las razones ya que no tenía clara la solución” (Participant F)	
“Me fue difícil porque hay muchas formas de solución” (Participant L)	Narrowing ideas
“No me pareció fácil escribir los argumentos para mi solución porque todos son posibles, no tenía una idea concreta” (Participant C)	
“Me fue difícil porque hay muchas formas de solución” (Participant L)	Problems to join ideas
“Me fue difícil escribir las razones del problema porque no sabía palabras para unir mis ideas” (Participant B)	Difficulty in organizing ideas
“Me pareció difícil escribir las razones porque no sabía cómo organizarlas” (Participant G)	
“No fue fácil escribir mi solución porque no tenía el conocimiento en Inglés y no sabía cómo organizar mis ideas” (Participant I)	
“No me fue fácil escribir la solución y dar razones porque no es fácil organizar mis ideas, me demoro mucho, y no entiendo” (Participant K)	
“Me pareció difícil escribir la solución porque me confundía al escribir y no organizaba bien mis ideas” (Participant O)	
“Me fue difícil escribir los argumentos porque no sabía cómo organizarlos” (Participant P)	
“Se me dificultó un poco escribir mi solución porque no sabía cómo organizar mis ideas” (Participant Q)	
“Me pareció difícil escribir mi solución y razones porque no sabía cómo organizar mis ideas” (Participant R)	
“Me fue difícil escribir mi solución y argumentos porque no sabía organizar bien mis ideas” (Participant T)	
“No fue fácil escribir la solución y las razones porque no	

sabía algunas palabras y no sabía cómo unir algunas” (Participant M)	Lack of vocabulary
“Fue difícil escribir mi solución porque no sabía cómo escribirla en Inglés” (Participant N)	
“Me pareció difícil escribir las razones porque no tenía mucho vocabulario” (Participant Q)	
“No fue fácil escribir la solución y las razones porque no sabía algunas palabras y no sabía cómo unir algunas” (Participant M)	Lack of connectors
“Me pareció difícil escribir las razones porque no sabía cómo unir mis ideas” (Participant N)	
“Fue un poco difícil escribir las razones porque no sabía cómo unir las” (Participant S)	
“No me fue fácil escribir la solución y dar razones porque no es fácil organizar mis ideas, me demoro mucho, y no entiendo” (Participant K)	Difficulty in understanding a topic
“Se me dificultó dar razones porque no conocía mucho del tema” (Participant O)	

Final survey instrument	
“Si me pareció fácil escribir la solución usando los organizadores porque <i>creo que tenía todo claro</i> ” (Participant A)	Clarifying ideas
“Un organizador es como un mapa conceptual pero con él <i>podemos aclarar nuestras ideas</i> ” (Participant A)	
“Me pareció que si fue fácil escribir la solución porque <i>tenía el concepto claro en el organizador</i> ” (Participant C)	
“Me pareció fácil escribir las razones porque <i>ya tenía mis ideas claras en el organizador</i> ” (Participant P)	
“Si me pareció escribir las razones porque <i>entendí muy bien el tema</i> ” (Participant A)	Understanding information
“Creo que si fue fácil escribir la solución porque <i>ya teníamos más conocimiento sobre el tema</i> ” (Participant E)	
“Si me pareció fácil escribir las razones porque <i>comprendía el tema y cada vez sabía más vocabulario</i> ” (Participant M)	
“Me fue fácil escribir la solución porque <i>ya sabía un poco más del tema</i> ” (Participant O)	
“El organizador es fácil de hacer y <i>fácil de entender</i> ” (Participant Q)	
“Un organizador es un mapa que sirve para <i>organizar ideas</i> y complementar soluciones” (Participant B)	
“Un organizador es como un gráfico para <i>organizar</i>	

<i>ideas</i> ” (Participant D)	Organizing information
“Es como un mapa conceptual que sirve para <i>organizar tus ideas</i> ” (Participant E)	
“Es un mapa donde pude <i>organizar mis ideas</i> sobre el tema visto en clase” (Participant H)	
“Ayudan a <i>organizar tus ideas</i> ” (Participant I)	
“Es una herramienta que facilita el aprendizaje y <i>ayuda a organizar las ideas</i> ” (Participant K)	
“Es un mapa de conceptos donde uno <i>organiza ideas, opiniones, o razones</i> ” (Participant M)	
“Un gráfico donde <i>organizo mis razones, mis opiniones, y mis soluciones desde mi punto de vista</i> ” (Participant S)	
“Si me fue fácil escribir la solución porque <i>ya sabíamos más vocabulario</i> ” (Participant B)	Learning vocabulary
“Si me pareció fácil escribir las razones <i>ya que al tener vocabulario era simple</i> ” (Participant C)	
“Si me pareció fácil escribir las razones porque <i>ya teníamos más vocabulario para las soluciones y ya teníamos el vocabulario correcto</i> ” (Participant E)	
“Fue fácil escribir la solución porque <i>pude aprender más vocabulario y fue más sencillo</i> ” (Participant H)	
“Si fue fácil escribir las razones <i>porque aprendí más vocabulario</i> ” (Participant H)	
“Si fue fácil escribir la solución porque <i>ya sabía más vocabulario y conectores</i> ” (Participant M)	
“Fue un poco más fácil porque <i>ya sabía más vocabulario</i> ” (Participant P)	
“Si fue fácil escribir la razón porque <i>ya tenía la solución y el por qué en el organizador</i> ” (Participant O)	Having a previous idea
“Si me pareció fácil escribir las razones porque <i>en el organizador gráfico ya lo teníamos todo, solo era organizarlo</i> ” (Participant N)	
“Si me pareció fácil porque <i>era una solución que ya había planteado en el organizador</i> ” (Participant I)	
“Si fue fácil escribir la solución porque <i>ya teníamos la idea en el organizador</i> ” (Participant T)	
“Si fue fácil escribir las razones porque <i>teníamos una idea principal en el organizador</i> ” (Participant L)	Narrowing ideas
“Con el gráfico <i>ya podía expresar mis ideas concretas y mis opiniones mucho mejor</i> ” (Participant O)	

FOCUS GROUP INSTRUMENT	
------------------------	--

“Me pareció fácil usar los organizadores porque me parece que <i>pude pensar muy bien todo</i> ” (Participant A)	
--	--

“Pues a mí me parece que los organizadores gráficos <i>nos han ayudado a organizarnos</i> ” (Participant E)	Organizing ideas
“Pues fue fácil utilizarlos porque podíamos <i>organizar bien las ideas y tener un concepto más claro de lo que podemos decir</i> ” (Participant I)	
“Pues fue fácil usar los organizadores porque <i>uno puede organizar las ideas, las razones con las opiniones que tiene frente al tema</i> ” (Participant M)	
“Para mí fue pues fácil usarlos porque <i>era la manera de organizar las ideas en base a una idea principal</i> ” (Participant P)	
“Me pareció sencillo, el gráfico me ayudó a que yo <i>podiera organizar mis ideas mucho más claro, mis razones</i> , y porque esta es la mejor solución para el problema que tenemos” (Participant S)	
“Me pareció muy buenos <i>porque organizaban nuestras ideas con base a eso y ya no necesitábamos tanta ayuda</i> ” (Participant D)	
“A mí me ayudó pues porque <i>yo no sabía organizar mis ideas, y pues ahí ya teníamos ideas para organizarlas y conectarlas</i> ” (Participant K)	
“Porque <i>el organizador ya tenía un orden, ya sabía cómo era que lo iba a hacer, lo que iba escribir, solo faltaban los conectores</i> ” (Participant O)	
“Me ha ayudado a <i>organizar las idea s y todo eso</i> ” (Participant Q)	
“Me pareció fácil usar los organizadores porque me parece que <i>pude pensar muy bien todo</i> ” (Participant A)	Clarifying ideas
“Pues fue fácil utilizarlos porque podíamos <i>organizar bien las ideas y tener un concepto más claro de lo que podemos decir</i> ” (Participant I)	
“Me pareció sencillo, el gráfico me ayudó a que yo <i>podiera organizar mis ideas mucho más claro, mis razones</i> , y porque esta es la mejor solución para el problema que tenemos” (Participant S)	
“A mí me pareció que sí me ayudaron porque <i>eran fáciles, teníamos conceptos claros</i> ” (Participant M)	
“Fácil escribir las razones por el graphic organizer porque <i>podíamos hacer algo más concreto, algo muy específico</i> ” (participant D)	
“A mí también me pareció fácil usarlos porque <i>daban una idea concreta</i> ” (Participant N)	

“Pues si me ayudaron porque eran como una guía para nosotros hacer nuestro escrito o texto y así podíamos unir ideas y <i>hacer una idea más concreta</i> ” (Participant I)	Narrowing information
“Si porque <i>los organizadores son una idea concreta</i> ” (Participant N)	
“Pues es que <i>era fácil y bueno porque ya teníamos la idea concreta</i> ” (Participant I)	
“Para mí fue pues fácil usarlos porque <i>era la manera de organizar las ideas en base a una idea principal</i> ” (Participant P)	
“A mí me ayudó mucho porque pues <i>ya podía hacer la solución en el gráfico y pues una idea concreta</i> ” (Participant T)	
“Para mí fue fácil usarlos porque <i>entendí los temas concretamente</i> ” (Participant D)	Understanding information
“Si me ayudaron porque <i>entendí mejor el tema antes de escribir la solución</i> ” (Participant A)	
“A mí me parece que nos ayudó porque te ayudaban para que tú te centraras en lo que tenías que escribir en el gráfico. <i>Me ayudó a entender</i> ” (Participant E)	
“Si me parece que hemos mejorado mucho, ya <i>ahora es mucho más fácil como entender</i> ” (Participant B)	
“Porque con eso ya sabía cuál era mi idea y aparte <i>entendí más como argumentar mis palabras</i> ” (Participant O)	Providing guidance/ support
“Los organizadores si me ayudaron porque pues para explicar de pronto uno no sabía, entonces <i>el gráfico le ayudaba pues para guiarse más en el tema</i> ” (Participant B)	
“Si porque siento que <i>con el organizador uno se iba ayudando, era cómo un apoyo para después lograr hacer la solución</i> ” (Participant C)	
“Pues si me ayudaron porque <i>eran como una guía para nosotros hacer nuestro escrito o texto y así podíamos unir ideas y hacer una idea más concreta</i> ” (Participant I)	
“A mí se me complicó porque pues yo no sabía argumentar y yo no podía dar razones a lo que yo escribía y <i>con el gráfico pues y me guiaba y por ejemplo a tener razones de mis argumentos</i> ” (Participant K)	
“A mí me pareció fácil usar los organizadores <i>porque escribíamos las razones</i> ” (Participant H)	
“Pues la solución era como, eh ya lo tengo, ya no lo habíamos aprendido y <i>era fácil sacar razones de nuestra solución</i> ” (Participant C)	
“A mí se me complicó porque pues yo no sabía argumentar y yo no podía dar razones a lo que yo escribía y con el gráfico pues y me guiaba y por ejemplo <i>a tener razones de mis</i>	

<i>argumentos</i> ” (Participant K)	Defining arguments
“Es muy diferente porque al principio no sabía cómo hacerlo y me quedaba en blanco y pues <i>ahora ya sé cómo hacer más argumentaciones y ya sé cómo organizarlo</i> ” (Participant O)	
“ <i>Ahora sé cómo dar un argumento, o explicación del porqué</i> ” (Participant S)	
“Yo antes pues no sabía así mucho argumentar y pues <i>aprendí a argumentar con conectores</i> ” (Participant C)	
“Ahora tenemos algo mucho más concreto que podemos escribir un párrafo y tú me puedes preguntar qué porque escogí esa solución y <i>yo te puedo decir porque así es y yo te puedo explicar</i> ” (Participant E)	
“Si porque <i>antes de escribir ya teníamos en el organizador una idea para escribir la solución</i> ” (Participant O)	Having a previous plan
“A mí me colaboró porque <i>ahí en el gráfico ya tenía la solución y mis razones</i> ” (Participant S)	
“Pues me ayudó ya que <i>pues uno con la idea y con todo ya listo, crear más argumentos ya sería más sencillo</i> ” (Participant L)	
“A mí me ayudaron bastante, mucho ¿porque? <i>Porque ya en el gráfico ya tenía una solución</i> ” (Participant T)	
“Pues me ayudó porque <i>ya teníamos las ideas</i> ” (Participant H)	
“Si me ayudó a escribir la solución porque ya conocía el problema, causas del problema, consecuencias del problema, <i>uno ya va a tener una idea de cómo quería hacer la solución, qué hay que hacer, hay que hacer esto, hay que ayudar a esto, no hay que hacer esto</i> ” (Participant L)	
“Pues me pareció que si porque uno <i>ya tenía las ideas frente al tema en el organizador y ya podía hacer la solución con esas ideas que uno ya tenía a priori</i> ” (Participant M)	
“Si me ayudó a escribir la solución porque <i>el organizador ya tenía sus razones, su idea principal</i> ” (Participant N)	
“A mí me ayudó porque ya en el organizador tenía, era solo los conectores, utilizar los conectores, escribirla. <i>El gráfico me ayudó mucho porque ya tenía una idea</i> ” (Participant T)	
“Había una <i>conexión para elegir las palabras</i> pues como para complementar más el tema y buscar más acerca de eso” (Participant B)	
“Pues a mí me parece que si nos ayudó a escribir nuestras razones porque nosotros al comienzo estábamos muy confundidos y eso <i>nos ayudaba a que buscáramos las palabras correctas, a que buscáramos las uniones y cómo comenzar</i> ” (Participant E)	
“Si me ayudaron pues para escribir la solución <i>porque me</i>	

<i>ayudaba a buscar las palabras</i> ” (Participant B)	
“Nos ayudó <i>harto</i> para tener una idea inicial, hemos <i>aprendido algunas palabras</i> y eso nos ha ayudado <i>harto</i> con las oraciones, con las soluciones que vamos a hacer” (Participant G)	
“Pues a mí me parece que si nos ayudó porque <i>encontrábamos las palabras y las uniones</i> ahí, aparecía pues puedes utilizar esto” (Participant E)	
“Me parece que tal vez mi escritura mejoró un poco porque <i>había palabras que no las sabía escribir muy bien, no sabía cómo se decían algunas cosas</i> ” (Participant A)	
“Mi escritura ha cambiado porque <i>he aprendido más palabras, he aprendido todos los temas</i> ” (Participant B)	
“Pues si porque yo antes no tenía mucho vocabulario y utilizando los organizadores <i>fui aprendiendo más vocabulario y pues oraciones</i> ” (Participant C)	
“ <i>Ahora se algunas palabras</i> ” (Participant D)	
“ <i>Antes tenía que buscar muchas palabras, tenía que usar el diccionario</i> ” (Participant E)	
“Ha mejorado ya que cuando empezamos el proyecto no teníamos mucho por decir, <i>vocabulario, ideas de palabras que utilizábamos para crear oraciones, frases</i> ” (Participant L)	
“A mí parece que a mí antes me pasaba lo mismo, que <i>me faltaban palabras que no sabía las palabras en Inglés entonces no sabía cómo complementar mis argumentos</i> ” (Participant M)	
“Entonces si porque y también <i>yo me siento que no sabía mucho de Inglés pero ya he mejorado y siento que he aprendido mucho</i> ” (Participant G)	Feeling assurance
“Yo mejoré mucho. Porque yo al principio del año cuando llegue ha avanzado <i>pues fui aprendiendo más Inglés y se me facilito</i> ” (Participant N)	
“Si pues porque <i>antes no sabía nada y pues he mejorado harto.</i> ” (Participant Q)	

QUESTIONNAIRE INSTRUMENT	
“Sí porque <i>nos hizo más organizados para escribir</i> ” (Participant E)	
“Si fueron útiles porque <i>me ayudaron a organizar mis ideas</i> ” (Participant I)	
“Si me ayudaron a mejorar mi habilidad argumentativa porque <i>al tener mis ideas organizadas es más fácil de argumentar.</i> ” (Participant I)	

“El organizador me ayudó a escoger mi solución porque <i>organizaba el problema y era más sencillo</i> ” (Participant K)	Organizing information
“Si me ayudó a mejorar mi habilidad argumentativa porque <i>sabía cómo organizar mis ideas</i> ” (Participant M)	
“Si me ayudaron a mejorar mi habilidad argumentativa <i>porque aprendí a organizar mejor mis ideas</i> ” (Participant O)	
“Mi habilidad argumentativa es bastante buena ahora porque <i>organizo mejor mis ideas</i> ” (Participant O)	
“Si me ayudó a escoger la solución porque <i>al organizar todo podía encontrar la respuesta</i> ” (Participant O)	
“Si fueron útiles <i>porque nos ayudó a organizar nuestras opiniones</i> ” (Participant P)	
“Si me parecieron útiles porque me ayudaba a dar mis ideas mucho más claras, <i>a organizar mis opiniones y a ser más ordenada con mis respuestas</i> ” (Participant S)	
“ <i>Ahora mis argumentos son organizados, sustentados, y bien hechos</i> ” (Participant S)	
“Si me ayudaron a escoger una solución porque <i>podíamos sacar fácilmente muchas ideas</i> ” (Participant A)	Clarifying information
“Si me ayudaron a escoger una solución porque <i>podíamos dar ideas</i> ” (Participant C)	
“Si <i>me ayudaron a lograr buenas ideas</i> para la solución dada a cualquier problema” (Participant F)	
“Si me sentí tranquila <i>ya que mis ideas estaban claras</i> ” (Participant F)	
“Si me ayudaron porque <i>me aclararon cosas que no entendía muy bien</i> ” (Participant H)	
“Si me ayudaron a escoger una solución porque <i>las ideas no se combinaban y podía escoger mi solución más fácil</i> ” (Participant H)	
“Si porque el ver mis ideas en el organizador <i>me ayudó a escoger la solución</i> ” (Participant I)	
“Si porque los organizadores <i>me ayudaron a responder con claridad</i> ” (Participant J)	Learning vocabulary
“Si fueron una herramienta útil porque <i>nos ayudaron a aprender más vocabulario</i> ” (Participant B)	
“Mi habilidad argumentativa si es mucho mejor porque <i>antes no sabíamos muchas palabras</i> ” (Participant B)	
“Mi habilidad si mejoró porque <i>antes no sabía algunas cosas cómo usar algunas palabras</i> ” (Participant F)	
“Si me ayudaron a mejorar mi habilidad porque <i>aprendía más vocabulario y podía dar razones</i> ” (Participant H)	
“Si me ayudaron porque <i>tenía vocabulario y podía escoger las palabras para organizar mis ideas</i> ” (Participant M)	
“Si me ayudaron a escribir porque <i>aprendí algunas palabras nuevas o cómo utilizarlas correctamente</i> ” (Participant N)	
“Los organizadores <i>me ayudaron a dar explicaciones</i> ” (Participant C)	

“ <i>Me ayudaron mucho a la hora de explicar</i> ” (Participant K)	Providing arguments
“ <i>Si ha mejorado porque ahora expreso mi opinión con una solución sustentada y con mejor redacción</i> ” (Participant S)	
“ <i>Los gráficos fueron útiles porque pudimos aprender más el tema dado</i> ” (Participant F)	Understanding information
“ <i>Si estaba más tranquilo para escribir mi solución porque podía mirar los organizadores</i> ” (Participant D)	Feeling assurance
“ <i>Si porque nos ayuda a tener más confianza en sí mismo y te ayuda a escribir</i> ” (Participant E)	
“ <i>Mi habilidad argumentativa si ha cambiado demasiado porque ahora tenemos más confianza y antes era muy difícil escribir</i> ” (Participant E)	
“ <i>Si me ayudaron a estar más tranquilo porque poníamos todas las ideas ahí y podía dar la solución más fácil</i> ” (Participant H)	
“ <i>Me ayudaron a no temer al dar mi opinión</i> ” (Participant K)	
“ <i>Si porque de acuerdo a las ideas que tenía en el organizador podía hacer la solución con más confianza</i> ” (Participant M)	
“ <i>Si me sentí más tranquilo porque el problema propuesto lo sabíamos muy bien con los organizadores</i> ” (Participant N)	
“ <i>Si estaba más tranquilo porque nos daban más claridad al responder</i> ” (Participant P)	