
This is the **published version** of the article:

Graham, Adam; Dooly, Melinda. The use of L1 in student-student interactions in a collaborative learning context. 2018. 43 p.

This version is available at <https://ddd.uab.cat/record/199301>

under the terms of the  license

The use of L1 in student-student interactions in a collaborative learning context

Adam Graham

Tutor: Melinda Dooly
Master's dissertation
June 2018



Màster oficial de formació de professorat
d'educació secundària obligatòria i batxillerat, formació
professional i ensenyaments d'idiomes

Acknowledgements

First of all, I would like to thank my tutor, Melinda Dooly, for her helpful comments and guidance while writing this dissertation.

Secondly, I would like to thank my school mentor, Carlos González, for his support, insight and patience during my school placement. I would also like to thank the rest of the teaching staff at my placement school for all their helpful advice and kindness. But I would like to extend a special thanks to the members of the English department who took us under their wing and allowed us to implement our teaching unit in their classes.

Almost most importantly, I would like to thank my students I had the pleasure to work with and who were welcoming and patient with their “newby” English teachers. Without their support, and especially those students who took part in this study, this dissertation would not have been possible.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my fellow master’s students who undertook this sometimes arduous journey with me this year, making the experience fun and enriching. Of course, on a final note, I would like to thank my partner who helped me immensely along my path to becoming a teacher with their encouragement and unconditional support.

Table of Contents

1. Abstract and keywords	4
2. Introduction and research questions	5
3. Theoretical framework	7
4. Methodology	12
4.1 Contextualisation and research design	12
4.2 Data management	15
4.3 Data limitations	16
5. Analysis	18
5.1 Task management	18
5.2 Scaffolding strategies	24
5.3 Task accomplishments	28
6. Discussion	32
7. Conclusions	36
8. References	38
9. Appendices	40
9.1 Transcription symbols	40
9.2 Task materials	41
9.3 Video data	43

1. Abstract

This paper examines the L1 interactions of four Catalan teenagers engaged in small group work during a communicative task in the L2 classroom. The data was gathered in a state secondary school in Greater Barcelona and the participants collectively planned the content and implementation of a short video. Looking at the data from a discourse analysis angle, this paper aims to observe the *translanguaging* practices employed by the four learners in their L1 to co-construct their L2 production and the ways in which L1 use can provide opportunities for L2 learning.

Keywords: L1, *translanguaging*, interaction, plurilingualism, scaffolding, EFL, communicative tasks.

Resum

Aquest estudi examina les interaccions en L1 de quatre adolescents catalans que treballen en grup reduït durant una tasca comunicativa a l'aula d'L2. Les dades es van recollir en un institut de secundària públic de l'àrea metropolitana de Barcelona. Els participants planifiquen col·lectivament els continguts i la implementació d'un vídeo. Partint d'una anàlisi del discurs de les dades, aquest estudi pretén observar les pràctiques de *translanguaging* en l'L1 utilitzades pels quatre estudiants per co-construir la producció en L2 i les maneres en les quals l'ús de l'L1 pot conduir a l'aprenentatge de l'L2.

Paraules clau: L1, *translanguaging*, interacció, plurilingüisme, bastida, EFL, tasques comunicatives.

2. Introduction and research questions

Interaction is one of the bywords of current foreign language education practices. One way in which interaction can be fostered is through pair work or small group work. In classrooms following a communicative approach, it is believed that by allowing language learners to engage in small group tasks, this will increase foreign language exposure and practice amongst learners as well as making learning more meaningful than in traditional teacher-fronted classrooms.

However, perhaps incongruously, there are some teachers who are reluctant to allow group work in their classrooms. They believe that group work gives rise to extensive use of the L1, effectively defeating the purpose of the foreign language communicative classroom if much of the communication is carried out in the learners' mother tongue(s).

Yet is it really so misguided to allow learners to express themselves in their L1 while they are engaging in communicative tasks in the L2 classroom? This paper aims to explore the common misconception that the L1 has no place in the L2 classroom. In a case study conducted in an English class in a Catalan state secondary school, the uses four teenage participants make of their L1 while carrying out a video role play task will be analysed to examine the ways in which L1 use can be conducive to L2 language learning. Based on this case study, the following research questions will be pursued in this paper:

- 1) In which ways do learners make use of their L1 to co-construct their L2 production?
- 2) How can L1 use be helpful to facilitating L2 learning?

In an attempt to answer these research questions, this paper will look at the constraints of "communicative approach" curriculums with regards to guaranteeing plurilingualism and fully accepting the reality of *translanguaging* practices in foreign language classrooms. Moreover, the paper will specifically analyse the ways in which the selected group of English learners use their L1 to help their L2 production by looking at concepts such as collective

scaffolding, task management practices and private speech. This analysis aims to argue why *translanguaging* practices and the use of the L1 can be useful to L2 learning and why they can be beneficial in L2 classrooms, rather than harmful.

3. Theoretical framework

Nowadays national curriculums for teaching modern foreign languages emphasise the need to develop *communicative competence*, defined by Hymes as not only “inherent grammatical competence but also as the ability to use grammatical competence in a variety of communicative situations” (as cited in Bagarić & Djigunović, 2007, p. 95). Indeed, the Catalan curriculum for foreign languages at ESO level (obligatory secondary education) specifically talks about “communicative and linguistic competence” as the “ability to express and interpret concepts, thoughts, feelings, facts and opinions in oral and written language”¹ (Generalitat de Catalunya, 2017). This focus on developing *communicative competence* in modern foreign languages largely pushes the agenda of communicative language teaching which requires “meaningful communication to attain communicative fluency in ESL settings” (Wen, 2008). Tognini and Oliver (2012) in their study into L1 use in foreign language (FL) classrooms in Australia describe communicative classrooms as having “learning outcomes that focus on developing students’ ability to communicate effectively and appropriately in the target language orally and in writing” (p. 54). They further observe that in order to meet these learning outcomes, teachers need to provide learners with “opportunities for interaction with themselves and importantly with peers through a range of activities and tasks and to encourage reflection on L2 form” (p. 54).

A key feature of communicative classrooms is interaction, which involves at least two individuals who “participate in an oral and/or written exchange in which production and reception alternate and may in fact overlap in oral communication”, as defined in the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 14). One way to foster interactions between learners is group work. According to definitions of group work by Brufee (1984) and Goodlad (1984) in Alley (2005), group work is where a teacher poses a problem and organises the students to solve the

¹ Due to a lack of official English translations available of Generalitat documents, translations have been provided by the student-researcher

problem collaboratively and helps the students develop critical thinking skills (Alley, 2005, p. 251). This is backed up by the Catalan FL curriculum which encourages the implementation of pair and group work in FL classrooms: “the classroom model where interaction is basically teacher-student is now entirely insufficient; pair and small-group activities in which the students have to communicate with each other [...] significantly help to improve the amount of time each pupil uses the language” (Generalitat de Catalunya, 2015, p. 7).

However, despite what would seem like only advantages to implementing group work to foster interaction in the FL classroom, it is true that many teachers are still reluctant to include group work in their teaching as they see it as being counterproductive due to the considerable use of the students’ L1 (Swain & Lapkin, 2000, p. 268). There is a pressure for teachers to adhere to the monolingual approach which argues that “L1 has no essential role in the EFL/ESL classroom and that it might deprive students of valuable input in the L2 and impede progress” (Bhooth, Azman & Ismail, 2014, p. 76). This view has been snapped up by curriculum writers, with the Catalan curriculum for modern languages stating that “the communication of the teacher must be in the language the students are learning” (Generalitat de Catalunya, 2015, p. 7). By prohibiting the use of the students’ first language in the classroom on the part of the teachers, but also by extension discouraging L1 use in student-student interactions, this is largely ignoring the bilingual nature of FL classrooms and the fact that L1 use is a reality in these classrooms (Tognini & Oliver, 2012, p. 53).

However, lessons from bilingual educational contexts have shown that allowing students to use their L1 can actually have a positive effect on L2 production (Cummins, 1981). Indeed, Cummins argues against the Separate Underlying Proficiency (SUP) model where L1 and L2 proficiency are entirely separate, stating that bilingualism is in fact based on a Common Underlying Proficiency (CUP) model where “proficiency in L1 and L2 are seen as common or interdependent across languages” (Cummins as cited in García & Wei, 2014, p. 13). This began to challenge the long-held structural notion of *code-switching* where speakers “shift or [...] shuttle between two languages”

(García & Wei, 2014), but rather that bilingual speakers in fact make use of “complex interrelated discursive practices” selecting features from a “complete language repertoire”. This perceptual difference is known as *translanguaging*, originally coined in Welsh by Cen Williams (García & Wei, 2014, p. 20), but has since been largely developed by Ofelia García.

Although the above concepts are largely concerned with minority bilinguals living in a country with a dominant language of education (such is the case of study of Ofelia García with Hispanic communities in the United States), the concepts of a CUP model and *translanguaging* practices can also be applied to the foreign language classroom. Indeed, the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (CEFR) developed by the Council of Europe now considers the concept of plurilingualism to be central to language learning. The plurilingual approach, as defined by the Council of Europe, states that a language learner as they progress in their mother tongue(s) or foreign languages “does not keep these languages and cultures in strictly separated mental compartments, but rather builds up a communicative competence to which all knowledge and experience of language contributes and in which languages interrelate and interact.” (Council of Europe, 2001). This definition moves away from the social construct of languages being distinct entities which should be kept separate from each other, and towards the notion of non-competing bilingual practices as speakers pull resources from “one system from which students select appropriate features” (García & Wei, 2014, p. 73). Moreover, García expands on the benefits of *translanguaging* practices in both foreign and second language programmes working towards communicative competence and critical thinking skills, saying that these “cannot happen without translanguaging, for students cannot engage in meaningful discussion, comprehension or designing and redesigning of texts with only a set of emergent language practices” (García & Wei, 2014, p. 73).

Despite some educators believing that allowing L1 use does not contribute much to the development of a new language, it is important to remember that a key feature of peer interaction in group work is the use of the L1 (Tognini &

Oliver, 2012, p. 55). Although, as previously mentioned, this has been seen by many teachers as counterproductive in that the learners are not solely engaging in exchanges in their L2 (Swain & Lapkin, 2000, p. 268), the use of L1 in student-student interactions has also been found to possess functions which can be conducive to constructing L2 knowledge (Anton & Dicamilla 1998; Swain & Lapkin 2000; Bhooth, Azman & Ismail 2014).

L1 use in collaborative group work has been found to have social and cognitive functions offering opportunities to learn (Tognini & Oliver, 2012, p. 56). This is also reflected by Atkinson who says the L1 can stimulate “cooperation among learners” to allow them to share ideas and ask each other for help (as cited in Bhooth, Azman and Ismail, 2014, p. 78).

Swain and Lapkin (2000) found that collaborative dialogue in the L1 or the L2 can mediate L2 learning. This collaborative dialogue is a learner problem-solving and knowledge-building strategy and by engaging in this dialogue, they are able to co-construct their L2 and build on their knowledge of it (p. 254). This ties in with the Vygotskian concept of the zone of proximal development (ZPD) where the use of L1 in group work serves as a scaffolding strategy allowing students to cognitively process a task at a higher level than in the L2 alone (Morahan, as cited in Bhooth, Azman & Ismail, 2014, p. 77). Storch and Wigglesworth (2003) concur stating that the L1 can offer a “cognitive support” in cognitively demanding tasks. Antón and Dicamilla (1998) who studied L1 collaborative interaction from a socio-cognitive point of view state that “the use of language [...] is the critical device for mediating cognitive development. It is within the ZPD that scaffolding occurs or that semiotically mediated interactions lead to development” (p. 319). Indeed, as Atkinson (cited in Bhooth, Azman & Ismail, 2014, p. 82) says the use of L1 in peer interactions is a “learner-preferred strategy” and, going back to Antón and Dicamilla, learners can use the L1 to build on “each other’s partial solutions to specific problems throughout the task” (p. 321). A way in which learners use their L1 to scaffold their L2 production is by engaging in “metatalk” which is a means to “establish control of the discourse and the task by explicitly commenting on their linguistic tools used in its construction”

(Donato & Brooks, 1994, p. 268). Brookes and Donato also argue that this is an important discursive feature, despite the fact that it largely occurs in the L1, useful for facilitating L2 production as it allows learners to “sustain and initiate verbal interaction with each other” (p. 266). This is related to what Swain and Lapkin (2000) understand by “focusing attention on language form, vocabulary use” (p. 268) where the learners use their L1 to discuss their L2 use.

In addition to the L1 being a useful scaffolding strategy to support L2 production, L1 use is a common feature of task management. In their articles, both Donato and Brooks, and Antón and Dicomilla speak of the use of the L1 allowing learners to create a shared perspective on a task. Donato and Brookes (1994) refer to this concept as “shared orientation” and that orientational talk about the task is an important means for all members to co-construct the task procedures in order to carry it out. This is important within group work as not all “activities will be approached the same way by all students” (p. 268) and goes beyond externally defined task objectives by internally discussing language and procedures of the task to make it meaningful and engage with it (p. 272). This is backed by Antón and Dicomilla (1998) who see a shared perspective and scaffolding through communication as going hand in hand in order to lead to development (p. 319). Bhooth, Azman and Ismail (2014) subscribe to this stating that the use of L1 in collaborative group work is “beneficial for expediency, information transfer and clarification as a means to facilitate learning in the classroom and to boost engagement” (p. 82). Linked to the concept of expediency introduced above, other than defining task objectives internally, L1 was used as a task management strategy to “move the task along” (Swain and Lapkin, 2000) which included initiation of the task and organisational aspects of task management, such as task clarification, assigning roles and seeking and giving help (Tognini & Oliver, 2012, p. 69).

Another major area of study of L1 use in the L2 classroom is the externalisation of private speech. This area has been largely developed by Antón and Dicomilla who define it as “speech directed to self for the purpose of regulating one’s self in the performance of the task” (Antón & Dicomilla,

2004, p. 36). They found that the use of private speech in the L1 while engaging in tasks in the L2 classroom, served to focus attention and create distance. This is described as a cognitive control strategy which learners use to “stop and reflect” on language or on a specific task. By using this strategy learners find an appropriate workaround which allows the learner to point out discrepancies between their language use and “an ideal solution” (p. 51).

4. Methodology

4.1 Contextualisation and research design

As mentioned, this paper aims to explore the different instances in which learners use their L1 to successfully co-construct their L2 production and the opportunities for learning this provides.

The data was collected in a Catalan state secondary school in the Greater Barcelona area. The school is relatively new, only coming into being in 2011. The school community is currently being educated in temporary portable cabins while they wait for the new school building to be completed. It offers obligatory and post-obligatory secondary education and has been in constant growth since its inception, now offering four lines at lower secondary (ESO) and two lines at upper secondary (*Batxillerat*). The school is located on the edge of a working-class town in the Greater Barcelona area with most students coming from a middle to lower class background.

The data was collected in a 4th year ESO English class, with students aged between 15 and 16 years. In English classes, the school places third and fourth year students into ability groupings. The cohort the study was conducted in had a medium-high level of proficiency of English for their year group (level B1 according to the Common European Framework of Reference). It is also important to mention, within the context of plurilingualism, that the speakers involved in the group-work scenario were all proficient speakers of both Spanish and Catalan. However, as a group, their preferred language choice was Spanish, which for the purposes of this study will be considered the L1.

The task (detailed below) which was implemented in this class to study the uses of L1 in student-student interactions, involved a group of four teenage girls planning a dialogue on a family conflict to be later filmed outside of class by the same group. In this task, the teacher had previously shown two family conflicts where the characters asked for advice (the first conflict consisted of

asking for advice because their family was angry about them failing at school; in the second conflict they wanted advice because their mum would not give them space and treated them like a child). In each case, the teacher displayed three possible solutions to the conflicts and the students had to decide in pairs which they felt was the most appropriate solution and justify why they chose it. With a view to scaffolding the students with the dialogue they had to write, the teacher reviewed how to structure a dialogue giving advice to a family conflict using a PowerPoint presentation. A model dialogue was also printed in the student booklet for the students to refer to. The teacher then instructed the class to get into groups of three or four and that they would plan to write a similar dialogue giving advice and a solution to a typical family conflict. The task called “Acting out your advice!”² would culminate in the students filming their own videos planned in class. In order to give the students ideas for their dialogue, the teacher also handed out laminated cards with two typical family conflicts they could base their dialogue on. The students were then placed in small groups of three or four and had to start planning the script and the ideas for their video they would complete as homework. The video the group produced has also been provided as evidence of the L1 being crucial for task accomplishment³.



Figure 1. Group members taking part in the task (clockwise from bottom left: Laura, Alba, Paloma and Elena)

In order to explore the ways in which the students made use of their L1 in this task and the functions it had, a group of four teenage girls was video-recorded

² See appendix 9.2 for materials

³ See appendix 9.3 on how to access videos

performing the task. The video camera (there was only one available per class taught) was placed on a neighbouring desk directly in front of the students. It was unmanned and the student-researcher instructed the students to act in the most natural way possible, as if it was not there. Since data collection had been ongoing in this class for the duration of the teaching unit, two of the students (Laura and Alba) had been filmed twice beforehand, so were by now used to working in front of the camera. For the two remaining students (Paloma and Elena), this was the first time they were being filmed although they had been present in the previous classes when their classmates had been filmed. Since it was the third recording of group interaction in this class and the students showed no qualms about being on camera, the student-researcher started filming shortly after placing them in their group of four. The students were fairly relaxed about working in front of the camera as the student-researcher had explained to the entire class (both on this occasion and on the previous two occasions) that it would be used solely for research purposes. Before any student was recorded, the student-researchers ensured that express written permission was granted to record the students by the headmistress and that the students had all signed consent forms to be photographed or recorded on school premises. After recording, and for the sake of data analysis, the names of the participants were given pseudonyms so as not to reveal their identity. This was also the case for any names mentioned in the transcripts.

4.2 Data management

In order to carry out this study, the student-researchers gathered data over the course of the four weeks that the implementation of the teaching unit lasted in three 4th year ESO English classes. The videos recorded included both teacher instruction and student-student interaction as this study was carried out in parallel to López's research on how teachers give instructions (López, 2018). In terms of data management, the videos were organised by class (there were three in total), divided into the four communicative tasks which were filmed over the course of the teaching unit and classified as either teacher-student interaction or student-student interaction. In order to carry out

this study on the use of L1 in student-student interactions, the student-student video recordings of the four communicative activities were watched from all three classes. Following observation of the video recordings, where the student-researcher took notes on the ways in which the students were using their L1 to structure their L2 production, it was decided the task called “Acting out your advice!” should be analysed. This task was considered to be most useful to analysing L1 use as it involved a mix of content creation and task planning in line with “Competency 2. Planning and producing different types of oral texts appropriate to the communicative situation” (Generalitat de Catalunya, 2015, p. 10). Moreover, L1 use has been found to be a student-favoured choice for tasks requiring cognitive processing (Swain, & Lapkin, 2000).

The research approach followed a qualitative research method, specifically focusing on the educational setting detailed above. The case study of the group of four participants was studied and their discourse analysed. For the purposes of the analysis section of this paper, relevant sections of video recording were selected and transcribed following the Jeffersonian system of transcription (Jefferson, 2004). Prior to transcription, the student-researcher went through the data by watching the videos and taking notes on the instances and functions of L1 use and grouping them into the areas of task management, scaffolding, metatalk and private talk. This research method is loosely based on a table adapted from Oliver & Mackay, cited in Tognini and Oliver (2012). The sections deemed most relevant to the focus of the paper and in line with previous research carried out in this area (as detailed in the theoretical framework) were transcribed.

4.3 Data limitations

It must be noted that this paper is based around the L1 and L2 production of a group of four teenage participants in an English classroom at 4th year ESO. The first limitation to data is that due to the lack of recording equipment available, either in the form of a camcorder or a dictaphone, only one group per class was able to be recorded. This means that the conclusions drawn

from the analysis of this group's discourse only relates to this particular group and, though common themes may have been found with prominent authors in the field, this cannot be easily generalised to other classroom contexts or even other groups within the same classroom environment whose production was not recorded.

Moreover, the physical classroom the research was conducted in was also a limiting factor. As mentioned above, the school community is not educated in a school building, with all classes taking place in portable cabins. The data was collected in one of these classrooms and, as such, due to the inadequate standard of the educational space, there was a lot of echo and background noise since a number of groups were carrying out the same task at the same time. This meant that it was at times incredibly difficult to make out the discourse of the group being analysed. This, even in spite of the fact that the group was located at the front of the classroom space, at a fair distance from other groups participating in the task. A possible solution to this limitation would have been to remove the group studied to their own individual room to complete the task or to have additionally audio-recorded the group's collective speech with a dictaphone placed in the centre of the table, rather than relying solely on the camcorder's audio recording function. This was a limiting factor as it was perhaps not placed close enough to make out all group members' discourse equally.

5. Analysis

The following section offers a detailed analysis of the discourse carried out by the group members (Alba, Laura, Paloma and Elena) while they work together through the task. The aim is to observe when the participants “translanguage” to co-construct knowledge in the L2 and the ways in which these *translanguaging* practices on the part of the participants are useful to facilitating L2 learning.

The discourse of the group participants was analysed in advance and the language choice for discourse contexts, such as task management, collective scaffolding and private talk, was identified and grouped into the following adapted table (Oliver & Mackey, cited in Tognini & Oliver, 2012, p. 59). The following discourse contexts were analysed holistically based on the themes occurring in each transcript selected, rather than grouped per specific theme.

Discourse context	Language used
Task management	L1
Metatalk	L1 and L2
Scaffolding	L1 and L2
Private talk	L1

Figure 2: Discourse contexts per language use

At the end of this analysis section, the final accomplishments of the group will be outlined, effectively showing that the participants were able to successfully produce a video lasting nearly three minutes in English (the L2) with minimal mistakes. The elements (both linguistic and technical) featuring in the students’ final video production will be discussed in connection with the pre-planning collective dialogue carried out in the L1.

5.1 Task management

For matters relating to task management, it was observed that the language chosen by the group members to carry out this activity was their L1. Within

task management, the L1 was used for the purposes of establishing a “joint perspective” (Brookes & Donato, 1994) on the task and to expedite completion of the task.

5.1.1 Creating a joint perspective on the task

Excerpt 1. The learners use L1 to discuss how to implement the use of a mobile phone in their final video. 00:31-01:01 (30 seconds)

- | | | |
|----|--------|--|
| 2 | Laura | Vale ((coughs)) |
| 3 | | <i>ok</i> |
| 4 | | >espera mira< ya está hacemos un diálogo por ejemplo que haya una |
| 5 | | persona |
| 6 | | <i>wait fine it's ok let's do a dialogue for example which has a</i> |
| 7 | | <i>person</i> |
| 8 | | ((pointing to self)) |
| 9 | | que [xxx] vale (0.1) yo que sé (.) yo os llamo↑ a [xxx] |
| 10 | | <i>who ok I dunno I phone you</i> |
| 11 | | ((motions with hand as if pressing a mobile phone)) |
| 12 | Elena | <En pla:n>↓ (.) llamas↑ |
| 13 | | <i>You mean you phone</i> |
| 14 | | ((makes phone gesture with her hand)) |
| 15 | Laura | >Claro claro< |
| 16 | | <i>Yeah yeah</i> |
| 17 | Alba | Pe:ro >una cosa< |
| 18 | | <i>But one thing</i> |
| 19 | Laura | >Sabes< una <u>llamada</u> de estas∞ |
| 20 | | <i>You know one of those calls</i> |
| 21 | | ((draws a square in the air)) |
| 22 | Paloma | Eso que dices es como (.) la Clara [xxx] |
| 23 | | <i>What you say is like Clara</i> |
| 24 | Alba | Como con la Clara con lo de la pizza |
| 25 | | <i>Like Clara with the pizza thing</i> |
| 26 | | ((must be referring to previous video done in class)) |
| 27 | Paloma | Sí la Clara [xxx] |
| 28 | | <i>Yes Clara</i> |
| 29 | Laura | <u>Sí</u>↑ |
| 30 | Alba | Era con nosotras |
| 31 | | <i>it was with us</i> |
| 32 | | ((pointing between herself and Paloma)) |
| 33 | Laura | Pues hacemos (0.1) que es una llamada↑ (.) y lo grabamos con el móvil |
| 34 | | <i>Well let's make a call and we record it with the mobile</i> |

35		existen las llamadas conjuntas no ↑ (0.2) con mucha gente en el (.) el ∞
36		<i>there are joint calls right with a lot of people in the the</i>
37		((motions downwards with her hand while looking at Elena))
38	Elena	En Skype
39		<i>On Skype</i>
40	Alba	En Skype pero tiene que ser por [xxx]
41		<i>On Skype but it has to be by</i>
42	Laura	No porque llamas
43		<i>No because you call</i>
44		((phoning motion in the air))

In this excerpt, Laura starts out by mentioning that she would like to include someone phoning the other actors in the video by mobile phone. She discusses how they are going to implement it by going through the options of how to make a group call on the mobile phone. Laura uses her L1 here to firstly brainstorm and exchange ideas with the other members of the group and secondly as a means to create a shared perspective of how they will carry out the task. The other members of the group, especially Alba and Paloma, relate what Laura is suggesting to a previous video carried out by another member of the class in the past ("lo de la pizza"), showing they are on the same page as Laura. Moreover, Laura elicits the help of her fellow group members by saying that it's possible to make group calls using a mobile phone, to which Alba and Elena reply that this is only possible using Skype. Together, the four members of the group create a shared perspective on how they would like to implement a telephone call in their video by making the suggestion of doing it in the first place (Laura) and drawing on previous experience of someone in their environment having done it before (Alba and Paloma).

Excerpt 2. The learners use L1 to discuss how they are going to organise themselves to complete the task. 01:03-01:40 (37 seconds)

45	Alba	O si no (.) >mira< (.) por ejemplo (0.2) >yo que sé< (.) vamos a ver (0.3)
46		nosotras dos podemos quedar juntas (0.2) no ↑
47		<i>Or if not look for example I dunno let's see us</i>
48		<i>two can stay together right</i>
49		((points between herself and Elena))

50 **y vosotras dos (.) no↓ (.) vale↑**
 51 *and you two don't ok*
 52 ((points between Laura and Paloma and stretches her hands out in the air))
 53 **Pues tú llamas↑**
 54 *So you call*
 55 ((pointing at Laura))
 56 **y tú llamas↑**
 57 *and you call*
 58 ((pointing at Paloma))
 59 **pero llamas a una de las dos↓**
 60 *but you call one of the two*
 61 ((looks at Laura while pointing between Paloma and Elena))
 62 **y las dos estamos juntas**
 63 *and the two of us are together*
 64 ((pointing between herself and Elena))
 65 Paloma **No↓ pero si tú tienes el problema↑ (0.2) o nosotras tenemos el**
 66 **problema (0.1) y ella la solución↑**
 67 *No but if you have the problem or we have the problem and she has the*
 68 *solution*
 69 Alba **Creo que sí↓ (.) nosotras↑ (0.2)**
 70 *I think so we*
 71 ((pointing between Alba, Elena and Paloma))
 72 **tenemos que tener el problema y ella la solución**
 73 *we have to have the problem and her the solution*
 74 ((points at Laura))
 75 Paloma **Nosotras tr:es↑ (.) por ejemplo [xxx] hace falta∞**
 76 *Us three for example need*
 77 ((pointing between herself and Alba and Elena))
 78 Laura **Vosotras tres estáis juntas↓ (0.1) y yo os llamo a vosotras↓ y (.) >por**
 79 **ejemplo< y cada una↓ me decís∞**
 80 *You three are together and I call you and for*
 81 *example each of you tell me*
 82 ((points between herself and Paloma))
 83 Elena **De todas formas es mejor que tres tengan el problema y la otra la**
 84 **solución**
 85 *In any case it's better that three have the problem and the other one the*
 86 *solution*

In this excerpt, following on from the discussion on how to include a telephone conversation in their video, Alba is firstly assigning roles to her fellow group members and discussing exactly how they are going to implement the telephone call in their video and the role each will play. She, with the agreement of her group members, decides that in order to include the phone

call in the video that Laura will have to call either herself and Elena (who will meet up) or Paloma. This is conducted in L1 due to the organisational nature of the utterance (Swain & Lapkin, 2000). This can be seen as being an example of creating a joint perspective as both Paloma and Laura later speak of “nosotras tres” (*us three*) and “vosotras tres” (*you three*) to show that they are in agreement with the way the task has been split between the four of them.

A second point to mention is that Paloma uses L1 to focus attention on the task objective, which is to create a dialogue providing a solution to a problem. By asking the question whether it is Laura who should have the problem or the other three members, she is effectively redefining internal task objectives. The other participants address her directive question by agreeing that it is the three of them who should have the problem and Laura should have the solution. Although the problem-solution element in the dialogue is an externally defined objective, the group members come to an internal agreement on how they are going to organise themselves to include it.

5.1.2 Task expediency

Excerpt 3. The learners use L1 to refocus attention with a view to completing the task. 19:41-19:51 (10 seconds)

87	Alba	<u>Venga vamos >da igual<</u> Hi mu:m
88		<i>come on it doesn't matter</i>
89		((starts writing. The girls follow suit))
90	Laura	Hi mum (0.2) > yo qué sé< (.) how are you↑
91		<i>I dunno</i>
92		((looking at Alba))
93		((19.44 – 19.48 silence while the participants write))
94	Laura	How are you > vale< ↑ Quien es la mum. Quieres hacerlo tú ↑ Paloma↓
95		<i>ok Who is the Do you want to do it</i>
96		((looks up at Paloma))
97	Paloma	Sí
98		<i>Yes</i>

In this excerpt, the participants are creating content collectively for their video dialogue. The participants are using their L1 for two purposes. Firstly, Alba

starts the excerpt by saying “venga vamos” (*come on*). This marks that she is alerting the girls that they should refocus on the task at hand, that is, creating a dialogue for their video. This is a means of expediting task completion and steering her co-learners away from any interactions which are not directly related to task completion. Secondly, Laura is using the L1 for role assignment, or at least, confirmation of the roles assigned as she asks Paloma if she is happy to play the role of the mum in the video dialogue they are creating. By asking Paloma, she is also effectively expediting task completion by confirming that all members are happy with the roles they have assigned each other.

Excerpt 4. The learners use L1 to expedite the writing process. 06:45 – 06:52 (7 seconds)

- | | | |
|-----|-------|--|
| 99 | Laura | Venga ↑ > vamos <
<i>Come on let's go</i> |
| 101 | Alba | E:::hm [xxx] (0.5) qué le decimos ↓
<i>Ehm what should we say to her</i> |
| 103 | | ((Laura starts to write down on her piece of paper)) |
| 104 | Elena | Pero a=la=vez no lo escribas ↓(0.2) dilo ↑ (0.2) y lo escribimos ↓
<i>But don't write at the same time say it and we'll write it</i> |
| 106 | | ((talking to Laura who has started to write something down)) |

In this excerpt, Laura again uses the L1 to refocus her fellow group members on the task who had previously been engaged in an off-task exchange about a driving fine. Her use of “venga vamos” (*come on*) marks to the other members of the group that they should return to the writing of their dialogue. Alba picks her up on this and says “qué le decimos” (*what should we say to her*) asking for input from her group members for ideas and marking that she agrees they should return to the task. Laura immediately starts to write down her ideas on her piece of paper. However, in order to ensure the task of writing the dialogue is not unnecessarily delayed, Elena tells her to stop writing it down and to say it out loud so that they can write the dialogue collaboratively. She is thus expediting the writing process but also reminding Laura that the objective of the task is to write a dialogue as a group.

5.2 Scaffolding strategies

The L1 was observed as being an important tool employed by the task participants to scaffold each other's L2 production, mainly by means of metatalk and lexical searches. Moreover, the L1 was observed to help them direct their thinking by engaging in private talk.

Excerpt 5. The learners use L1 to search for vocabulary and as self-directed speech. 06.52 – 07.14 (16 seconds)

- 107 Laura **Cómo >se dice< esperar**↑
108 Paloma Wait
109 Laura Wait (0.5) e::hm (1.2) **hast::a**∞ (5.5)
110 *until*
111 ((Laura scratches her head and looks to the others for the answer))
112 Laura And wait↓ and (0.5) when my moth::er∞
113 Alba was come↑ no↓ was no↓ >**o sea**< was **es estuvo**
114 *so is was*
115 ((looking at Laura))

In this excerpt, Laura translanguages into her L1 to ask for lexical support from her peers. Paloma interprets Laura's question as asking for help and she provides her with the lexical item she did not have in her L2 repertoire. Once Laura has been provided with the term she was looking for, she continues to attempt to construct the sentence in English, but again elicits help from her peers when she says "hasta" (*until*). Since no answer or lexical support is forthcoming, she tries to continue constructing the sentence with words in her repertoire. Alba builds on the sentence which Laura has already constructed by suggesting "was come". However, she realises that this is not an ideal solution and reverts back to her L1 to engage in private speech where she flags the discrepancy between her L2 production and the language she should be producing. Although her speech seems social in nature as it is externalised and she is looking at her peer, Laura, while she says it, she is in fact stopping and reflecting on her own language. The fact that she answers her own thought by saying "was es estuvo" is indicative that she was not expecting an answer from Laura.

Excerpt 6. The learners engage in metatalk about intonation. 19:52 – 20:31
(39 seconds)

116 Laura >vale< (4.0) I'm fi:ne[∞] (1.2) I have (0.2) a surprise↑ for you (9.0)
 117 ok
 118 ((writes down on her piece of paper))
 119 I have a surprise for you
 120 ((coughs))
 121 >Yo le respondo< (.) really↑ (3.5)
 122 I answer her
 123 ((writes down her suggestion))
 124 No sé really >què et sembla (.) no sé<
 125 I dunno what do you think dunno
 126 ((directs her question towards Alba))
 127 Alba Rea↑lly↓ (.) >Really<↓
 128 ((marks stress on her piece of paper))
 129 es como si fuera una pregunta↓ (0.2) really↑
 130 it's as if it were a question
 131 Laura Es verdad↓ (.) sí↓
 132 You're right yes
 133 ((turns to write down))

In this excerpt, the participants are engaged in collaboratively writing their video dialogue. Laura suggests including the word “really” to express surprise. When she suggests it, she pronounces it with rising intonation at the end of the word. However, since she is not convinced this is entirely correct, she turns to Alba to ask for confirmation (*què et sembla / what do you think*). In this case, Laura is making full use of her linguistic repertoire as she is addressing Alba, with whom up until now she has mainly engaged in Spanish, in Catalan. Alba repeats the word twice, the first time stressed with falling and rising intonation and the second time quieter with falling intonation. While she does this, she uses her pen to gesture on her piece of paper where the stress falls in the word. Once she has tried out pronouncing the word both with rising and falling intonation, she rectifies her production and she tells Laura that since it is like a question, the intonation should rise at the end of the word. Laura seems convinced by this explanation and accepts it when she says “es verdad sí” (*yes, that's right*), moving back into Spanish when talking to Alba. The participants have managed to successfully scaffold each other in reproducing the correct intonation of the word “really” in the form of a question.

This is useful to their L2 production since it will be used in the implementation of the video when Laura has to act out the line they have just written down in the dialogue.

Excerpt 7. The learners scaffold each other to build on each other's partial solutions. 22.27 – 22.43 (13 seconds)

134	Laura	it's excited
135		((writes it down))
136		excited
137		((looks to Alba))
138		e:x (.) <c:i>↓ (.) >ted<↓
139		((spells it out loud to herself))
140	Laura	<u>excited</u> ↑
141		((looks around for confirmation))
142	Elena/Alba	exciting
143	Elena	exciting↓ con I (.) N (.) G
144		with
145		((points at Laura's sheet))
146	Alba	exciting

In this excerpt, Laura suggests adding extra content to their collective dialogue. She suggests “it’s excited” and starts to write it down. However, in the process of writing it down, she realises there is something not entirely right and looks to Alba and forms a question using the same word. When Alba does not correct her, she proceeds to write it again and starts spelling it out to herself in syllables (ex-ci-ted), effectively engaging in private speech as she works out how to write it. Yet, she still does not seem convinced and repeats it again and looks around the group for confirmation. Only then do both Elena and Alba correct her and say “exciting”. To further reinforce the error correction, Elena points to Laura’s sheet where she has written “excited” and says “exciting” while spelling out the ending and reverting temporarily to the L1 to make it clearer. Alba backs her up by repeating “exciting”. In this instance, the group has managed to build on Laura’s partial solution of “excited” by providing her with the correct adjective ending. In comparison to other lexical searches (such as *esperar/wait* mentioned above), this section has largely been conducted entirely in the L2. This could perhaps be put down

to the fact that they have not engaged in “cognitively demanding” content and are merely reproducing a form they have learnt in the past.

Excerpt 8. The learners engage in collaborative dialogue and metatalk to flag up discrepancies in the L2 production. 22.49 – 23.58 (1 minute, 11 seconds)

- 147 Laura >Vale< pero mira (0.2) tienes que poner aquí ya la fecha porq:ue↑ [xxx]
 148 Ok but look you have to put the date here because
 149 Paloma Sí vamos a [xxx] y tú dices qué día y ella te dice sábado
 150 Yes let's and you say which day and she says Saturday to you
 151 Elena Qué e:s↑ sábado↑
 152 What's Saturday
 153 ((question directed at Alba))
 154 Alba Es Saturday↓
 155 It's
 156 Laura Saturday↓
 157 Paloma Y pues (.) hay un problema
 158 And so there's a problem
 159 Laura >entonces< (.) yo digo=of course↑
 160 so I say
 161 Alba Y ella con cara [xxx] (2.3)
 162 And she with a face
 163 ((turns to Laura))
 164 Laura [xxx] también
 165 as well
 166 ((looking at Alba's sheet))
 167 Of course↑(0.1) what date↓
 168 Alba Ah vale (8.0)
 169 Ah ok
 170 ((nodding and the girls write down))
 171 Alba What date
 172 ((read out as she is writing it down))
 173 Laura Saturday next (3.0) I will prepare (0.2) a surpr∞
 174 ((Laura scratches head))
 175 Paloma A:y n:o↓ (.) porque [xxx]
 176 Oh no because
 177 Alba El vi:ernes↑ (0.5) o el sábado por la mañana↑ (0.2) todos los días (.) el
 178 sábado s::í (.) Sat::ur (.)day
 179 Friday or Saturday morning every day
 180 Saturday yes
 181 ((said looking down at her paper in an introspective manner))
 182 Laura [xxx] sí >está bien<
 183 yes it's fine

184 Alba Saturday↓ (0.3) **Qué día es**∞
 185 *What day is it*
 186 ((looks at Laura and shrugs))
 187 Laura **Oh oh**
 188 Alba Which day **porque** (.) what date↑ (.) **qué fecha**↑ **sábado**↓
 189 *because which date Saturday*
 190 (looks at Laura)
 191 **Qué=día**↑ (.) **sábado**↓
 192 *Which day Saturday*

In this excerpt, the learners use their L1 as a problem-solving strategy by flagging up the discrepancy in meaning of the word “date” instead of “day” when being paired with Saturday. In this instance, Alba translanguages into Spanish to show that in Spanish you cannot use “fecha” to modify “sábado”, but rather you need to use “día”. By doing this, she is helping Laura and the other group members understand that “day” is the most appropriate lexical item required by comparing Spanish and English and finding the usage is similar.

Moreover, we also hear Alba repeating the word “Saturday” to herself in a low voice before writing it down. She seems to be using this strategy to check she has chosen the correct word before committing it to paper.

Another use of collective scaffolding is where Elena shuttles into Spanish to ask Alba to clarify the meaning of “Saturday”. By doing so, she manages to expedite the information transfer which would have taken longer in the L2 alone.

5.3 Task accomplishments

This section will briefly analyse whether the participants’ collective dialogue relating to lexical searches and task management had an effect on their linguistic and technical output in the video.

5.3.1 Lexical searches

In excerpts 6, 7 and 8 above, the participants engage in lexical searches as they are collaboratively constructing their dialogue. In the transcript of the

video which the participants produced after the data showing the participants planning in class, a number of these lexical items can be identified:

- 193 **Mum:** Laura, come here!
194 **Laura:** Ok, mum! (enters room) What do you want?
195 **Mum:** I have asked to in my job to have a free day, to meet with you, like a girls' day. It's
196 exciting, isn't it?
197 **Laura:** Of course! What day?
198 **Mum:** On Saturday.
199 **Laura:** Ah (shrugs shoulders) cool
200 **Mum:** Really? Are you fine?
201 **Laura:** Yes yes, don't worry

In excerpt 6, between lines 115 and 125, Laura and Alba engage in metatalk about the intonation of the word “really” they are writing into their script. In line 193 of the video transcript above, we can see that the participants have included this word in their final video production. Moreover, the intonation in the final production is very close to that of a question, showing that the metatalk in the L1 was necessary for the participants to decide how best to utter this word in practice.

In excerpt 7, between lines 128 and 140, Elena and Alba collectively scaffold Laura's partial solution in the L2 when she suggests “it's excited” in line 128 while writing the script. In line 136, both Alba and Elena correct her production to “it's exciting”, followed up by Elena reiterating the adjective ending *-ing* in line 137. In their final video production, we can see that the participants' collective scaffolding was necessary as in line 188 the mum says “it's exciting” showing the participants in the end included the most appropriate L2 form in their video production.

Finally, in excerpt 8, between lines 181 and 184, Alba translanguages into her L1 to flag up the discrepancy in using the word “date” to modify “Saturday”. Her *translanguaging* strategy allows her to suggest that they should use “day” instead by comparing Spanish and English usage and finding that it is similar. In lines 190 and 191 of the participants' video transcript, we can see that they have opted for “what day” before answering “on Saturday”. This analysis of usage between the L1 and the L2 was necessary in order to flag up the discrepancy in the L2 and to come up with the most appropriate solution in the L2.

5.3.2 Technical video implementation

In excerpts 1 and 2 above, the participants use their L1 in order to discuss the technicalities of how to include a group phone call in their video (excerpt 1) and how they are going to organise themselves and how they will divide up their roles in the phone call (excerpt 2). Screenshots inserted below taken from the students' own video production show that the students have indeed included a phone call in their video and how the division of roles finally translated into the final video.



Figure 3. On-screen texting and phone call



Figure 4: Participants (Laura: top; Alba and Elena: bottom) role-playing the phone call

Figures 3 and 4 show how the participants have implemented the phone call they were discussing in excerpts 1 and 2. In excerpt 1, in lines 30 to 32, Laura talks about including a group call which they should film using a mobile phone. Similarly, in excerpt 2, between lines 42 and 59, Alba is assigning roles and instructing the other participants exactly how to implement the phone call, where she says that she and Elena will meet up and that Laura should phone either herself and Elena or Paloma. In the end, it seems that from the discussion, the participants have decided that Laura should phone Alba and Elena. This is exemplified by the on-screen text conversation and the screenshot featuring the mobile phone device shown in figure 3. Figure 4 shows Laura phoning Alba and Elena on screen. It can certainly be argued that without having been able to discuss the intricacies of technical task implementation, as in excerpts 1 and 2, the participants would not have been able to have produced such a technically sophisticated video if the task planning had been conducted in the L2 alone.

6. Discussion

Throughout the analysis section of this paper, we have clearly seen an alternation between Spanish (the students' chosen L1) and English (the L2). Rather than seeing this extensive use of the L1 while communicating during the task as something to be actively discouraged, it is important to point out the support that using the L1 has had in helping the students co-construct their L2 production, which will be detailed below.

As has been mentioned, small-group interaction has been identified as decisive in allowing greater contact with and use of the foreign language in the Catalan FL curriculum. However, it may not always be taken up enthusiastically by teachers influenced by the same curriculum which may see group work as not conducive to developing communicative competence in the foreign language as it often takes place in the L1 (Swain & Lapkin, 2000). L1 use was certainly a frequent feature in the case study observed in the analysis section.

Yet, following analysis of the ways in which the learners used their L1, it has been shown that L1 use in the L2 classroom is not necessarily negative and it can certainly create opportunities for learning.

García (2014) argues that in order for learners to attain communicative competence in a second or a foreign language, it is necessary to allow learners to engage in *translanguaging* practices (p. 73). This is supported by Cummins' (1981) CUP model stating that "proficiency in L1 and L2 are seen as common or interdependent across languages" (García & Wei, 2014, p.13). García goes further to argue that learners, when co-constructing knowledge must pull linguistic resources using "one system from which students select appropriate features" (p. 73). Indeed, especially when the learners in this case study were engaging in content creation and task management, it was observed that they used a number of *translanguaging* practices. In line with García's and Cummins' views, the learners were seen to move dynamically across language 'boundaries', picking features from their full linguistic repertoire rather than limiting themselves to one specific language 'code'. To exemplify this point, in excerpt 6, where Laura and Alba engage in metatalk

to discuss the intonation of the word “really” in their dialogue, they move between Spanish, English and Catalan without there being any clear boundary between each language chosen. This is significant as it suggests that they are making use of their full linguistic repertoire to communicate rather than treating each language as distinct entities, thus illustrating what is defined in the CEFR as plurilingualism “[...] builds up a communicative competence to which all knowledge and experience of language contributes and in which languages interrelate and interact” (Council of Europe, 2001).

Throughout the content creation process, the group members were engaged in collaborative dialogue, mainly taking place in the L1. This was useful to them firstly as a problem-solving strategy and secondly as a means to co-construct their L2 and to build on their L2 knowledge (Swain & Lapkin, 2000, p. 254). An example of the learners making use of collaborative dialogue is in excerpt 8 in the analysis section. In this excerpt, the learners use their L1 as a problem solving strategy by flagging up the problem with using the word “date” instead of “day” when referring to Saturday. In this case, Alba translanguages into Spanish to show that in Spanish you cannot use “fecha” to refer to “sábado”, but rather you need to use “día” and thereby clarifies to Laura and the other group members that “day” is the most appropriate lexical item required. By engaging in this collaborative dialogue, she is able to scaffold and help the others to build on their L2 knowledge. This is also an example of what Antón and Dicamilla (1998) refer to as building on “partial solutions to specific problems throughout the task” (p. 321).

Another scaffolding strategy which has been observed in the analysis section of this paper is the use of metatalk in the L1, which has two main functions according to Donato & Brooks (1994). It is firstly an important discursive function allowing learners to take control of the discourse by verbally reflecting on language use, and secondly L1 use in metatalk is efficient in allowing verbal communication to be initiated and sustained. Both functions of metatalk were observed in the analysis section of this paper. In the first instance, the learners in excerpt 5 engage in metatalk to regulate their speech by explicitly talking about the stress and intonation of the word “really”. Not only is this metatalk useful for the learners to carry out a metalinguistic analysis of the term, but it

is also useful going forward since uses this word appears in the final video performance. Metatalk is therefore a means to help the learners carry out the task successfully. In the second instance, in excerpt 8, the learners largely use metatalk as a scaffolding strategy to co-construct and make sense of their own interactions. For example, Elena translanguages into the L1 in order to make a confirmation check of the English word “Saturday”, by specifically talking about language her peers are able to scaffold her with the equivalent in Spanish. Moreover, the group members engage in metatalk while they are deciding whether to pair the English word “date” or “day” as the question introducing “Saturday”. The fact that they shuttle into Spanish to make sense of their own production is helping keep the discourse going and promotes verbal interaction within the group (Donato & Brooks, 1994).

Last but not least, we saw two task management strategies used which required use of the L1. These were either carried out as a group as a whole in the case of the group members using their L1 to come to a shared perspective on the task, or on an individual level with private speech, used as a means to self-direct their performance of the task. Creating a shared perspective on the task is key for group work and allows learners to engage with the task at hand by defining and co-constructing their own task procedures (Donato & Brooks, 1994) and contributes to the overall development of the group members as they work collaboratively in their ZPD (Antón & Dıcamilla, 1998). The most relevant examples of learners in the data sample creating a shared perspective are in excerpts 1 and 2. In both instances, a shared perspective is created by the group members as they firstly discuss how they are going to implement a phone conversation in their final video (excerpt 1) and how they are going to organise the said phone conversation when they implement the video (excerpt 2). In both instances, the learners are internally defining task procedures or objectives which they are setting for themselves, but they were not an external requirement. The fact that the participants have set their own goals, makes them visibly engage more with the task they have been instructed to complete.

Private speech, defined as “self-directed speech” (Antón & Dıcamilla, 2004), was also observed to have a facilitating role in task completion. This is

essentially speech which, although it may seem social in nature as it is externalised, it is in fact psychological in function according to the sociocultural theory (Antón & Dicamilla, 2004). This was observed mainly in the speech of Alba in excerpts 5 and 8. On both occasions, although Alba is externalising her speech, they are essentially self-directed questions or repetitions. In excerpt 5, Alba highlights distance between her L2 production in response to the text she has co-constructed with Laura (“was come”) and an ideal solution by saying “no, was no, was es estuvo”. This shows she has understood her production has not been correct and she is thinking out loud about how she can rectify it. In excerpt 8, she is clarifying her understanding of the word “Saturday” by repeating it to herself in a low voice. As Antón and Dicamilla (2004) state, private speech is normally conducted in the L1 as it is used for “cognitive processing”, which is essentially what Alba is doing.

On a final note, it is important to mention the task accomplishments of the four learners. Overall, by using *translanguaging* practices in their L1, the learners have managed to successfully produce a three-minute video in the L2 containing dialogue constructed collectively. Moreover, their video includes technical elements which are unlikely would have been possible without the help of the L1.

7. Conclusions

Before drawing conclusions on the results observed, it is a good opportunity to remind ourselves of the research questions which underlie the analysis of this paper. To recap, the purpose of this paper was to find out:

- 1) the ways in which learners make use of their L1 to co-construct their L2 production
- 2) how using the L1 can be helpful to facilitating L2 learning

As is to be expected in the context the data was gathered in, where the learners shared the same L1, L1 use was prevalent amongst the learners. However, was this use of the L1 helpful in any way to co-constructing their L2 production?

The most relevant conclusion we can draw from the data analysed is that L1 use, although used extensively throughout the learners' speech, was indeed conducive to L2 learning. The learners used their L1 as a means to co-construct their collaborative dialogue; as a scaffolding strategy to provide each other with help while engaging in the task; as a task management strategy, most notably to achieve a shared perspective on the task to be completed as well as defining their own internal objectives for task implementation. Last but not least, the L1 was used by the group members to engage in private speech, an effective strategy to direct their own thinking with a view to supporting themselves in the task completion.

All of the above instances of L1 use were useful to co-constructing their L2 production and successfully completing the task they had been instructed to do. Without having the resource of their L1, the learners would have been unlikely to have been able to collaboratively write a dialogue on a relationship conflict for a video showing a problem and solution, or to include technical elements in a video with them acting out the dialogue they had written collaboratively. Many of the lexical searches and task implementation strategies (such as including a phone call in their video) were seen in their final video production. It is beyond question that the group members would not have developed such a polished finished product, both from a linguistic and a technical (video-making) point of view, if they had not been able to use

the resource of their L1 to collaboratively write the dialogue and to discuss task implementation.

This ties in nicely with García's argument on *translanguaging* which she argues is essential to help develop communicative competence and critical thinking skills across what is traditionally considered language boundaries. Students only allowed to use "a set of emergent language practices" are unable to engage in "meaningful discussion, comprehension or designing and redesigning of texts" (García & Wei, 2014). Allowing students to use their L1 to scaffold each other's L2 production, to define the task and to engage in collaborative dialogue can be beneficial to their overall cognitive development. The pedagogical implications of allowing, if perhaps not actively encouraging, L1 use in the L2 classroom environment should certainly be reviewed by curriculum planners as having a "necessary and facilitating" role (Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003) rather than something to be avoided at all costs.

However, this paper only discusses a small-scale case study of one group of four teenage participants engaging in a collaborative writing and planning task. In order to really assess the true significance of L1 use in a collaborative learning context, a far more in-depth study would have to be carried out involving a number of high schools across a range of age groups and levels, perhaps on an international scale, to see whether L1 use has a clear facilitating role in helping co-construct L2 production in all stages of the language learning process, or whether it is solely an additional support to students with a lower level of language proficiency.

8. References

Alley, D. C. (2005). A study of Spanish II high school students' discourse during group work. *Foreign Language Annals*, 38(2), 250-257.

Antón, M., & DiCamilla, F. (1998). Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 54(3), 314-342.

Bagarić, V., & Djigunović, J. M. (2007). Defining communicative competence. *Metodika*, 8(1), 94-103.

Bhooth, A., Azman, H., & Ismail, K. (2014). The role of the L1 as a scaffolding tool in the EFL reading classroom. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 118, 76-84.

Brooks, F. B., & Donato, R. (1994). Vygotskian approaches to understanding foreign language learner discourse during communicative tasks. *Hispania*, 262-274.

Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge, U.K: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge

Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. *Schooling and language minority students. A theoretical framework*.

DiCamilla, F. J., & Antón, M. (2004). Private speech: A study of language for thought in the collaborative interaction of language learners. *International journal of applied linguistics*, 14(1), 36-69.

García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Generalitat de Catalunya. (2015). *Competències bàsiques de l'àmbit lingüístic. Llengües estrangeres. Identificació i desplegament a l'educació secundària obligatòria*. Retrieved from <http://ensenyament.gencat.cat/web/.content/home/departament/publicacions/colleccions/competencies-basiques/eso/eso-linguistic-ca-es-literatura.pdf>

Generalitat de Catalunya. (2016). *El currículum de l'Educació Secundària Obligatoria*. Retrieved from http://xtec.gencat.cat/web/.content/curriculum/eso/curriculum2015/document_s/ANNEX-3-Ambit-lingueistic.pdf

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcripts symbols with an introduction. U (Ed. Lerner, GH) *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the first generation*.

López, M. (2018). How do teachers give instructions? Unpublished MA thesis. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2003). Is there a role for the use of the L1 in an L2 setting?. *TESOL quarterly*, 37(4), 760-769.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2000). Task-based second language learning: The uses of the first language. *Language teaching research*, 4(3), 251-274.

Tognini, R., & Oliver, R. (2012). L1 use in primary and secondary foreign language classrooms and its contribution to learning. In E. Alcon & M. P. Safont (Eds.), *Language learners' discourse in instructional settings* (pp. 53–78). Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Wu, W. (2008). Misunderstandings of Communicative Language Teaching. *English language teaching*, 1(1), 50-53.

9. Appendices

Appendix 9.1. Transcription symbols

I have adapted a range of symbols from the Jeffersonian system of transcription.

The symbols I have used are as follows:

Symbol	Function
(.)	Micropause
(# seconds)	Timed pause
:	Prolonged sound
↑	Rising pitch
↓	Falling pitch
((double brackets))	Non-verbal activity
=	Latching
Bold text	Language production in foreign language
<i>Italic text</i>	English translation of foreign language production
>Text<	Faster speech delivery
<Text>	Slower speech delivery
∞	Unmarked ending
<u>Underlined text</u>	Emphasised speech
(xxx)	Unintelligible speech

Appendix 9.2 Task materials

9.2.1 “Acting out your advice!” worksheet

Activity 2. Acting out your advice!



1. Look at Charlie's problem in the PowerPoint. He needs some help. What would you suggest? Are you happy with his friend's advice?

2. In the table below, you have the structure for solving someone's problem:

The problem	The solution
1. Give context <i>I've failed four subjects</i>	1. Advice statement <i>If I were you</i>
2. Explain the conflict <i>My parents are angry at me. It's so unfair because I tried!</i>	2. General solution <i>I would try my hardest to improve</i>
3. Ask a question for advice <i>What should I do?</i>	3. Examples of actions <i>Ask your teachers for help, tell your parents about your situation</i>
	4. Final encouragement <i>And do your best!</i>

3. Using the structure above, write a short role play in a small group using one of the conflicts on the cards provided or inventing your own.

Example role play:

Charlie: My dad is getting married again! I don't want to talk to him again. It's not fair that he's going to have another family. I don't want any more brothers or sisters!

Friend: If I were you, I would talk to your dad.

Charlie: But why should I?

Friend: Because he's your dad and you want him to be happy, don't you?

Charlie: Yes, I suppose so.

Friend: You should talk to him, you will feel better if you do. Your dad will also understand your feelings. It's normal for you to feel like this.

4. For homework, film yourselves acting out your dialogue and send your teacher your video!

9.2.2 Conflict cards for video dialogue

Activity 2. Act out your own advice

Video conflict cards

<p>Conflict 1</p> <p>I don't know how to talk to my dad, our conversations always turn into fights. I want to have a good father-son relationship. What should I do?</p>	<p>Conflict 2</p> <p>My dad insults my mum all the time. Am I right if I yell at my dad and tell him to stop?</p>
<p>Conflict 1</p> <p>My sister told me a secret recently and she begged me to not tell my mum. Should I tell her?</p>	<p>Conflict 2</p> <p>My brother took my favourite T-shirt without asking me before and now he doesn't remember where he left it. Can you give another solution instead of killing my brother?</p>
<p>Conflict 1</p> <p>My mum got mad at me and took my phone away. How can I get back in her good books so she gives it back?</p>	<p>Conflict 2</p> <p>My sister is 18 and I'm 15. She always sits in the front seat and my parents always let her sit there. How can I ask to sit there without starting a fight?</p>
<p>Conflict 1</p> <p>My dad is always complaining about how long I spend in the bathroom and yesterday he turned the boiler off! The water was freezing cold! What can I do to make him respect my times?</p>	<p>Conflict 2</p> <p>We have a dog and I love it! But I don't want to walk it every single day. What should I tell my parents?</p>
<p>Conflict 1</p> <p>My parents are so against dating and there is this boy... We're just friends, but maybe it could develop into something more... Should I tell my parents?</p>	<p>Conflict 2</p> <p>I'm so fed up! I am the youngest of three brothers and my older brothers are both athletes and good at school. My parents always expect the same of me, but I'm more into drama and music. What can I do to make them understand?</p>

9.2.3 PowerPoint presentation



Appendix 9.3 Video data

9.3.1 Video data recorded

The data collected and used for discourse analysis can be viewed at:

[REMOVED]

9.3.2 Students' final video production

The student's own video, which the in-class recording shows them building up to, can be viewed at: [REMOVED]

It is especially useful to look at the following segments:

- 00.00.07 – 00.00.32: *showing the participants using the language they had co-constructed in their planning video*
- 00.00.32 – 00.01.09: *showing how the participants have implemented on-screen texting*
- 00.01.10 – 00.02.35: *showing the participants implementing the phone call they discussed in their planning video*