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

Cufí Pericot, Miquel; Dooly, Melinda, dir. The Effectiveness of Providing EFL Students with Language Support as a Scaffolding Resource when Writing a Text. 2021. 68 pag. (939 Formació de Professorat d'Educació Secundària Obligatòria i Batxillerat, Formació Professional i Ensenyaments d'Idiomes 942 Formació de Professorat d'Educació Secundària Obligatòria i Batxillerat, Formació Professional i Ensenyaments d'Idiomes)

This version is available at <https://ddd.uab.cat/record/245201>

under the terms of the  license



**Universitat Autònoma
de Barcelona**

The Effectiveness of Providing EFL Students with Language
Support as a Scaffolding Resource when Writing a Text

Màster Universitari en Formació de Professorat d'Educació Secundària Obligatòria i
Batxillerat, Formació Professional i Ensenyament d'Idiomes (Especialitat Anglès)

Master's Dissertation

Miquel Cufí Pericot

Supervisor: Dr. Melinda Dooly Owenby

Barcelona, 4th June 2021

Acknowledgements

First of all, I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr. Melinda Dooly, for the guidance, feedback and advice provided at all stages of this Master's Dissertation; and Anna Corredera, our UAB tutor, for all the ideas for the teaching unit implementation. I would also like to show my gratitude to Estefanía Santidrián, our school mentor, who always helped us implement the tasks for this study and encouraged us to become better teachers. Furthermore, special thanks to the students from the high school, who always collaborated with enthusiasm on the activities for this dissertation.

I want to express my gratitude to my internship colleague, Núria Gallardo, for being each other's pillar during the hard times. Finally, I would like to acknowledge my flatmates, friends and family for being by my side during the ups and downs.

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION, OBJECTIVES AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS	1
1.1. Contextualisation of the study	3
2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	4
2.1. Pedagogical frame	4
2.1.1. Cognitive approach	4
2.1.2. Sociocultural approach	5
2.2. Analytical frame: Language-Related Episodes	8
3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND METHOD	9
3.1. Context: Pedagogical intervention outlined	9
3.2. Data collection	11
3.3. Data analysis	13
4. RESULTS	16
4.1. Analysis of the scripts	16
4.2. Analysis of the LREs	18
4.3. Analysis of the interviews	24
4.3.1. Most important categories of structures	24
4.3.2. Impressions about the language support section	25
4.3.3. Suggested improvements or adjustments to the language support section	26
5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	28
6. BIBLIOGRAPHY	39
7. APPENDICES	42
7.1. Appendix A: The scripts	42
7.2. Appendix B: The LREs	50
7.2.1. Explicit references to the language support section or any of the structures that it contains	50
7.2.2. Clarification requests about the meaning, function or spelling of any structure from the language scaffolding	53
7.2.3. Explicit references to the writing process and the organisation of ideas	55
7.2.4. Allusions to the use of external digital tools	56
7.3. Appendix C: Interview questions	57
7.4. Appendix D: The interviews	57

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to prove the usefulness of providing 4th ESO EFL students with language support when writing a text, as a scaffolding resource. This writing support consists of explicit instruction and examples of structures and connectors to organise their composition, so as to facilitate the task of writing in English. The research, undertaken in a high school in Sant Boi de Llobregat (Barcelona), combines content analysis and conversation analysis. Following data collection, the study analyses and compares first students' written productions; then their comments during the writing process and finally their answers to the in-class interviews, concerning their impressions towards the language support and the adjustments they would make. Basing the analysis on language-related episodes (LREs), the results show that the effectiveness of the language support section depends on each student needs, preferences and learning barriers. It can be concluded that scaffolding must be adapted to each student, by the teacher or by themselves.

Keywords: *language support, scaffolding resource, LRE, EFL context, second language writing, writing process.*

RESUM

L'objectiu d'aquest estudi és demostrar l'eficàcia de proporcionar un suport lingüístic per tal d'escriure un text, com a recurs d'andamiatge (*scaffolding*), a alumnat estudiant d'anglès com a llengua estrangera de 4t d'ESO. Aquest suport lingüístic consisteix en instrucció explícita i exemples d'estructures i connectors per organitzar les seves redaccions, amb l'objectiu de facilitar la tasca d'escriure en anglès. La recerca, portada a terme en un institut de Sant Boi de Llobregat (Barcelona), combina anàlisi de continguts i anàlisi de converses. Després de la recollida de dades, l'estudi analitza i compara primer les produccions escrites de l'alumnat; després els seus comentaris durant el procés d'escriptura i finalment les seves respostes a les entrevistes fetes a classe, sobre les impressions respecte el suport lingüístic i les modificacions que hi farien. Basant l'anàlisi en els episodis relacionats amb el llenguatge, els resultats mostren que l'eficàcia del suport lingüístic depèn de les necessitats, preferència i barreres d'aprenentatge de cada estudiant. Com a conclusió, cal que el professorat o l'alumnat mateix adapti l'andamiatge a cada estudiant.

Paraules clau: *suport lingüístic, recurs f o c p f c o k c v i g . " g r k u q f k " t e q p v g z v " f o c p i n ³ u " e q o " c " n n g p i w c " g u v t c p i g t*

1. INTRODUCTION, OBJECTIVES AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The aim of this Master's Dissertation is to analyse the usefulness of providing language support to the students when they write a composition. Language support can be provided in many different formats. In this study, the language support is an additional document, provided by the teacher, which includes examples of connectors to organise the text, structures to introduce and conclude the script and so on.

It is important to delve into the field of additional language support provided to the students because helping tools and resources to ease the writing process are necessary, since students tend to feel overwhelmed when writing a text in English without any external help. Along these lines, the decision to design this activity was based on students' comments during the first stage of the practicum, during which time they shared a feeling of being overloaded when writing in English due to the complexity of the English language. It was found that they tend to employ external tools such as Google Translate in order to express their ideas, which has limited efficacy. Therefore, gaining confidence when writing in English is essential, because it can help students express and organise their ideas in a clear and original way.

The main premise of the teaching actions taken in this study was that, by providing students with key additional language support (that has the aim of helping them with the general structure of the essay), they would feel confident enough to focus on other aspects of the writing process, such as the wording of their ideas or the topics they will discuss throughout the script.

It is the aim of this Master's Dissertation to provide proof that the language support can be effectively implemented in high schools' English lessons as a tool that can be adapted to students' different preferences, levels, aptitudes and learning barriers. This study has also considered how, after some practice with the language support section, students could even create their own language support depending on their needs.

Moreover, varied tools will be employed in order to prove whether language support is useful enough for the students. Mainly, the use of structures and discourse markers from the language support section in their final productions will be examined. A close analysis of their writing will determine if they have used the structures from the language support section, or only some of them. In addition to this, the analysis will confirm if the structures they employ are located in the right place and have a correct meaning in context. For example, using the structure “I will begin with...” at the very end of the composition would illustrate that the student does not know where this structure should be located.

If it is not the case, how can such language support be improved? The answer may suggest the need of format adjustments to the language support or having to adapt the language support to the needs of each student.

As for research questions, there is a driving research question, which can be broken down to more specific research questions:

- Is offering language support to the students helpful or not when they write their final text? If so, how is it most helpful? If not, how can this language scaffolding be improved to meet students' needs when writing?

To answer this question, the following questions are formulated:

- Do students use all the types of connectors and structures provided to them?
- Which types of connectors and structures are used the most?
- Do they employ the structures from the language support section properly, meaning in the right context and with a correct meaning?
- According to the students, what adjustments would improve the use of the structures from the language support?

1.1. Contextualisation of the study

The high school is located in a working-class neighbourhood in Sant Boi de Llobregat, but the students come from different areas of the city. According to the Ajuntament de Sant Boi de Llobregat (2019), the town is characterised by its cultural diversity. In the past and recently, families from all around the world, especially Morocco, China, Romania, Honduras and Pakistan, have moved to Sant Boi de Llobregat, as it can be confirmed by Ajuntament de Sant Boi de Llobregat (2019).

According to Institut Puigdevall (2019, p. 6), the aims of the school's educational project, presented in the *Projecte Educatiu de Centre*, are these: improving academic results, enhancing social cohesion in the school and, finally, improving the level of commitment from the families to the education of their children. Moreover, one of the relevant elements that characterise the school is the wide range of projects in which the school takes part. Some of these projects are initiatives driven by the school and other projects are external. The nature and topic of these projects are diverse: inclusion, health, sports and reading improvement among others.

The English methodology implemented in the school is determined by each English teacher. There are very innovative project-based approaches in some English lessons and other traditional theory-plus-exercises approaches. However, CLIL has been implemented in some subjects such as maths in English and biology in English and co-teaching has also been used in some subjects. It should be noted that it has always been a teacher initiative.

The class in which the data were gathered is a 4th of ESO class. According to the CEFR standards, their English level is B1. They are a group of 21 EFL students who are studying the scientific-technological itinerary. It is important to mention that there are only five girls in the classroom. This gender imbalance ratio of students was a principal factor in deciding to include gender stereotypes in the teaching unit on which this study is based.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. Pedagogical frame

The language support, also referred to as language scaffolding, is a pedagogical tool used in order to facilitate the writing process. It usually consists of providing the necessary structures and vocabulary items organised in the format of a list, a template or a chart to support a language task (Evnitskaya, 2018, p. 15). This tool will be analysed in depth in the following sections. The language support can be regarded from two different perspectives:

2.1.1. Cognitive approach

Long's seminal work (1998) divided English as a foreign language teaching practices into Focus on Meaning (FoM), Focus on FormS (FoFS) and Focus on Form (FoF). According to Long, FoM is described as the learner (intuitively) inducing the grammar rules through sufficient exposure or input of the target language. FoFS is typically associated with "traditional" methods that depart from study of the language as the bases for learning the language. Therefore, it refers to pre-planned language-centred activities which are explained and instructed explicitly in the classroom using syllabuses or coursebooks. Long described Focus on FormS as:

The teacher or textbook writer divides the L2 into segments of various kinds (phonemes, words, collocations, morphemes, sentence patterns, notions, functions, tones, stress and intonation patterns, and so on), and presents these to the learner in models, initially one item at a time, in a sequence determined by (rather vague, usually intuitive) notions of frequency, valency, or (the all-purpose and question-begging) "difficulty". (Long, 1998, p. 36)

On the contrary, FoF refers to linguistic content being explained when it is mentioned during the course of the lesson. It is explained naturally, spontaneously and from a communicative purpose.

According to these definitions, a language support section could be understood from a cognitive approach because it is explicit knowledge presented to the students as part of the planned task design,

not when it arises in the classroom conversation. Other pedagogic discourses make use of Focus on FormS pedagogies to first internalise the content through explicit instruction, and then focus on practising it orally or in writing. In this study, the language support analysed exemplifies this type of input, since the language items are explained to the students and then put into practice as they write their scripts.

It must be recognized that nowadays most teaching approaches are hybrid in the sense that they draw from both pre-planned explicit instruction and more spontaneous learning moments that emerge from the interaction. As Morton points out:

Another variant on this approach is Ellis's (2003) 'task-supported language teaching' in which specific language features are presented but tasks are used to provide focused practice of them. What these pedagogic discourses (PPP, ESA and task-supported language teaching) have in common is that they all are examples of explicit grammar instruction (Ellis & Shintani, 2014: 121), or, in Long's terms, of Focus on Forms. That is, they depend on a predetermined grammar syllabus of items selected to be taught and practised, rather than focusing on implicit instruction through communicative tasks (such as, for example in a CLIL approach) possibly with incidental Focus on Form. (Morton, 2017, p. 18)

2.1.2. Sociocultural approach

The sociocultural approach also takes into account the importance of input and output but takes social interaction as the driving force in order to learn a language. One of the most important concepts is the scaffolding, developed by Bruner.

I have used the expression "scaffolding" to characterize what the mother provides on her side of the dyad in one of the regularized formats--she reduces the degrees of freedom with which the child has to cope, concentrates his attention into a manageable domain, and provides models of the expected dialogue from which he can extract selectively what he needs for filling his role in discourse. (Bruner, 1978, p. 254)

Applied to language acquisition, the scaffolding refers to the temporary assistance, in this case provided by the teacher, that allows the student to accomplish a task beyond their capacities.

This key concept is closely related to Vygotsky's concept of Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). As Moll pointed out:

Vygotsky (1978, Ch. 6; 1987, Ch. 6) proposed differentiating *two* levels of development in the child: the actual developmental level which refers to individual performance or problem solving, and the more advanced proximal level which refers to aided performance or problem solving. He defined the zone of proximal development as the contrast between aided and unaided performance. (Moll, 1990, p. 158)

This concept of scaffolding is brought into this Master's Dissertation, as it is assumed that the students' performance when writing the script will be affected by the focused assistance provided by the language support section.

Once the context and tenets have been presented, the language support itself will be detailed. The function and nature of a language support section are formulated as:

. . . necessary language support to enable them [students] to continue and expand on their contributions, this support being either specific terminology, grammatical structures or general academic language items required by the disciplinary content being talked about or the nature of the task to be carried out. (Evnitskaya, 2018, p. 15)

According to Evnitskaya (2018, p. 15), the language support is required especially in content-rich contexts (such as CLIL classrooms) and for non-native English speakers who have a low English level. It is also specified that the provision of language support can be withdrawn once the students' English level is improved.

Secondly, Gibbons (2014) has also investigated language scaffolding. The author states that, instead of simplifying the tasks, the scaffolding that is provided to the students should be critically analysed and diversified. Some examples of language supports are provided:

For example, all learners might be expected at some point to write a persuasive text . . . For others the teacher may provide a scaffold that provides the connectives that start each section: first, my second point, on the other hand. For a student who as yet has very little English, the teacher might also provide the first sentence (or more) of each part of the text. Or they may provide, in addition to all these, and by talking with the student, a list of words or phrases that the student will need to use . . . In this way, the outcomes (here, the type of text) are similar for all students; what differs is the nature and amount of scaffolding provided, and the route by which the outcomes are achieved. (Gibbons, 2014, pp. 18-19)

As it has been mentioned above, the language support section tends to be targeted at students who have a low English level or who have just started studying this language.

As Chapter 1 pointed out, as far as possible teachers should try to have the range of learners in their class complete the same or similar tasks—what will vary is the kind and degree of the scaffolding teachers provide. For children at the early stages of writing in English, provide a simple organizational framework and some suggested connecting words as they begin writing . . . You could also provide a list of some of the vocabulary they will need to use. (Gibbons, 2014, p. 122)

It should be pointed out that, regarding the process of writing, Gibbons (2014, pp. 110-121) presents the language support as an additional scaffolding resource to the Teaching and Learning Cycle. This cycle, developed in 1990 by Derewianka and other Australian linguists, helps students write a specific text. Each lap of the cycle represents a different genre that students internalise. The whole cycle consists of four stages: building knowledge on the field, deconstructing the genre, joint construction and independent writing.

As will be mentioned afterwards, the genre of text that students write for the purpose of this Master's Dissertation is different from the typical genres studied in the school, included in the DECRET 187/2015 (2015, p. 56), such as: narration, description, argumentation, etc. Their text must be an analysis of the types of gender stereotypes (studied in the classroom or new ones) they can spot from an advertisement.

At this point, what are the gaps that this Master's Dissertation fills? Firstly, the language support section tends to be used for non-native English students who have a low English level or who have just started studying this language. However, is the language scaffolding useful with 4th of ESO students, who may not have a high English level, but who have studied it for years? Secondly, is the language support useful if the same document is given to all students? Otherwise, some diversification and adaptation to each student may be required, as Gibbons (2014) stated.

2.2. Analytical frame: Language-Related Episodes

It is noteworthy that since the students will be working in pairs, language-related episodes (LREs), as a negotiation of meaning, are going to take place. “A LRE episode is defined as any part of a dialogue where students talk about the language they are producing, question their language use, or correct themselves or others” (Swain & Lapkin, 1998, p. 326). As will be explained afterwards, knowing the students’ impressions and opinions regarding the language support section will be crucial to confirm its effectiveness or to make the required adjustments.

The co-construction of knowledge in pairs, as the sociocultural theory states, is only possible thanks to social interaction.

According to him [Vygotsky], human cognitive development is a socially situated activity mediated by language. Knowledge is socially constructed by interaction and is then internalized: individuals learn how to carry out a new function with the help of an expert (a more capable member of the community) and then they can perform it individually. (García Mayo & Zeitler, 2017, p. 62)

LREs are evidence of this aforementioned co-construction of knowledge. Students have to interact to discuss the message they want to deliver, to choose the most adequate words, to organise their ideas in different paragraphs, to tackle the linguistic doubts they find, etc. These negotiations of meaning that take place during the writing process are the LREs.

It is important to mention that, even if students discuss in Spanish, they are still negotiating to build a final product in English. As Jackson (2001) points out, LREs will have a major role in stating the usefulness of the language support section and the adjustments that should be done to it:

Here, LREs that occur during interaction may be useful in developing material for further instruction and/or testing. In addition, as a research tool, LREs are a useful construct for understanding the nature of second language production, and for exploring the contribution that output makes in learning a second language. (Jackson, 2001, p. 299)

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND METHOD

3.1. Context: Pedagogical intervention outlined

This Master's Dissertation is based on the teaching unit (Cufí & Gallardo, 2021) that was implemented in a 4th of ESO classroom. The teaching unit addressed gender stereotypes in different TV genres. During the first lessons, sitcoms and interviews to celebrities were analysed in depth (using Internet videos), in order to spot the different types and prevalence of gender stereotypes in each TV genre. In these lessons the students started to get used to the vocabulary and structures that are common to this field: vocabulary about physical appearance, jobs and professional aspirations, structures to describe a video and express opinion, etc. In the design of the teaching unit, it was expected that the main learning outcomes would be reproduced in the final production. The final production, the writing of a script for an oral presentation, was carried out in pairs: they had to choose an advertisement containing visible gender stereotypes and had to analyse the types of gender stereotypes that they could identify. Once the analysis was done, they had to write a text, as a "script" (for which they were provided with the language support) and finally they had to make an oral presentation explaining what they had spotted.

The 4th of ESO students, for the teaching unit, had a dossier containing all the activities, examples and resources. For the lesson in which students had to write the script for the oral presentation examining the advertisement, on one of the pages from the dossier they had the language support section printed for them to check. It was presented at the beginning of the first writing session. All the structures and discourse markers from the language support chart were read out loud and exemplified in a sentence or translated if necessary. They were given the chance of writing down the translation next to the structures if needed. The students were expected to use it as a resource to organise their text and to put the ideas in the right order, using the structures and connectors. It is important to highlight that, before the writing sessions, the teachers had given an example of the estimated final product (the oral presentation), by analysing an advertisement.

Below we can see the language support section provided to the students, which was included in their dossier:

Table 1: Language support section provided to the students

TYPES OF STRUCTURES	EXAMPLES
Initial greeting	Good morning... Hello everyone...
Introduction	Today we are here to talk about... We would like to talk about... The topic of our presentation is...
Handing over	Maria, the floor is yours. Now, Maria will talk about...
Organising and separating ideas	I will begin with ... Another interesting point is... I move on to... Finally, ...
Describing the video	In this video/scene, we can see that... What surprises me the most is that... This video shows...
Expressing opinion	I think that... To be honest... In my opinion... I strongly believe that...
Contrasting ideas	Unlike the man, the girl... While the boy..., the girl... However, ...
Thanking	Thanks for your attention. Thank you all for listening.
Asking for questions	I am happy to answer your questions now. Do you have any questions?

3.2. Data collection

In order to answer the research questions and objectives, data were gathered during the implementation of the teaching unit in the high school. Three different data collection tools, which are complementary sources, have been used to obtain data from a qualitative approach. Articles that adopt a similar approach to delve into this field of study, such as Kayi-Aydar (2013, p. 326), also make use of some of these data gathering tools. With regards to this Master's Dissertation, firstly, qualitative data were mainly gathered by analysing the scripts written by the students (see Appendix A). Just before giving their oral presentations (based on the previously written script), the students were asked to submit their scripts (as an assignment) to the Classroom platform, which they use as the educational platform to submit tasks, write and receive messages and take exams. Afterwards, these scripts were analysed in depth. A content analysis of the student written productions revealed if they used all the types of structures provided by the teacher (or only some of them) and what kinds of structures were more used. Moreover, this analysis determined whether students used the structures in the right place and according to their correct meaning. In summary, this analysis allowed for a clear counting (also considering the quality) of the discourse markers and structures from the language support used by the students in their scripts.

Secondly, qualitative data were also gathered by in-class interviews during the writing process (see Appendices C and D). In turns, they were spontaneously asked by the teacher about their opinion and feelings towards the usefulness of the language support provided by the teachers. This method revealed their impressions about language support and the justifications behind their decisions about whether using this resource, or some part of it, or not. In addition to this, students were encouraged to express the adjustments that they consider would improve the effectiveness of the language support document. From the interviews, the information provided by the students was gathered by the third data collection tool: the recordings.

The rationale behind carrying out in-class interviews, rather than after-class or online interviews, is that due to the current pandemic context, the timetables in the high schools are tight and strict. As practicum teachers, we were allowed to attend specific subjects with some groups. Therefore, planning after-class interviews would entail special requirements and arrangements. Online interviews would also entail legal requirements and would imply extra work for the students, who are overwhelmed with tasks and assignments at this point in the school year. In addition to this, in-class interviews ensured a lower level of formality for the students, hence they were more likely to express their opinions and impressions from a comfortable, spontaneous and honest point of view. By conducting online or after-class interviews, the students would feel pressured, as if it was a grading activity.

An ethical issue that must be mentioned is that, during the interviews, students' answers could have been guided towards a specific and desired answer. To avoid this, students were given plenty of time to answer the questions, rather than constantly suggesting possible answers to try to help them. Moreover, they were encouraged to answer in English, even if their utterances were faulty and poor. Nonetheless, to ensure that they expressed their ideas and impressions freely, and in case they do not feel confident expressing themselves in English, they were given the chance to answer in Spanish. The students' utterances from the interviews used in this Master's Dissertation have been translated into English.

Thirdly, the whole writing process was audio-recorded during the lessons. One of the students from each pair used their mobile phone to record the two lessons (one and a half hours) in which they were writing the script. The recordings were carefully and precisely listened to, first to get a general gist of the conversations and a second time to identify and take note of the LRE moments (see Appendix B). This method allowed for the analysis of their comments and references, during the lessons, to the language scaffolding section they had been provided with. It enabled to state if students constantly checked and employed the language support section or if they put it aside.

The recording planning was explained to the students before the first writing lesson. One person from each pair was responsible for the recording requirements: putting their mobile phone in the middle of the table, stating their names (for identification purposes) and uploading the recording to the Classroom platform folder, as an assignment. These folders were set up before the writing lessons. At the end of each of the two writing lessons, they were asked to submit the recording before the end of the class, to make sure nobody forgot to do so. Before they started writing their scripts, the students were informed that neither the recordings nor the interviews would have an impact on the mark, since they are sources to gather data for the Master's Dissertation. As teachers, we are in a position of power, hence it had to be clearly explained to the students that these were not grading activities.

3.3. Data analysis

From the recordings, students' excerpts reflected classroom discussions to negotiate meaning, reflect on their own language and produce an output in English. It should also be emphasized that students' comments were in Spanish because they do not tend to use the target language unless the teacher is present. Therefore, the selected utterances from the students were transcribed in Spanish and translated into English.

From the corpus of recordings, only some fragments were considered LREs, hence were included in this Master's Dissertation. According to the agreed criteria, to be considered an LRE, student's comments and discussions had to concern any of these topics:

- Explicit reference to the language support section or any of the structures that it contains.
- Clarification request about the meaning, function or spelling of any structure from the language scaffolding; asked to the teachers, partners or other classmates.
- Explicit reference to the writing process and the organisation of ideas.

- Allusion to the use of external digital tools, such as Google Translate.

Although the fourth category does not belong to the scaffolding process, it is included as part of the analysis because it indicates a deficiency in the language scaffolding.

From the recordings, a total of 26 LREs were encountered, all of them included in the Appendix B. From these LREs, 13 of them were references to the language support section or its structures, 6 were clarification requests about the structures, 6 were references to the writing process and the organisation of ideas, and there was a single allusion to the use of external digital tools.

In this Master's Dissertation, out of the 26 LREs, 10 of them were chosen and included in the results to exemplify and illustrate in more detail a variety of LREs from different categories and informants. These LREs were the most informative and represent different comments and impressions towards the language scaffolding.

The selected excerpts from the recordings were included in the study using broad transcription, instead of the Jefferson Transcription System. The rationale behind this decision is that the focus is mainly on what students say, rather than on how they say it or the non-verbal actions.

Regarding the interviews, also collected in the recordings, the fragments that were included in this Master's Dissertation were chosen to exemplify the most contrastive and wide-ranging opinions on the language support section.

The entirety of students from the class of 4th of ESO C, EFL students, were the participants in the study, as the informants. The information they provided, in writing for the scripts and orally for the interviews and recordings, was analysed in pairs because that is how students worked during all the process of writing the scripts. Therefore, the methodological approach combined content analysis (for the scripts) and conversation analysis (for the LREs and the interviews, both included in the recordings).

Once all the data were gathered, it was classified according to the informants. Each pair of students had their oral and written productions analysed and organised separately. Firstly, the scripts were examined in order to count the number of structures included from the language support section, taking into account whether they used all the types of connectors and which were used the most. It was also considered the suitability of the structures they used, meaning in the right context and with a correct meaning (see Appendix A). Secondly, the recordings were analysed to select the LREs mentioned by each pair of students (see Appendix B). Thirdly, their answers from the interview, included in the recordings, were written down (see Appendices C and D). This means that each pair of students had a document with their script, their LREs and the interview answers. Afterwards, these results were compared to other students' results.

The English teacher and also my practicum colleague (who was coteaching with me) helped to collect all the necessary data, in particular the recordings, which was the most difficult procedure for the students. Nonetheless, I was the person asking the questions during the in-class interviews.

In order to ensure the anonymity of students, each of the nine pairs of students is referred to with a name of a colour. These include: Red, Blue, Green, Yellow, Pink, Black, White, Orange and Purple.

For legal purposes, the document "Permission to take photos and to record videos" was delivered to the high school during the first practicum, and it was signed and stamped. In addition to this, the English teacher and the 4th of ESO students were asked whether they gave their permission to be recorded during the two English sessions.

4. RESULTS

4.1. Analysis of the scripts

In this part of the dissertation, the written output produced by the students (see Appendix A) is analysed in order to discover whether they have used all the types of discourse markers and structures and which of them are used the most. For this reason, table 2 is included so as to illustrate the structures and connectors that have been employed by each pair of students in their final script.

It is worth mentioning that variations of the structures and discourse markers from the language support section are also included in the following table. These modifications include variations in the verb used (e.g. “Now Yellow will explain...” instead of “Now, Maria will talk about...”), in the level of formality (e.g. “Today we’re gonna talk about” instead of “Today we are here to talk about”) or in the formulation of the expression (e.g. “As we can see,...” instead of “In this video/scene, we can see that...”).

Moreover, some numbers from the tables are marked in red, which indicates that the structure from the language scaffolding is used incorrectly. The mistakes include omissions of particles and prepositions (e.g. “Today we would talk about...” instead of “We would like to talk about...”) and the wrong usage of the connector or formulation of the sentence following this connector, as it is the case of the structure “Unlike the man, the girl...”, which is used as if it worked like the connectors “Regarding the girl” or “However, the girl”. Nonetheless, despite the omissions and wrong formulation, all the structures marked in red are used in the right context within the script overall structure and with an intended correct meaning.

The results from this table will be analysed and compared in the following sections and in the conclusions, in order to answer the initial research questions.

Table 2: Structures and discourse markers from the language support included in students' scripts

Types of structures	Examples	Red	Blue	Green	Yellow	Pink	Black	White	Orange	Purple	Sum
Initial greeting	Good morning...		1								8
	Hello everyone...	1		1		1	1	1	1	1	
Introduction	Today we are here to talk about...	1			1	1		1	1		6
	We would like to talk about...			1							
	The topic of our presentation is...										
Handing over	Maria, the floor is yours.						1			1	3
	Now, Maria will talk about...				1						
Organising and separating ideas	I will begin with...		1					1		1	7
	Another interesting point is...		1								
	I move on to...		1								
	Finally, ...	1	1								
Describing the video	In this video/scene, we can see that...	1	1	1		1	1		1	2	18
	What surprises me the most is that...		1	1				1		1	
	This video shows...	1	1						3	1	
Expressing opinion	I think that...				1			1			7
	To be honest...			1							
	In my opinion...		1	1			2				
	I strongly believe that...										
Contrasting ideas	Unlike the man, the girl...		1	1					1		6
	While the boy..., the girl...	1									
	However, ...			1	1						
Thanking	Thanks for your attention.		1	1		1			1		7
	Thank you all for listening.				1			1	1		
Asking for questions	I am happy to answer your questions now.										5
	Do you have any questions?			1	1	1			1	1	

4.2. Analysis of the LREs

Next, an analysis of several language-related episodes (LREs) from the recordings (see Appendix B) will be carried out. The LREs included in the following table will be categorised according to the type of structure they allude to. As aforementioned, these include references to the structures from the language scaffolding section, clarification requests about the meaning, function or spelling of any of the structures, and references to the writing process.

The categorisation of LREs alluding to the structures from the language support section will be counted on the whole, without specifying which pair of students mentioned each one of the LREs. The rationale behind this decision is to identify on which types of structures they comment most frequently. The most predominant categories will be analysed in depth in this section. However, the least predominant ones will be subject for discussion in the conclusions.

Table 3: Students' LREs categorised according to the structure they allude to

Types of structures	Examples	Number of LREs	Sum
Initial greeting	Good morning...		0
	Hello everyone...		
Introduction	Today we are here to talk about...	2	4
	We would like to talk about...	2	
	The topic of our presentation is...		
Handing over	Maria, the floor is yours.	3	5
	Now, Maria will talk about...	2	
Organising and separating ideas	I will begin with...	1	2
	Another interesting point is...		
	I move on to...	1	
	Finally, ...		
Describing the video	In this video/scene, we can see that...	2	7
	What surprises me the most is that...	2	
	This video shows...	3	
Expressing opinion	I think that...	1	1
	To be honest...		
	In my opinion...		
	I strongly believe that...		
Contrasting ideas	Unlike the man, the girl...	1	2
	While the boy..., the girl...		
	However, ...	1	
Thanking	Thanks for your attention.	2	3
	Thank you all for listening.	1	
Asking for questions	I am happy to answer your questions now.		2
	Do you have any questions?	2	

The most predominant types of structures, including 7 LREs, are the structures from “Describing the video”, which are: “In this video/scene, we can see that...”, “What surprises me the most is that...” and “This video shows...”. Most of the LREs in this section reflect a clarification request to their partners about the meaning or the spelling of the structure they have suggested to employ. An example of this type of LRE is provided below.

Excerpt 1 (Blue)

B1: I think that he appears the most of the time. ¿Sí? Es para meter más cosas.

K u p øIvis"tkinlAdë more things.

Lo que más me sorprende era “What surprises me the most is that”.

What surprises me the most was

B2: Sí, eso sí.

Yes, it is.

B1: Fua, ¿cómo se escribía?

Wow, how is it written?

B2: Sur-pri-ses me the most is that the girl. Todo junto, mi amor.

All together, my love.

B1: What surprises me the most is that the girl appears the most of the time.

Other examples of LREs alluding to structures to describe the video reflect a discussion among the partners to select, from the language support section, the most suitable structure for the sentence they are writing in their script. It is considered a co-construction of meaning, since both members of the pair are deciding together how the text will be constructed. The following excerpt exemplifies this.

Excerpt 2 (Orange)

O1: El hombre va con traje.

The man wears a suit.

O2: Sí, él va de trabajo y ella va de estar por casa.

Yes, he wears working clothes and she wears clothes to wear around the house.

O1: Veamos, hmmm...

Ng v ø u " u g g .

O2: Escoge bien, eh. Describe, describing the video.

Choose wisely, huh.

O1: Vale, this video shows.

All right,

O2: This video shows that the men.

The last example of LREs alluding to structures to describe the video illustrates that one of the partners emphasizes that the structures from the language support section should be written and employed as they appear in the dossier, without changing any word. Therefore, this excerpt represents a correction made to their partner.

Excerpt 3 (Black)

B1: And he put...

B2: No, así no. Ponlo en plan: en esta escena se ve, in this scene we can see that

No, not like this. Write it as: in this scene it is seen,

B1: In the video we can see the men...

B2: THAT men...

B1: that he was washing, and he put female soap.

B2: Vale.

All right.

Secondly, another predominant category of structures is “Handing over”, which includes the structures “Maria, the floor is yours.” and “Now, Maria will talk about...”. 4 LREs make reference to this category in order to hand over. Some of these LREs reflect a clarification request to their partner about the meaning of the structures they want to employ. Below an example of this is provided.

Excerpt 4 (Green)

G1: Eh ¿Y esto qué es? ["Handing over" section]

Hum, and what is this?

G2: Em, [Green], the floor is yours, o sea, [Green] tu turno.

Em, or rather, [Green] your turn.

G1: Ah.

Ah.

G2: O ahora [Green] hablará sobre eso: Now, Maria will talk about...

Or now [Green] will talk about this

G1: Vale.

All right.

The rest of LREs reflect a collective organisation of the ideas they want to mention. In the following excerpt, they check the language support section in order to decide how to divide the ideas each of them will explain during the oral presentation.

Excerpt 5 (Black)

B1: Vale, vamos a leer lo que he puesto.

Q m g { . " n g v ø u " t g c f " y j c v " K " j c x g " y t k v v g p 0

B2: Vale, espera, ahora te doy el turno a ti. Espera, espera un momento.

All right, wait, now I give you the floor. Wait, wait a minute.

B1: ¿Dónde están las formas para decirlo? En plan...

Y j g t g " c t g " v j g " h q t o u " v q " u c { " k v A " N k m g í "

B2: [Black], the floor is yours.

B1: Vale, ¿y luego?

All right, and then?

B2: Toma, escribe tú ahora.

Take it, now you write.

Thirdly, the last type of category that will be analysed is the “Introduction”, which includes the structures “Today we are here to talk about...”, “We would like to talk about...” and “The topic of our presentation is...”. 4 LREs belong to references to this category. Since the structures included in the language support section to introduce the topic are well-known among the students, any of the LREs are clarification requests about the meaning of these structures. Instead, the LREs reflect the collaborative decision-making in order to select the most suitable structure to introduce the topic of the presentation or a discussion with the teacher about the process of writing. Below, two examples of LREs from this category are provided.

Excerpt 6 (Green)

G1: Today... ¿Cuál ponemos? ¿Esta, “Today we are here to talk about” o esta, “We would like
Which one do we choose? This one or this one
to talk about”?

G2: Esta. [the second one] Espera, voy a preguntar una cosa a la profe.
This one. Wait, I am going to ask the teacher one thing.

Excerpt 7 (White)

T: So you have ideas, you already know. Now you have to write it down.

W1: Okey, ¿y usando esto, no? [the language support section]
Okey, and using this, right?

T: Claro, por ejemplo: “We would like to talk about”, nos gustaría hablar sobre this
Of course, for example: we would like to talk about
advertisement, este anuncio.
this advertisement.

W1: Vale.
All right.

Slightly changing the topic, other relevant LREs must be included in this section. The following LREs allude to the use of external digital tools and to the writing process (and the organisation of ideas). These excerpts will be discussed in the conclusions.

The following LRE concerns the use of external digital tools, and it indicates a deficiency in the language scaffolding.

Excerpt 8 (Red)

R1: ¿En serio tus padres te pagan [la academia de] inglés para que escribas con el

Do your parents really pay for an English [language academy] so that you write

Traductor?

using [Google] Translate?

R2: Me da igual, así es más fácil.

I do not care, it is easier this way.

Moreover, in the two following excerpts, it is inferred that the language support section is regarded as a tool to simply improve their mark, instead of a tool to help them write the script.

Excerpt 9 (Red)

R1: Tenemos que hacerlo como sale aquí, así nos suben más nota.

We have to do it as it appears here, this way we get a higher mark.

Excerpt 10 (Blue)

B1: Tenemos que poner estas cosas eh también... [structures from the language support]

Y g " j c x g " v q " k p e n w f g " v j g u g " v j k p i u " v q q í " " ' "

B2: Primero ponemos las ideas y ya luego lo hacemos en plan bien.

First, we write the ideas and then we do it properly.

4.3. Analysis of the interviews

As for the interview results, the third source of data collection (also extracted from the recordings), the information will be classified according to the questions they were asked during the interviews (see Appendices C and D).

4.3.1. Most important categories of structures

During the interviews, the students were asked which parts of the language support section were more important, according to their own opinion. In the following table the answers are expressed. The table only includes the general category of structures, not the examples within each category.

Table 4: The most important types of structures according to students' criteria

Types of structures	Red	Blue	Green	Yellow	Pink	Black	White	Orange	Purple	Sum
Initial greeting	X			X	X	X	X			5
Introduction			X		X	X		X	X	5
Handing over										0
Organising and separating ideas		X	X			X				3
Describing the video		X	X	X				X	X	5
Expressing opinion		X				X				2
Contrasting ideas								X	X	2
Thanking	X			X	X	X				4
Asking for questions				X	X					2

It should be noted that, during the interviews, the students highlighted which were the most relevant types of structures according to them, which does not mean which structures they used to write their script (see table 2). As an example, Green expressed that they had used at least one structure from each category. Nonetheless, White shared that despite using the initial greeting structures, “Prefiero ir por libre. No me ha servido mucho”. [*I prefer to work on my own. It [the language support section] has not been very useful.*]

From table 4 it can be highlighted that “Initial greeting” and “Introduction” are among the most used categories. Some students shared the reason behind this factor. According to Pink: “Los de iniciar el tema y todo son los que suelen costar más”. [*The ones to introduce the topic and all are the ones that we find more difficult*]. Moreover, Black expressed that these initial categories can be helpful to take the first step and start writing: “Por si no tienes ninguna idea, pues que te ayude a empezar. Por ejemplo, si no sé decir “hola a todos” pues ya me ayuda para presentarme”. [*In case you do not have any ideas, it helps you start. For example, if I do not know how to say òhello everyoneö it helps me introduce myself*].

4.3.2. Impressions about the language support section

Another question from the interview concerned the impressions they obtained regarding the language scaffolding section. The students all provided similar answers, although with some nuances. Almost all of them expressed that the language support section was sort of a support or help when writing the scripts, and that it made them feel confident. Below we can see some quotes reflecting their answers to this question.

Excerpt 11 (Green)

“ . . . creo que es un poco de ayuda, para irte guiando. A nosotras nos va bien. A lo mejor no sabemos cómo empezar y esto te dice “María, te toca”, o sea “María the floor is yours”. Yo no sabía que se podía decir eso, es algo nuevo que he aprendido”. [*. . . I think that it is a little help, to keep guiding you. It is helpful for us. Maybe we do not know how to start and this tells you*

ō O c t ¶ c . " { q w t " v w t p ö . " q t " t c v j nōttkrōwōyōuccōu¶l say thax ÿ ig " h n q q t
something new that I have learnt.]

Excerpt 12 (Yellow)

“Está bien tenerlo, así no tienes que buscarlo por Internet. Y ya lo tienes aquí”. [*It is a good thing to have it, so you do not have to look it up on the Internet. You already have it here.*]

Excerpt 13 (Pink)

“A mi sin más. Es como que te dice que tienes que trabajar. Tú lo miras y dices “tengo que hacer esto”. Da un poco de palo. Aunque ayuda, claro, para hacer el texto”. [*To me it is indifferent. It is like it tells you that you have to work. You take a look c v " k v " c p f " v j k p m " ò K " j c x g " v me feel a bit lazy. Although it is helpful, of course, to write the text.*]

Excerpt 14 (Purple)

“More comfortable. Así tengo más recursos esenciales. Ayuda, ayuda más”. [*This way I have more essential resources. It helps, it helps even more.*]

4.3.3. Suggested improvements or adjustments to the language support section

The last question from the in-class interviews was related to the improvements or adjustments that should be made to the language support section, in order to make it more useful and functional. Regarding the answers, they offered a wide range of adjustments to improve the language scaffolding section.

Firstly, Yellow and White expressed that they would not make any changes to the language support, without any further specification. Opposing views were shared regarding this topic. On the one hand, Black and Purple expressed that they would add more categories and more examples within each category, to have more options when writing their script. On the other hand, Orange

suggested removing some of the categories, since some of them are too obvious, and only keep the fundamental ones. According to Orange, there are too many categories.

Other suggestions include format adjustments, an adaptation of the structures to the assignment or including the translation of the structures, as can be seen below.

Excerpt 15 (Blue)

“Que no esté tan apelotonado todo. Más espacio entre las categorías”. [*It should not be so crammed together. More space between the categories.*]

Excerpt 16 (Red)

“Es que esto [the language support section] no es específico para hacer este trabajo, esto es más para escribir un texto cualquiera. Algo más enfocado a nuestro trabajo”. [*The thing is that it is not specific to do this assignment, it can be used to write any text. Something more focused upon our assignment.*]

Excerpt 17 (Green)

“A lo mejor la traducción de algunas palabras. Sabes, o sea, poner entre paréntesis el significado. A ver, lo típico no, “Good morning” lo sabe todo el mundo. En plan las palabras que no conocemos, difíciles, como “However””. [*Perhaps the translation of some words. You know, I mean, writing the difficult words that we do not know. For example, “Good morning” everyone knows. In the case of words we don't know, like “However”, it's better to put the meaning in parentheses.*]

Excerpt 18 (Pink)

“Lo único que me ha costado ha sido tener que traducir siempre cada una [of the structures]. Si quería decir esto, pues tenía que traducirlo en castellano . . . tenerlo en castellano a mí sí que me ayudaría. Claro porque así sabes lo que estás diciendo en tu cabeza en castellano y después sabes como se dice en inglés. Y a lo mejor lo automatizas mejor”. [*The only thing that was hard was always having to translate each of them. If I wanted to say that, I had to translate it into Spanish . . . having it in Spanish would be helpful to me. Sure, because this way you know what you are saying inside your head in Spanish and then you know how it is said in English. And maybe you make it automatic more easily.*]

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

After carrying out the analysis of the results, they have been interpreted following this order: the scripts, the LREs and the interviews. Firstly, the data from the scripts suggest that most of the students follow a coherent organisation of the ideas when describing the different gender stereotypes from the chosen advertisement. As can be seen in table 2, they use different types of structures and discourse markers from the language support section.

As was stated by Green in excerpt 11, the language support section can help students reach new levels of understanding. In other words, as pointed out by Bruner (1978) in the theoretical framework, the language scaffolding and the help of others (teachers and peers) represent a temporary assistance to help the student achieve goals that are beyond their capacities. In this case, students have been able to employ new structures and connectors in their scripts.

The initial research questions will be answered at this stage: **“Do students use all the types of connectors and structures provided to them?”**. To a different extent, students use in their scripts the majority of types of structures from the language support section. Nevertheless, no student has used all the types of connectors and structures provided to them. In other words, nobody has used at least one of the structures from each of the categories in the language scaffolding. In fact, it should be pointed out that some of the structures and discourse markers have not been employed by any of the students in the classroom, as it is the case of the structures “The topic of our presentation is”, “I strongly believe that” and “I am happy to answer your questions now”.

Regarding the selection of structures within each category, there are two possible interpretations regarding this phenomenon. In some categories (see table 2), the most used structure is the first one from the section, as it is the case of “Introduction”, “Organising and separating ideas”, “Describing the video” and “Thanking”. Nevertheless, in some other categories, the most used structure is the simplest, shortest and more common one from the section, as it is

the case of “Initial greeting” and “Asking for questions”. In this case, these interpretations imply that the majority of students want to ease the process of writing the script. For this reason, when checking the language support section, they tend to employ the first or the simplest structure from the section. It would also justify why structures such as “I strongly believe that” and “I am happy to answer your questions now”, which are quite long and complex, have not been employed by any of the students in their scripts.

Another research question is: “**Which types of connectors and structures are used the most?**”. Categories such as “Describing the video” and “Initial greeting” are the most used among the students. With the exception of one pair, the rest of students have included different structures from these categories in their scripts. A justification for this phenomenon is that due to the nature of the assignment (an oral presentation describing gender stereotypes from an advertisement), such categories were necessary to fulfil the task.

Nevertheless, other categories like “Handing over” and “Asking for questions” are only employed by a small minority of the working pairs. The reason for this phenomenon is that, unlike the aforementioned categories, these categories are not compulsory in an oral presentation. As an example, during the first practicum it was observed that, when giving other oral presentations, students did not include structures from these categories.

The following research question is: “**Do they employ the structures from the language support section properly, meaning in the right context and with a correct meaning?**”. From the results in table 2, it can be stated that, in general, students have been able to employ the structures in the right context, meaning in the correct part within the organisation of the script, and with a correct meaning. The majority of structures used incorrectly are due to the omission of some particles. Surprisingly, the sentences in which the discourse marker “Unlike” is employed are formulated inappropriately. This factor implies that this connector should have been scaffolded, explained or trained in more detail, since its appearance in the language support section without any context nor translation, is found to be insufficient for the students. Perhaps, the wrong usage

and formulation of this connector in students' scripts suggest that the discourse marker "Unlike" is still too complex for B1 students to be used.

It must be highlighted that, some students even tried adaptations of the original structures from the language support section. In most cases, the verb of the structures was changed in order not to repeat the sentence starters in an identical way. It can be regarded as a strength, since it indicates that some pairs understood the provided structures and managed to look for alternatives.

Secondly, the data from the LREs have been interpreted. On the one hand, as it has been exemplified by the LREs in the previous section, clarification requests to teachers and peers prove that writing the script is a task that has a slightly more difficult level compared to the students' level. As pointed out by García Mayo & Zeitler (2017), this higher level that the task requires can be reached with the help of teachers and peers and the focused assistance of the language support section.

On the other hand, among the LREs, there are a lot of clarification requests about the meaning of the spelling of the structures. This factor could indicate that some structures are too difficult for the students' level, and a greater degree of scaffolding should be provided to the students. As suggested by Green in excerpt 17, the translation of some structures would facilitate the writing process.

From the analysis of the LREs, it can be stated that some structures are alluded to in a lot of occasions. The most alluded categories are "Describing the video", "Handing over" and "Introduction". It is noteworthy that the "Handing over" section is discussed a lot in the LREs, but is one of the least employed categories in the scripts. The reason behind this factor could be that, even though it is not employed in their scripts, students commented on this section since it includes new structures that they had not heard of. Another reason could be that, even though the structures to hand over were discussed, these structures were not considered contextually appropriate for the content of the scripts they were writing.

In accordance with García Mayo and Zeitler (2017), social interaction, mediated by language, allows for a co-construction of knowledge. In this case, LREs reflect a collaborative construction of the text by discussing about the message they want to deliver, the organisation of ideas, the selection of the most suitable structure, etc. However, the most remarkable phenomenon is that there are far less LREs referring to the structures than structures actually used in their scripts. The sum of 26 LREs is a small number, taking into account that the recordings lasted one and a half hours. A possible reason behind this phenomenon is that some categories (such as “Initial greeting” or “Expressing opinion”, the least discussed categories) are too obvious to be commented on. It would mean that the pair directly wrote the structure without discussing the structure they would use or the organisation of ideas.

Other reasons for this phenomenon could also be plausible, according to their working methods. As it has been confirmed by listening to the recordings, some pairs preferred working individually during some periods of time. Each of them would write their part of the script (corresponding to their part of the oral presentation) separately and in turns. During the performance of the task, sometimes only one person from the pair was writing the script on their own. These working methods reduced the level of co-construction of meaning among the students. Since they wrote the scripts using their laptops, other pairs worked together but in silence, co-constructing the script in their shared document but without talking, also reducing the number of LREs. Green, Yellow and Pink are an example of these alternative working methods.

It will be detailed in the limitations section, but the use of laptops, in my opinion, reduced the number of LREs produced by the students during the writing process. By using an online shared document, they could write at the same time, without having to discuss the structure they wanted to use or the formulation of the sentences. Therefore, when they use a structure included in the language support without mentioning it out loud, it is not clear whether they know the structure by heart or if they have checked the language support section.

Thirdly, the data from the interviews have been interpreted. As it was expected, in-class interviews ensure a lower level of formality and the students felt free to give their opinion, especially on the adjustments that should be done. Students were given plenty of time to answer the questions, to avoid guiding them towards a specific and desired answer. This can be proven by the diversity of answers provided by them.

The initial research question can be answered at this stage: **“Is offering language support to the students helpful or not when they write their final text? If so, how is it most helpful?”**

K h " p q v . " j q y " e c p " v j k u " n c p i w c i g " u e c h h q n f k p i . " d g " k o r

Their answers during the interviews regarding their impressions suggested that almost all the students (excepting White) consider that the language support section is a helpful resource when writing the scripts, and that it makes them feel confident. Therefore, it can be stated that it is an effective tool. Moreover, by examining table 2, it can be confirmed that a considerable number of structures from the language support section have been employed by the students.

Similar conclusions are drawn by Cotterall & Cohen (2003). Although this study is contextualised within a writing programme for international students and focuses on another text genre, it also delves into the provision of diversified scaffolding. The conclusions can be summarised as follows:

... by providing appropriate scaffolding throughout the essay cycle, we were able to focus attention on the language and structure needed to produce an argument essay. This successfully reduced the learning burden for class members as they engaged in what was, for most, an unfamiliar and challenging task. (Cotterall & Cohen, 2003, p. 165)

In accordance with what Gibbons (2014) states, instead of simplifying the task, scaffolding resources should be provided to students. In this way, they can accomplish a task that is slightly more difficult than their current level and capabilities, but that is still within their Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), described by Moll (1990).

According to students' criteria, the most important language support sections are “Initial greeting”, “Introduction” and “Describing the video”, which is in keeping with the results from

the analysis of the scripts. On the contrary, the least mentioned categories when answering this question are: “Handing over”, “Expressing opinion”, “Contrasting ideas” and “Asking for questions”. These results are also in accordance with the results from the analysis of the scripts.

Nevertheless, even though they mention they have used the language support, some pairs contradict themselves when stating this, since they have not employed it as much as they say. For example, in comparison to the 11 structures used by Blue in their script, Red and Yellow used 6 and Pink used only 5. A possible reason is that they are aware of the language support section but do not know how to use it. Another reason could be that they were afraid of expressing the truth during the interviews, as they thought that not using the language support would lower their mark.

From the recordings, other references to the use of external digital tools and to the writing process in general (excerpts 8-10), confirm that, for some students, the impressions towards the language scaffolding section are different from the ones mentioned during the interview.

The excerpt 8 implies that the language support section is not useful, since Red still prefer (or need) to make use of Google Translate to write their script. Moreover, excerpts 9 and 10 prove that Red and Blue regard the language support section as an additional tool to improve their mark, instead of a scaffolding tool to help them write the script. In their opinion, if they include structures from the language scaffolding in their script, the teacher will increase their mark.

It can be inferred from excerpts 8-10 that for some students, the feeling of being overwhelmed still remains despite the provision of language support. Therefore, since students use external tools such as Google Translate, adjustments are needed in order to improve the effectiveness of this scaffolding resource. By implementing adjustments, perhaps all the students would master the use of the structures in the scripts and would be able to focus on their wording and formulation of ideas.

As for the question concerning the adjustments they would implement to the language support section, their answers were divergent. These answers are the response to the last research

question: **“According to the students, what adjustments would improve the use of the structures from the language support?”**. Almost all pairs suggested adjustments, hence the data confirm the importance that students attribute to improving the language support section in some way. According to their opinion, its effectiveness could and should be enhanced. The different answers during the interviews included adding or removing categories and/or examples, format adjustments, an adaptation of the structures to the assignment or including the translation of the structures.

At this point, how can this language scaffolding be improved to meet students’ needs when writing? Based on the data from the LREs and the interviews, the answer is that the language support should be personalised and adapted to students’ different preferences, levels, aptitudes and learning barriers. During the interviews, students suggested different adjustments, depending on their needs. Therefore, it can be concluded that each student needs a personalised language support section, principle which corresponds with the Universal Design for Learning (CAST, 2021). Other authors and researchers support the adaptation of scaffolding resources. Firstly, as Gibbons (2014) points out, to meet students’ needs, diversified and adapted scaffolding should be provided to each student: “what will vary is the kind and degree of the scaffolding teachers provide” (Gibbons, 2014, p. 122). Secondly, Benko (2012) reinforces the same statement considering the nature of the scaffolding provided to the students:

Scaffolding for the same writing task may look very different from classroom to classroom and even from student to student within the same classroom; teachers might consider ways to tailor instruction to meet the various needs of students, keeping in mind that all students might not need the same kind of assistance. (Benko, 2012, p. 299)

Slightly changing the topic, Evnitskaya (2018) and Gibbons (2014) stated that the language support section, as a scaffolding resource, tends to be targeted at students who have a low command of English or who have just started studying this foreign language. According to Evnitskaya (2018), this tool can be withdrawn once students advance to superior English levels. Different from what Evnitskaya (2018) and Gibbons (2014) declare, it has been observed in this study that the language scaffolding, even more if adapted to each student needs, is a useful tool to push students

a step further, regardless of their English level or their experience studying this language. As it has been proven, almost all the students in the classroom, with different English levels, have employed the language support section, to a different extent.

As it can be inferred from the scripts (see Appendix A), on the one hand, Blue wrote a high-level script and, nevertheless, they made use of a great number of structures from the language support section. Therefore, it can be deduced that this scaffolding tool should not be withdrawn once students advance to superior English levels, as long as the language support is adapted to their level and needs. On the other hand, Pink wrote a low-level script and did not use many structures from the language support. The data unveiled that some students, such as Pink, did not quite understand how to use this specific language support section. Therefore, reading and explaining the language support out loud and providing an example of the estimated final product is not enough for all students to start writing the script independently.

For this reason, another kind of language support, and a different degree of scaffolding, should have been provided to them. As suggested by Afitska (2015, p. 83), instead of providing a list of structures and connectors that students could use, a good idea would be providing Pink with sentence starters (the first sentence of each part of the text to guide the structure) or substitution tables (model sentences they can use as a pattern to create their own sentences), for example. The sentence that best summarises this idea is: “the outcomes . . . are similar for all students; what differs is the nature and amount of scaffolding provided, and the route by which the outcomes are achieved.” (Gibbons, 2014, p. 19). Moreover, Walqui (2006, pp. 177-178) also supports the idea of multiple scaffolding resources during the learning process. This author concludes that, in comparison to English native speakers, EFL students may need more activities and a greater amount of scaffolding to develop the same competence. As Walqui states: “Teachers need to be well versed in their subject matter to be able to provide students with as many scaffolds as are needed to assist their learning.” (Walqui, 2006, p. 177)

In addition to this, if eventually students are able to create their own language support, adapting it to their preferences and needs, its usefulness would increase to the maximum, since each student knows what their strengths and weaknesses are. They would be able to add or remove categories, to include the translation of some words, to make format adjustments, etc. Afitska (2015), in her study, also comes to the same conclusion when scaffolding learning and materials to help students learn science and language:

The recurring nature of such exercises and the opportunity to record ideas in writing gave learners space to eventually develop their own bank of linguistic resources that could be used to help them express their scientific ideas in future lessons. (Afitska, 2015, pg. 83)

Regarding the limitations of this Master's Dissertation, almost all of them concern the process of audio-recording the writing process. Even though it was stated that the recordings were not part of the mark, students were concerned that their comments would have an impact on their mark. Some students felt uncomfortable at the beginning of the recording process because they would be recorded during a whole session, because they would not know where they should place their mobile phone, etc. Other students got distracted by the recordings: they talked to their mobile phone (instead of putting it aside), told jokes and played with the microphone (blowing and whistling at it).

In addition to this, as previously mentioned, a problem encountered was that the use of laptops and online shared documents hindered the analysis of the co-construction of the texts among the pairs of students. I consider that it reduced the number of LREs produced by the student (therefore, interaction) when writing. For further studies, a suggested solution would be writing by hand (not having an online shared document would make them discuss more orally) or video-recording the writing process, to examine how often they consult the language support and to analyse their non-verbal language.

On the one hand, as for the weaknesses and threats of the study, recording the writing process in a small classroom with 21 students talking at the same time generated a lot of

background noise, which complicated the careful listening of the recordings. Moreover, using three different tools for data collection (the scripts, the LREs and the interviews) slows down the analysis of data. The process of listening to hours of recordings turns out being time-consuming. In the end, all the information gathered must be cut down for extension constraints. For further studies, it would be suitable to focus on a smaller research framework.

On the other hand, as for strengths and opportunities of the study, useful conclusions have been drawn from the analysis of the gathered results. Having a lot of data also allowed me to get an overall picture of student's results, comments, impressions and opinions so as to identify and establish the right connections. As a small victory, it can be stated that the proposed objectives have been reached and that the initial research questions have been answered according to the results. It has been proven that language scaffolding can be effectively implemented in high schools' English lessons, and that it should be adapted to students' needs, by the teacher or by the students themselves.

This study helps advance our understanding of learning processes in the classroom, since it is affirmed that language support, as a scaffolding resource, can help students achieve tasks that are beyond their level, instead of simplifying the assignments. For myself as a teacher and for the educational community at large, this study is valuable because it has demonstrated the importance (according to students' adjustments) of adapting the language support section, or other scaffolding resources, to the preferences and learning barriers of each student. It has been confirmed that providing the entirety of the class with the same language support only turns out to be effective for some of the students, and to a different degree. Even though some students declared that they would still use the language support for writing other compositions, for other students, according to the LREs and the interviews, it was not particularly helpful.

As a teacher, for my professional development, I have learned that students have different levels, working paces and learning paces. Therefore, each student has different ways of learning and, although the language support provided can help them, the scaffolding resources must be

adapted to their learning barriers. As for the areas which can be improved as a teacher in the future, I suggest developing students' skills to identify their own strengths and weaknesses to create their personalised language support and other scaffolding resources. I have realised that forcing them to understand a language support that is not suitable to their level and learning barriers could turn the language support into a pressure rather than an actual support.

Finally, new study branches for the future arise from the outcomes of this research project. Firstly, an interesting field of study would be examining the students process of creating their own language support. Or perhaps delving into the tools by which a teacher can help their students do so. Secondly, another research area would be comparing the levels of interaction (therefore, number of LREs) produced by the students when they write a text in pairs using online shared documents to the same task but writing it by hand. This study would explore new ways of co-constructing learning caused by new ways of social interaction.

6. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Afitska, O. (2015). Scaffolding learning: developing materials to support the learning of science and language by non-native English-speaking students. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 10(2), 75–89. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2015.1090993>

Ajuntament de Sant Boi de Llobregat. (2019, April 15). *Xifres de població a 1 de gener del 2019*. Observatori de la ciutat. Open Data Sant Boi. <https://observatori.santboi.cat/xifres-de-poblacio-a-1-de-gener-del-2019/>

Benko, S. L. (2012). Scaffolding: An Ongoing Process to Support Adolescent Writing Development. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 56(4), 291–300. <https://doi.org/10.1002/JAAL.00142>

Bruner, J. S. (1978). The Role of Dialogue in Language Acquisition. In A. Sinclair, R. J. Jarvella, & W. J. M. Levelt (Eds.), *V j g " E j k n f ø u " E q p e g r v k q p " q h " N c p i w c i g " and Communication* (First Edition, Vol. 2, pp. 241–255). Springer-Verlag.

CAST. (2021). *About Universal Design for Learning*. CAST. <https://www.cast.org/impact/universal-design-for-learning-udl>

Cotterall, S., & Cohen, R. (2003). Scaffolding for second language writers: producing an academic essay. *ELT Journal*, 57(2), 158–166. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/57.2.158>

Cufí, M., & Gallardo, N. (2021). Boys and Girls: Find the Differences! [Unpublished manuscript].

F g r c t v c o g p v " f ø G f w e c e k » . "loWap k x g t u k v c v " C w v ¼ p q o c "

DECRET 187/2015, de 25 d'agost, d'ordenació dels ensenyaments de l'educació secundària obligatòria. (2015). *DOGC*, 6945, *Disposicions*, de 28 d'agost de 2015, 1–305. <https://portaldogc.gencat.cat/utillsEADOP/PDF/6945/1441278.pdf>

Evnitskaya, N. (2018). Classroom Interaction and Language Learning in CLIL contexts. *CLIL Journal of Innovation and Research in Plurilingual and Pluricultural Education*, 1 (1), 7-17.

<https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/clil.3>

García Mayo, M. del P., & Zeitler, N. (2017). Lexical language-related episodes in pair and small group work. *International Journal of English Studies*, 17(1), 61–82.

<https://doi.org/10.6018/ijes/2017/1/255011>

Gibbons, P. (2014). *Scaffolding Language, Scaffolding Learning. Teaching English Language Learners in the Mainstream Classroom* (2nd ed.). Heinemann.

Institut Puigdevall. (2019). *Projecte Educatiu de Centre*. Funcionament i normativa.

<https://agora.xtec.cat/iespuigdevall/institut/normes-dorganitzacio-i-funcionament/>¹

Jackson, D. O. (2001). Language-related episodes. *ELT Journal*, 55(3), 298–299.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/55.3.298>

Kayi-Aydar, H. (2013). Scaffolding language learning in an academic ESL classroom. *ELT Journal*, 67(3), 324–335. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cct016>

Long, M. H. (1998). Focus on form in Task-Based Language Teaching. *Working Papers in ESL*, 16(2), 35–49.

https://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/bitstream/10125/40789/1/Long%20%281998%29_WP16%282%29.pdf

Moll, L. C. (1990). Vygotsky's zone of proximal development: Rethinking its instructional implications. *Infancia y Aprendizaje*, 13(51–52), 157–168.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/02103702.1990.10822276>

¹ The name of the high school has been changed for anonymity purposes. For more information, please contact the investigator.

Morton, T. (2017). Second Language Acquisition in Classroom Settings [Unpublished manuscript].

Department of Language Education, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and Second Language Learning: Two Adolescent French

Immersion Students Working Together. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82(3), 320–337.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1998.tb01209.x>

Walqui, A. (2006). Scaffolding Instruction for English Language Learners: A Conceptual Framework.

International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 9(2), 159–180.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050608668639>

7. APPENDICES

7.1. Appendix A: The scripts

In this section, the original scripts written in pairs by the students during the writing process are annexed. No modifications to their productions have been made.

Red

Invictus Paco Rabanne

Hello everyone, today we are going to talk about sexist advertisements, in this case the one from the perfume from Paco Rabanne: Invictus.

Now we will see the ad, and after we see it we will think of the things we saw in the video.

First we want to remark the role that the male interprets in this video. The man is like a god, he's the first and all the other men that follow him are left behind so easily. All the girls desire him and finally at the end we can see five girls waiting for him at the changers in a seductive way.

Secondly we would like to comment on the prevalence of male and female characters. The male is the only one man that we can see, only seeing other men without a face for representing he's on top of them. On the other hand the women are exposed as an object, like they are waiting for him and nothing more.

After this we are going to see different physical appearances. The man does not wear a shirt, and he is very strong, and he has the face of being a surplus. The girls are half naked. With normative bodies and they are dressed like the women of the ancient age.

Also in the video one thing that shows is how the man is like the alpha, the leader of something while women are like the ones that desire to be alpha's women.

Blue

Oral presentation: Paco Rabanne for Her

Good morning, we are [Blue] and [Blue] and today we are going to show you a perfume advertisement.

(put the video on)

First of all we are going to start talking about roles and personalities. As we can see, the main character is the girl. In the advertisement she is trying to flirt and seduce the boys that are following her. She is ignoring them and they are trying one by one to achieve her.

Another interesting point is the prevalence between boys and girls in that video. It shows only a girl and 4 boys following her. What surprises me the most is that the girl appears the most of the time.

I move on physical appearance. First, let's talk about the girl. She is wearing a dress that covers little skin. She has make up and she goes very elegant. Little by little she is taking off her clothes at the same time that she is seducing the other boys. She looks like a lot of girls that we can see in other advertisements. She is thin, she has long hair, she is tall, she is attractive and draws attention.

On the other hand, all the boys are wearing suits. Unlike the girl, they are not showing their skin. As the girl, they are tall and thin too. In my opinion they also look strong. In general all of them are young and attractive to draw the public attention.

And finally lets talk about the jobs and aspirations. In this advertisement we can't identify what are their specific jobs.

So that's all of our presentation, thanks for your attention.

Green

Script

Hello everyone, my name is [Green] and she is [Green], and today we would talk about this commercial, let's start.

In this video, we can see a man in the bathroom and he's going to take a shower and a lot of girls are looking at him. What surprised me the most is the moment where the women tried to kiss the men but there's a glass in the middle. In the video the role of the men is sexual and seductive, and the woman has a role of despair for them.

The man appears more than the woman. To be honest this commercial is very sexual in part to the men, he first is dressed informal and shirtless, and the woman is looking at him. And the girls appear but they appear less than men and they put strange faces, as if of pleasure.

Unlike the man, his physical appearance is strong and has a good body with a pretty face. Make the women look more attractive for them. However, the women dressed elegant and had a lot of makeup.

In our opinion this commercial focus for the attention is for the men and girl appearing in little moments and the faces of them are desperation and pleasure.

Thanks for your attention, do you have any questions?

Yellow

Script

Hello, my name is [Yellow]. And my name is [Yellow].

And today we're gonna talk about the gender stereotypes of our ad. Okay, let's talk about the roles and personality: In here, the man is acting like a god for trying their perfume. Also, this ad features almost exclusively men, here there are almost no women, but it is still offensive nonetheless.

Alright now let's talk about the prevalence of male and female characters: Like I said earlier, there aren't almost any women. However, we can't more or less speculate that it also has a hidden message targeting women.

Okay, now [Yellow] will explain the next two things: the physical appearance, the guy is not wearing a shirt and he's very strong and there's only strong men and there are girls too. We think the man is model and footballer and the girls too.

Thanks for listening to our presentation, do you have any questions?

Pink

Hello everyone, today we come to talk about this advertisement and we will analyse gender stereotypes.

We will talk about the roles and personalities, the man is as if he were the leader of a team of some elite sport and the woman as if he were the trophy.

Now it's time to talk about the prevalence, the man appears longer in the ad but there are more women.

Now of the appearance, the man is very defined and the woman has a body with The beauty standards. And at the end of the ad you can see that women are like a man's trophy.

Thanks for your attention, are there any questions?

Black

Advertisement Oral Presentation

Hello everyone, we are [Black] and [Black] and we present the advertisement of axe. This is about of famous deodorant. This advertisement it's about to roles and personalities in the video we can see a men than he was washing and he put female soap. Next a lot of bird appear in his bathroom and they gift a towel. [Black], the floor is yours.

Now I will speak for the physical appearance, in the next scene the men close the door and he see a lot of animal. A butterfly put in his nose and the squirtle try to paint his lips, a bird put flower in his bowl, a rabbit bring a female shoes and the rats bring a female clothes. In this video is not appear jobs and aspiration.

In conclusion, the advertisement says that you smell women compared to a women. In my opinion the advertisement is wrong because you aren't a woman to smell a woman.

In my opinion this video expresses the men, he wants to put the other soat of the women, is not to judge him.

White

Invictus Advertisement

Hello everyone, today we are going to talk about the invictus advertisement.

We will begin with the man, because he's the only man in the advertisement but there are a lot of women that are so excited and they are running in a stadium to reach the man.

What surprises is that in all of this type of advertisement a lot of men try to reach a man, and he's the only important man in the advertisement and he destroy the other man.

In most of the advertisements are a man and a lot of women that follow the man, and this is not appropriate.

I think that they can make an advertisement of a fragrance that can be a man and a woman that are work partners or something and they discover that they use the same fragrance.

In the advertisement the man appears more than the women and he's supposed to be more important.

And that's all, thank you for listening to our presentation.

Orange

Advertisement Tul

Hello everyone!!!! We are [Orange] and [Orange].

Today we are going to talk about gender stereotypes.

The advertisement we chose was made in years 80 and it publishes a liquid detergent called Tul.

“We see the advertisement” ...

In this advertisement we can see a man who is talking about a new detergent.

This advertisement shows a lot of gender stereotypes.

The first thing we can see is the physical appearance of the men, the men wears a suit and a tie, unlike the women is dressed like house dress and she has a handbag.

This video shows that the woman has to always clean the clothes and go shopping and cleaning the house.

After that say that womens can carry not so much weight.

And also say that women can only get out of the house if they have to buy. It assumes that the men work and have to keep the women.

It shows a different role and personality, the work that she has, is cleaning the house and everything and for that the detergent is perfect.

But the man is occupied working.

Thank you all for listening and your attention.

Do you have any questions?

Purple

Jean Paul Gaultier

Hello everyone, we are [Purple] and [Purple] and we are going to analyze the next advertisement.

I will begin with the roles, as we can see the girls are more like statues and the boys are doing more hard work.

In the first scene we can see some girls in what looks like a women's factory, this matches with the stereotype of a perfect woman.

[Purple], the floor is yours.

Now I'm going to talk about the clothes of each gender, the video shows that the women are in lingerie and the men in most of the times are completely dressed.

What surprises me the most is that in the end of the advertisement all the factory is controlled by an old man.

Do you have any questions?

7.2. Appendix B: The LREs

In this section, the LREs produced by the pairs of students during the writing process are annexed. These fragments are categorised according to the four types of LREs.

7.2.1. Explicit references to the language support section or any of the structures that it contains

Red

R1: Today we are, ehh... Mira es esto. Today we are here to talk about.

Look at this.

Blue

B1: This video shows.

B2: ¿Qué?

What?

B1: Pues lo que pone aquí: "This video shows" a girl that...

So what is written here:

Blue

B1: I move on to physical appearance.

Blue

B1: "By the other hand". ¿Era así?

Was it like this?

B2: ¿No sale en el papelito ese?

F q g u p ø v " k v " c r r g c t " k p " v j k u " r k g e g " q h " r c r .

B1: Yo creo que no. Es "on the other hand", creo.

I do not think so. It is , I reckon.

Blue

B1: So that's all.

B2: Of our presentation.

B1: Thanks for your attention.

Green [Excerpt 6]

G1: Today... ¿Cuál ponemos? ¿Esta, "Today we are here to talk about" o esta, "We would like
Which one do we choose? This one or this one
to talk about"?

G2: Esta. [the second one] Espera, voy a preguntar una cosa a la profe.

This one. Wait, I am going to ask the teacher one thing.

Black [Excerpt 3]

B1: And he put...

B2: No, así no. Ponlo en plan: en esta escena se ve, in this scene we can see that
No, not like this. Write it as: in this scene it is seen,

B1: In the video we can see the men...

B2: THAT men...

B1: that he was washing, and he put female soap.

B2: Vale.

All right.

Black [Excerpt 5]

B1: Vale, vamos a leer lo que he puesto.

Q m g { . " n g v ø havè wrigten.f " y j c v " K "

B2: Vale, espera, ahora te doy el turno a ti. Espera, espera un momento.

All right, wait, now I give you the floor. Wait, wait a minute.

B1: ¿Donde están las formas para decirlo? En plan...

Y j g t g " c t g " v j g " h q t o u " v q " u c { " k v A " N k m g í "

B2: [Black], the floor is yours.

B1: Vale, ¿y luego?

All right, and then?

B2: Toma, escribe tú ahora.

Take it, now you write.

Orange

O1: In the advertisement...

O2: In THIS advertisement... [as in the language support]

O1: there is a man...

O2: A ver, we can see a man... [as in the language support]

N g v ø u " u g g .

Orange [Excerpt 2]

O1: El hombre va con traje.

The man wears a suit.

O2: Sí, él va de trabajo y ella va de estar por casa.

Yes, he wears working clothes and she wears clothes to wear around the house.

O1: Veamos, hmmm...

N g v ø u " u g g .

O2: Escoge bien, eh. Describe, describing the video.

Choose wisely, huh.

O1: Vale, this video shows.

All right,

O2: This video shows that the men.

Orange

O1: Espérate, falta la despedida, la despedida. ((Papers moving)) Thank you all for listening and

Wait, it lacks the farewell, the farewell.

your attention.

O2: And your attention.

O1: Do you have any questions?

O2: Ya estaría, perfecto.

That would be all, perfect.

Purple

P1: [Purple], the floor is yours. El suelo es tuyo.

The floor is yours. [literal translation]

Purple

P1: Qué pone ahí, déjame la hoja. Give me the paper. Now I'm going to talk about the clothes
What does it say here? Give me the paper.
of each gender.

7.2.2. Clarification requests about the meaning, function or spelling of any structure from the language scaffolding

Blue

B1: Lo de “unlike” era lo de “a diferencia de” ¿verdad? Unlike the girl, they are not showing
y c u " ò w p n k m g ö . " t k i j v A
their skin...

Blue [Excerpt 1]

B1: I think that he appears the most of the time. ¿Sí? Es para meter más cosas.

K u p ø v " k v A " K v " k u " v q " k p

Lo que más me sorprende era “What surprises me the most is that”.

What surprises me the most was

B2: Sí, eso sí.

Yes, it is.

B1: Fua, ¿cómo se escribía?

Wow, how is it written?

B2: Sur-pri-ses me the most is that the girl. Todo junto, mi amor.

All together, my love.

B1: What surprises me the most is that the girl appears the most of the time.

Green [Excerpt 4]

G1: Eh ¿Y esto qué es? [“Handing over” section]

Hum, and what is this?

G2: Em, [Green], the floor is yours, o sea, [Green] tu turno.

Em, or rather, [Green] your turn.

G1: Ah.

Ah.

G2: O ahora [Green] hablará sobre eso: Now, Maria will talk about...

Or now [Green] will talk about this

G1: Vale.

All right.

Green

G1: Dictámelo. What surprises...

Dictate it.

G2: What surprises me the most.

G1: Con coma, ¿no?

Y k v j " c " e q o o c . " k u p ø v " k v A

G2: No, sin coma en medio.

No, without comma in between.

Green

G1: ¿Qué era “However”, [teacher]?

What was the meaning of

G2: Sin embargo.

However.

G1: Sin embargo. ¿Tienes un lápiz? Que no me voy a acordar ((she writes the translation down)).

However. Do you have a pencil? I will not remember it.

Purple

P1: This video shows. Shows? ¿Con hache, no?

Y k v j " c k v e j . " k u p ø v " k v A

P2: Así, como sale aquí.

Like this, as it appears here.

P1: The video shows that the women...

7.2.3. Explicit references to the writing process and the organisation of ideas

Red [Excerpt 9]

R1: Tenemos que hacerlo como sale aquí, así nos suben más nota.

We have to do it as it appears here, this way we get a higher mark.

Blue [Excerpt 10]

B1: Tenemos que poner estas cosas eh también... [structures from the language support]

Y g " j c x g " v q " k p e n w f g " v j g u g " v j k p i u " v q q í " " ' "

B2: Primero ponemos las ideas y ya luego lo hacemos en plan bien.

First, we write the ideas and then we do it properly.

Green

G1: Vale ¿Cómo seguimos, Maria? Ay Maria... Como aquí sale todo el rato...

C n n " t k i j v . " j q y " f q " y g " e q p v k p w g . " O c t k c A "

Pink

T: You have to finish the presentation somehow.

P1: ¿Despedida?

Farewell?

T: Yes.

P1: ((Opens the dossier)) Ah es verdad, que es como un guion. Lo de "Do you have any

Oh, it is true, that it is like a script. The

questions?" y esas cosas, ¿no?

and these things, right?

White [Excerpt 7]

T: So you have ideas, you already know. Now you have to write it down.

W1: Okey, ¿y usando esto, no? [the language support section]

Okey, and using this, right?

T: Claro, por ejemplo: "We would like to talk about", nos gustaría hablar sobre this

Of course, for example:

we would like to talk about

advertisement, este anuncio.

this advertisement.

W1: Vale.

All right.

White

T: ¿Cómo empezarías a decir “empezaremos por physical appearance”? How would you say it?

J q y " y q w n f " { q w " u v c t v " u c { k p i " ò y g " y k n n " d g i

W1: Now, let's start.

T: Remember we have some structures here, look at this: “I will begin with” or “I will start with”... What you prefer.

7.2.4. Allusions to the use of external digital tools

Red [Excerpt 8]

R1: ¿En serio tus padres te pagan [la academia de] inglés para que escribas con el

Do your parents really pay for an English [language academy] so that you write

Traductor?

using [Google] Translate?

R2: Me da igual, así es más fácil.

I do not care, it is easier this way.

7.3. Appendix C: Interview questions

In this section, the questions that were asked to the students are presented. Different formulations of the same questions are offered, in case the student did not understand the first one.

1. Which parts from the language support do you think are more important?
2. What are your impressions towards the language support section? How does it make you feel?
3. What adjustments would you make to the language support section? How could it be improved?

7.4. Appendix D: The interviews

In this section, the students' answers to the interviews are annexed. If the two members from the pair answer the question, it is marked in square brackets.

Red [Excerpt 16]

Which parts from the language support do you think are more important? ðInitial greeting” and “Thanking”. It’s useful, hay bastantes palabras, los “links” van bastante bien. Si no lo tuviera hubiera hecho lo mismo porque se me da bastante bien el inglés. [ð K p k v k c n d'hd t g g v k p ð V j c p m kispwi uög0h" wKiv. " v j g t g " c t g " g p prøttj hjełp'h ywqnt0f" uK. h "" vKj" gj "c ðf npkø] *I would have done the same because I master English pretty well.*]

What are your impressions towards the language support section? How does it make you feel? Es una ayuda un poco. [*It is little bit of a help.*]

What adjustments would you make to the language support section? How could it be improved? [R1] Como support no, pero quizás para escribir el texto unas guías. ¿Pero eso ya están no? Aquí ya hay una pauta. [R2] Es que esto [the language support section] no es específico para hacer este trabajo, esto es más para escribir un texto cualquiera. Algo más enfocado a nuestro trabajo. O también distintos para cada cosa. [R1] *Not as a support, but maybe some guidelines. But it is already here, right? There is already a pattern.* [R2] *The thing is that it is not specific to do this assignment, it can be used to write any text. Something more focused upon our assignment. Or also different ones for each thing.*]

Blue [Excerpt 15]

Which parts from the language support do you think are more important? Como empezar y como acabar, lo de los conectores sí. Veo más útil los conectores: “Organising and separating ideas”, “Describing the video” and “Expressing opinion”. [*How to start and finish, the thing about the conp g e v q t u . " k p f g g f 0 " K " v j k p m " v j c v " v j g " o q u v " u g r c t c v k p i " k f g c u ö . " õ F g u e t k d k p i] " v j g " x k f g q ö " c p f " õ*

What are your impressions towards the language support section? How does it make you feel? [B1] Si la necesitas para consultar algo pues va bien. [B2] Si no sabemos qué poner lo miramos un momento y ya está. [*[B1] If you need it to check something it is useful. [B2] If we do not know what to write we look at it for a second and that is it.*]

What adjustments would you make to the language support section? How could it be improved? Que no esté tan apelotonado todo. Más espacio entre las categorías. Yo así lo veo bien, es para decirte algo. [*It should not be so crammed together. More space between the categories. I think it is fine like that, it is to tell you something.*]

Green [Excerpt 11 and 17]

Which parts from the language support do you think are more important? Sí, bueno hemos ido siguiendo la estructura más o menos. Sobre todo hemos utilizado “Introduction”, “Organising and separating ideas” (unas cuantas), “Describing the video”, etc. Hemos cogido al menos una de cada una. [*Yes, well, we have been following the structure more or less. Above all y g " j c x g " w u g f " õ K p v t q f w e v k q p ö . " õ Q t i c p k u k p i " c p f " u g the videq ö . " g v e 0 " Y g " j c x g " r k e m g f] " c v " n g c u v " q p g " h t q o " g c*

What are your impressions towards the language support section? How does it make you feel? No sé, creo que es un poco de ayuda, para irte guiando. A nosotras nos va bien. A lo mejor no sabemos cómo empezar y esto te dice “María, te toca”, o sea “María the floor is yours”. Yo no sabía que se podía decir eso, es algo nuevo que he aprendido. [*I do not know, I think that it is a little help, to keep guiding you. It is helpful for us. Maybe we do not know how to start and this v g n n u " { q w " õ O c t ¶ c . " { q w t " v w t p ö . " q n b t k n b w c y o u j c o g u l d " õ O c t ¶ say that, it is something new that I have learnt.*]

What adjustments would you make to the language support section? How could it be improved? A lo mejor la traducción de algunas palabras. Sabes, o sea, poner entre paréntesis el significado. A ver, lo típico no, “Good morning” lo sabe todo el mundo. En plan las palabras que no conocemos, difíciles, como “However”. A ver, que a lo mejor lo debería saber todo el mundo, pero a lo mejor se te olvida. Ya está, yo diría eso. [*Perhaps the translation of some words. You know, I mean, writing thg " o g c p k p i " k p " d t c e m g v u 0 " Y g n n . " p q v " v j g known by everyone. I mean the difficult words that we do not know, the difficult ones, like õ J q y g x w e l l , m a y b e e v e r y o n e s h o u l d k n o w t h i s o n e , b u t p e r h a p s y o u f o r g e t i t . T h a t i s a l l , I would say that.*]

Yellow [Excerpt 12]

Which parts from the language support do you think are more important? “Initial greeting”, “Thanking”, “Asking for questions” and “Describing the video”.

What are your impressions towards the language support section? How does it make you feel? Está bien tenerlo, así no tienes que buscarlo por Internet. Y ya lo tienes aquí. [*It is a good thing to have it, so you do not have to look it up on the Internet. You already have it here.*]

What adjustments would you make to the language support section? How could it be improved? Yo lo dejaría así tal cual. No tocaría nada. [*I would leave it like this. I would not change anything.*]

Pink [Excerpt 13 and 18]

Which parts from the language support do you think are more important? “Initial greeting”, “Introduction”, “Thanking” and “Asking for questions”. Son importantes pero no se usa porque tampoco es muy difícil. Yo creo que lo más importante, para así decirlo, son lo que hemos dicho. Los de iniciar el tema y todo son los que suelen costar más. [*ō K p k v k c n " i t g g v ò K p v t q f w e v k q p ö . " ò V j c p m k p i T h e y a r e n o t v e r y d i f f i c u l t . I t h i n k t h a t t h e m o s t i m p o r t a n t o n e s , s o t o s p e a k , a r e t h e o n e w e h a v e m e n t i o n e d . T h e o n e s t o i n t r o d u c e t h e t o p i c a n d a l l a r e t h e o n e s t h a t w e f i n d m o r e d i f f i c u l t .*]

What are your impressions towards the language support section? How does it make you feel? A mi sin más. Es como que te dice que tienes que trabajar. Tú lo miras y dices “tengo que hacer esto”. Da un poco de palo. Aunque ayuda, claro, para hacer el texto. [*To me it is indifferent. It is like it tells you that you have to work. You take a look c v " k v " c p f " v j k p m " ò f q " v j k u ö 0 " K v " o c m g u " o g " h g g n " c " d k v " n c |] { 0 " C n v j q w i j*

What adjustments would you make to the language support section? How could it be improved? [P1] Lo único que me ha costado ha sido tener que traducir siempre cada una [of the structures]. Si quería decir esto, pues tenía que traducirlo en castellano. Sé que es una tontería, pero tenerlo en castellano a mí sí que me ayudaría. [P2] Claro porque así sabes lo que estás diciendo en tu cabeza en castellano y después sabes como se dice en inglés. Y a lo mejor lo automatizas mejor. [*[P1] The only thing that was hard was always having to translate each of them. If I wanted to say that, I had to translate it into Spanish. I know it is nonsense, but having it in Spanish would be helpful to me. [P2] Sure, because this way you know what you are saying inside your head in Spanish and then you know how it is said in English. And maybe you make it automatic more easily.*]

Black

Which parts from the language support do you think are more important? “Organising and separating ideas”, “Initial greeting”, “Introduction”, “Expressing opinion” and “Thanking”.

What are your impressions towards the language support section? How does it make you feel? [B1] Esto es una ayuda. Por si no tienes ninguna idea, pues que te ayude a empezar. Por ejemplo, si no sé decir “hola a todos” pues ya me ayuda para presentarme. Es un soporte. [B2] A mí me ha servido. Me siento más seguro. *[[B1] This is a help. In case you do not have any ideas, it helps you start. For example, if I do not know how to say òhello everyoneö it helps me introduce myself. It is a support. [B2] It has been useful to me. I feel more comfortable.]*

What adjustments would you make to the language support section? How could it be improved? [B1] Pondría más apartados, un apartado más que fuera para hablar más con el público o para comunicarse más. Y pondría algún ejemplo más para introducir y acabar, y de lo de “Handing over”. [B2] A mí me parece bien así. *[[B1] I would add more categories, a category to talk more to the audience or to communicate more. And I would also add some more examples to k p k v k c v g " c p f " h k p k u j . " c p f " v q " v j g " õ J c ð f k p i " q x g t ö "*

White

Which parts from the language support do you think are more important? “Initial greeting” only.

What are your impressions towards the language support section? How does it make you feel? Prefiero ir por libre. No me ha servido mucho. *[I prefer to work on my own. It has not been very useful.]*

What adjustments would you make to the language support section? How could it be improved? Nada. *[Nothing.]*

Orange

Which parts from the language support do you think are more important? “Introduction”, “Describing the video” and “Contrasting ideas”.

What are your impressions towards the language support section? How does it make you feel? Nos ayuda a continuar y a saber qué escribir. Lo hemos ido utilizando. Te sirve de ayuda. *[It helps us continue and know what to write. We have used it. It is helpful.]*

What adjustments would you make to the language support section? How could it be improved? A ver, para mí sería quitando alguna de estas. Que no hubiera tantas categorías, solo las principales. Hay algunas que son muy obvias. *[N g v ø u " u g g . " h ñemoñivog goñðkof " y q w n f these. There should not be so many categories, only the principal ones. Some of them are really obvious.]*

Purple [Excerpt 14]

Which parts from the language support do you think are more important? “Introduction”, “Describing the video” and “Contrasting ideas”.

What are your impressions towards the language support section? How does it make you feel? More comfortable. Así tengo más recursos esenciales. Ayuda, ayuda más. [*More comfortable. This way I have more essential resources. It helps, it helps even more.*]

What adjustments would you make to the language support section? How could it be improved? [P1] Yo creo que está bien así. [P2] Añadiría alguna expresión más en alguna parte, pero así está muy bien. [*[P1] I think it is fine like this. [P2] I would add some more expressions somewhere, but it is really good like this.*]