UAB
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

Analysing Students' Perspectives on a Collaborative Class Diary: A Universal Design for Learning Approach

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

Master's Dissertation

Maria Furriols Vilardell

Supervisor: Dr. Melinda Dooly

Barcelona, June 2021

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor, Melinda Dooly. Her invaluable guidance and her support have been paramount throughout the process of writing this dissertation.

Secondly, I would like to thank my school mentor, Meritxell Roig, for her unconditional help and for being a role model of a teacher who strives to make language learning accessible to all the students.

I would also like to acknowledge my UAB tutor, Oriol Pallarés, who has been truly inspiring and who has helped us develop the collaborative class diary taking his collaborative note-taking tool as a starting point.

My special thanks are for my colleague, Cristina Castro, her support and advice have helped me understand that learning is indeed a shared experience.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my practicum students for their hard work, for agreeing to being recorded and participating in the focus groups. I really hope that this experience has benefited them as much as it has benefited me.

Contents

Abstract

This dissertation aims at testing the use of a tool which was specially designed for this study but that can be used in a wide range of learning contexts: the collaborative class diary. The collaborative class diary is a space for learners and teachers to write down important information and new ideas at the end of each lesson using Google Jamboard. In the teaching unit presented in this dissertation, the collective class diary was relevant since it provided students with all the language and content needed to complete the final task. This tool has been analysed from the students' perspective by assessing its use, the students' opinion on the tool and the students' awareness of three relevant features: scaffolding, collaboration and learner autonomy. To do so, data has been gathered from two groups of EFL learners in a Catalan public high school. This work is consistent with previous studies that also determine a positive effect of peer-peer scaffolding.

Keywords: collaborative class diary, universal design for learning, collaborative learning, learner autonomy, scaffolding.

Resum

L'objectiu d'aquest treball de fi de màster és avaluar una eina especialment dissenyada per aquest estudi però que es pot emprar en nombrosos contextos educatius: el diari d'aula col·laboratiu. El diari d'aula col·laboratiu és un espai compartit per professors i alumnes on s'anota informació rellevant al final de cada classe a través de la plataforma Google Jamboard. En la unitat didàctica en què es basa aquest treball, el diari era cabdal per dur a terme la tasca final, tant en termes de contingut com de llengua. Aquesta eina s'ha analitzat des de la perspectiva dels alumnes i s'ha avaluat tenint en compte l'ús que en van fer els alumnes, l'opinió que en tenien i si aquesta eina els feia reflexionar sobre els suports a l'aprenentatge, la col·laboració o l'autonomia de l'alumne. Amb aquesta finalitat, es van recollir dades de dos grups d'alumnes d'anglès en un institut públic de Catalunya. Els resultats d'aquest estudi coincideixen amb estudis previs que assenyalen els efectes positius del suport i aprenentatge entre iguals.

Paraules clau: diari d'aula col·laboratiu, disseny universal per a l'aprenentatge, aprenentatge col·laboratiu, autonomia de l'alumne, teoria de la bastida.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this ever-changing society, education is also undergoing structural changes. For instance, in Catalonia, the Decree 150/2017 aims to develop a more inclusive education system to help move towards these needed structural changes. Spain has also committed to the UNESCO 2030 Incheon Declaration, which ensures "inclusive and equitable quality education and lifelong learning opportunities for all" (UNESCO, 2015). The implications of this paradigm shift are numerous. In terms of pedagogical implications, the focus is on Universal Design for Learning (UDL), which is based on the idea of presenting multiple means of engagement, representation and action and expression, which can be enriched by the use of digital materials and tools (Meyer & Rose, 2005). Some of the applications of UDL are multiple modalities of instruction and the use of technology, to name but a few (Spencer, 2011). Within this domain, the scope of this study is a specific tool which we named "collaborative class diary" and which in this study will be referred to as CCD. This study looks at how the features of UDL can be promoted through pedagogical strategies such as this one.

The CCD is a journal or class minutes designed using Google Jamboard which the students and the teachers construct together at the end of each session. The CCD is used to reflect on the learning process of each session as well as keep a record of the most important concepts. This tool is accessible to all the students on the Google Classroom site so they can refer to it any time they may need to. A similar educational tool is "exit tickets" or "exit slips", which according to Leigh "offer students a physical space to digest ideas, to question, to ponder, to ruminate over what has been shared and discussed in class" (2012, p. 190). Leigh also highlights the importance of tools which put in writing the learning process because "ideas are slippery; securing them through writing allows students to see the power of their own words and how those words reflect their growth as teachers and learners" (Leigh, 2012, p. 190).

The objective of this study is to assess the usefulness of the CCD from the students' perspective in order to determine whether this tool should be included in our future teaching practice.

When assessing "usefulness", the following research questions have been put forward following the guidelines by Punch and Oancea (2013):

A) Do students *refer to* the CCD when preparing the final product of the teaching unit?

In this question, *refer to* could be interpreted in two different ways. The term may indicate both the act of actually accessing the contents of the CCD and the act of expressing verbally that they are able to recall the language needed for the final task because it was included in the CCD.

B) Do the students feel that the CCD is useful?

This question is directly related to the students' own personal perception. In order to answer it, they will be asked what their opinion on this tool is.

C) Do the students mention any of the features analysed in this study, namely assistance, collaboration and autonomy?

This question is related to students' awareness of the three aspects discussed in the present study: scaffolding, collaborative learning and learner autonomy.

2. CONTEXT

2.1. The school

This research was conducted in a Catalan public high school. The centre is located in a working-class neighbourhood with a high percentage of immigrant population. The area is one of the most highly populated in the city. The overall household income and the level of education are among the lowest in the area, while the unemployment rate is one of the highest (Ajuntament de Mataró, 2018).

The high school's educational project is founded on three main pillars: innovation, inclusion and new technology. Innovative methods such as co-teaching, cooperative learning and project-based work are essential when analysing the school's strong commitment to inclusive education and innovation. The classes are heterogeneous and therefore students with special educational needs,

newcomers, repeaters or students with behavioural issues are distributed equally in all the classes. The students usually work in cooperative groups which remain the same in every subject. According to Johnson at al. (1994), cooperative groups help achieve a positive learning environment that moves away from competition and encourages working together towards a shared goal. Moreover, these cooperative groups are especially relevant in the foreign language class because they provide a safety net for students who struggle to communicate in English (Zhang, 2010).

2.2. The teaching unit and the collaborative class diary

The teaching unit in which this research was developed is about the topic of sustainability (Castro & Furriols, 2021). More specifically, it described the dangers of aluminium foil use and the existing sustainable alternatives. The main purpose of this teaching unit was increasing students' oral skills by challenging them with a content-rich approach. In order to fulfil this objective, this unit was organised in three main parts. The first one focused on learning about aluminium and its impact on the planet. In the second, students were presented with alternatives and then they developed their own product: a sandwich wrap. Finally, this product was presented to the school community through an informative video which also discussed the dangers of aluminium and some of the alternatives to it. The CCD was used in parts one and two, that is in sessions one to five.

The CCD that was designed for this teaching unit consists of five slides, each corresponding to a session (see Appendix A). The first slide contains new vocabulary items that were discussed in the first session and revised at the beginning of the following class. The second slide contains four questions regarding the reading task carried out in session two. On slide number three there are questions which include comprehension of the task "How does the story end?" or "The video showed a negative consequence of aluminium, which one?" as well as reflection "Do you think it is a happy ending?" or "Do you know any similar stories?". On slide four there are four statements that the students had to complete by rephrasing the information given by another group. Similarly, on slide five, students had to complete the instructions on how to make a sandwich wrap. Each group had

previously written their version and they were asked to combine all of them to create a class version. Both slide four and five encourage interaction and build on the idea that the CCD is a collaborative project.

2.3. The participants

The participants of this study were 13- and 14-year-old Secondary education students in 2nd year (2n d'ESO). The sample were two groups, 2n A and 2n B. 2n A had 20 students organised in five cooperative groups and 2n B, 18 students organised in four groups. The groups were heterogeneous and there were a total of 19 female and 19 male students across the two classes. A written permission to record and interview the students was signed by the school director and our school mentor. In addition, all the students were informed of the aim of this study. All data presented in this study are anonymous.

3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

3.1. A classroom for everyone

Figures show that, on average, 19% of students in a high school classroom have specific educational needs (Departament d'Educació, 2021). By specific educational needs (in Catalan, *necessitats específiques de suport educatiu* or NESE), the Decree 150/2017 refers to diverse situations which include disadvantageous socioeconomic situations, recent incorporation to the education system, gifted students or special educational needs such as ADHD or ADS.

In order to promote an inclusive classroom, numerous interventions have been put in place, which can be organised in three tiers: universal, additional and intensive. (Sala-Bars et al., 2020; Buffum et al., 2010). While universal interventions are addressed to all the students and include project-based learning, coteaching or cooperative learning, among others, additional interventions are addressed to students in a temporary situation that requires additional support, such as temporary linguistic support or in-hospital teaching. Finally, intensive interventions are addressed to students

with severe learning difficulties who require individualised learning plans. These three tiers are designed to exist simultaneously. Therefore, if a student needs additional support, it will be provided in addition to a universal intervention. Likewise, a student with a severe learning difficulty will also benefit from universal and additional measures (Sala-Bars et al., 2020; Departament d'Ensenyament, 2015).

3.2. Universal Design for Learning

One of the most successful universal interventions worldwide is Universal Design for Learning (UDL) (Sala-Bars et al., 2020). UDL was developed by the Center for Applied Special Technology (CAST) and first appeared in print in 1998, when Anne Meyer and David Rose provided the framework for UDL (CAST, 2021). In fact, universal design originated in architecture and in this field, it takes the shape of accessible structures which tend to benefit everybody, such as ramps or dropped kerbs (Rose, 2000; Spencer, 2011). Meyer and Rose (2005) base UDL on the premise that "barriers to learning occur in the interaction with the curriculum— they are not inherent solely in the capacities of the learner" (p. 9) and therefore the curriculum must be made accessible to everyone using a design that is driven by the "needs of individuals in the margins" but that serves the needs of all the learners. However, brain imaging technologies have demonstrated that both individual brain regions and larger functional networks show relevant person-to-person differences and, in the same way, there are no standard students (Dolan & Hall, 2001). This suggests that the flexibility and versatility of digital tools are imperative to a universally designed learning environment (Dolan & Hall, 2001; Rose, 2000; Meyer & Rose, 2005). Nonetheless, Rose (2000) claims that UDL would not be feasible or affordable for most schools without digital tools.

Considering the need to provide "multiple, redundant, and varied representations of concepts and information" (Meyer & Rose, 2005, p. 14), CAST compiled a set of guidelines on multiple means of engagement (the "why" of learning), representation (the "what" of learning), and action and expression (the "how" of learning). This division was also made by Vygotsky, who identified the

prerequisites for learning as "(a) recognition of the information to be learned, (b) application of strategies to process that information, and (c) engagement with the learning task" (Dolan & Hall, 2001, p. 2).

Within the universal design for learning framework, this study focuses on three aspects: scaffolding, which relates to representation or the recognition networks, and collaborative learning and learner autonomy, which are directly related to the engagement or affective network. These three aspects are essential when designing teaching materials universally and they are all promoted in the use of the CCD.

3.3. Scaffolding

Drawing from the sociocultural theory, which determines that all learning is social, that is, mediated through interaction, Vygotsky developed the notion of Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), which is "the limit to which someone can learn new information with the assistance of someone else" (as cited in Apple, 2006, p.283). This assistance was first referred to as "scaffolding" by Wood, Bruner and Ross (1976) and it was divided into six features that characterised that process, namely recruiting interest in the task, simplifying the task, maintaining pursuit of the goal, marking critical features and discrepancies between what has been produced and the ideal solution, controlling frustration during problem solving, and demonstrating an idealized version of the act to be performed. Scaffolding was later extended to educational settings by Donato (1988) and learner-learner situations by Storch (2002) (as cited in Memari, 2019) and there is considerable research which supports that cognition and knowledge are social and constructed dialogically (Memari, 2019; Tahmasebi & Yamini, 2011; Donato, 1994).

Considering the idea that a "high-challenge, high-support classroom benefits all children" (Gibbons, 2015, p.18), scaffolding is essential. Moreover, well-constructed and diverse scaffolds help

learners complete the task and provide a supportive environment as well as facilitating student independence (Gibbons, 2015; Salem, 2019).

3.4. Collaborative learning

Roselli (2016) differentiates collaboration from cooperation. While cooperative learning is a division of functions, collaborative learning (CL) is a "collective process from the beginning, where all of them are jointly involved for task performance" and which leads to spontaneous interactive dynamics (p. 255). As cited in Roselli (2016), Quiamzade et al. (2013) consider CL part of a "social psychology of knowledge" and knowledge is identified as negotiation or joint construction of meanings (p. 256). Equally, CL not only enhances the value of peer interaction but also involves the teachers and the whole teaching context, the "promotion of exchange and participation of each member in order to build a shared cognition" (Roselli, 2016, p. 256). In the same way, scaffolding of knowledge from classmates places more emphasis on the process and therefore can help learners reach their ZPD (Storch, 2002; Apple, 2006).

Moreover, Chen (2008) proved CL successful from the point of view of motivational theory, social interdependence theory, sociocognitivism and socioculturalism (as mentioned in Tahmasebi, Yamini, 2011). CL is directly related to the notion of "scaffolding" since the latter requires dialogue and shared experiences in order for a learner to acquire knowledge.

3.5. Learner autonomy

Learner autonomy (LA) is a concept that is also closely related to scaffolding and collaborative learning since the mere access to a piece of content does not mean that the student can understand it (Eagleton, 2021). The definition of LA has evolved over time and while this concept was first defined by Holec (1981) as "the ability to take charge of one's own learning" (as cited in Benson, 2006, p. 22), Little (1991) changed the focus to "interdependence" in learning. Yasmin and Naseem (2019) discuss a broader concept, collaborative learner autonomy (CLA), which leads learners to "participate in social

interactions and interdependently negotiate and perform tasks with their peers" (p. 71494). Finally, other authors such as Zou (2011) see LA as a gradual increase related to awareness of learning contexts.

3.6. Relevance of this study

This study provides an insight into a tool which can easily be included in any lesson plan while transforming classrooms into collaborative, supportive and inclusive environments. Similar tools such as collaborative note-taking or exit tickets have been discussed in previous literature but most of the studies focus on University or Primary students (Tahmasebi & Yamini, 2011; Leigh, 2012; Awaludin et al., 2017; Baldwin et al., 2019; Harbin, 2020).

4. DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

As mentioned in the introduction, this study focuses on the CCD from the students' perspective. To answer our research questions, and according to the notion of Punch and Oancea (2013) that "the empirical criterion stresses the link between concepts and their empirical indicators" (p. 75), data were collected using different techniques. The data gathered were qualitative and quantitative. Qualitative data are empirical information about the world such as interviews or transcripts (Punch & Oancea, 2013). Moreover, Dooly and Moore (2017) refer to Creswell's (2009) features to define qualitative research, which include that there is interaction between the researcher and the participants, that the data are gathered *in situ*, and that the data are natural because "the interactions take place where they would naturally occur" (p. 5). In this study, qualitative data include voice recordings of the students working in class and two focus groups. However, quantitative data were also included when analysing the scripts and the observation grids. As for the scripts, Tahmasebi and Yamini (2011) consider Johnson's (1970) "idea unit" as a way to conduct a quantitative analysis. Based on this approach, in this study the CCD was divided into units, which are sentences or meaningful units. The scripts were analysed considering the number of CCD units used. In their study,

Shooshtari and Mir (2014) also analysed the students' production using a quantitative approach by counting the number of strategies that they had included.

In this study there were two main data collection periods: the first one was in session six and the second one after the last session.

4.1. Addressing research bias

Before discussing the data collection and analysis, attention must be drawn to some techniques that researchers may use to reduce the bias, as listed by Johnson (1997), and which have been applied in this study. First of all, negative case sampling, in other words, selecting examples that do not meet your hypothesis, can be observed in this study. For instance, in the results section, excerpts that evidence that students were not able to recall the CCD have been included (see Section 5.2). Secondly, this study has also included investigator triangulation, which involves multiple observers and peer review. As for multiple observers, the class observation was carried out by three different observers (see Appendix F). Finally, data triangulation has also been included. Data triangulation involves collecting multiple data, like multiple interviews, or at different times, with different people. An instance of data triangulation is combining class observation, audio recordings and analysis of the scripts.

4.2. Observation

In order to answer research question A, "do the students *refer to* the CCD when preparing the final product of the teaching unit?", the audio recordings and the observation grid were considered relevant. As regards observation, in session six the students were asked to write the script for their final video. They were asked to include all the language and content covered in class during the previous five sessions, which could be found in the CCD. Therefore, this was a key moment to test the usefulness of the tool. Three teachers observed if the students referred to the CCD and their observations were later transferred to an observation grid to facilitate analysis (see Appendix F).

Observation has been considered a data collection technique as well as a research method by many authors (Baker, 2006; Punch & Oancea, 2013; Dooly & Moore, 2017). In her study on exit tickets, Leigh (2012) kept a record of the students' performance in a field journal and Tahmasebi and Yamini (2011) also used observation to conduct their research.

4.3. Audio recordings

Baker (2006) reminds us that observation is a complex method and that "the researcher must always remember her/his primary role as a researcher and remain detached enough to collect and analyse data relevant to the problem under investigation" (p. 172). Therefore, in order to overcome any possible bias in the teachers' observation, voice recordings were also used as a data collection technique. During session six, three groups were audio-recorded (using mobile phones) while doing their task. According to Collier and Collier, using recording enhances observations since cameras are an "instrumental extension of our senses" and they help researchers to "see more and with greater accuracy" (as cited in Baker, 2006, p. 184). In order to answer question B, "do the students *refer to* the CCD when preparing the final product of the teaching unit?", a transcription of the relevant excerpts has been provided[1]. Adapted symbols from Jefferson (2004) *Transcript Notation System* were used to transcribe the audio recordings (see Appendix G). Excerpts have been considered relevant when they feature students referring to the CCD or discussing assistance, collaboration and autonomy. The parts where the students organise their work are not considered relevant for the aim of this study.

4.4. Focus groups

Focus groups[2] provided insight into the students' opinion on the CCD and answered research questions B and C "do the students feel that the CCD is useful?" and "do the students mention any of the features analysed in this study, namely assistance, collaboration and autonomy?". To this end, two

---

[1] To access the complete voice recordings, please contact the researcher.

[2] To access the audio recording of the focus groups, please contact the researcher.

focus groups were set up. The participants were selected randomly to avoid bias, given that the researcher was also playing the role of teacher and therefore knew the participants. Focus group 1 was formed by two male and two female students in 2n A and focus group 2 by three male and one female student in 2n B. These focus groups were conducted together with my peer Cristina to include questions regarding her study and four students in each class were asked to participate in each focus group. The participants were informed about the purpose and use of their contributions (Gibbs, 1997). Special emphasis was placed on highlighting that their contributions would not affect their marks in any way. According to Canals (2017) "in focus groups the participants are invited to talk about their views, attitudes and beliefs in relation to a particular subject, concept or idea" (p. 396). Moreover, Gibbs (1997) states that focus groups help researchers obtain several viewpoints on the same topic. Both Canals and Gibbs mention that focus groups might include questions because the moderators are promoters of the debate. Therefore, in this study, the moderators asked questions and allowed time for the students to express themselves. The students were asked four questions: 1) Do you remember the CCD?, 2) Did your group use the CCD? If so, when?, 3) Do you think that the CCD has helped you? If so, why?, 4) Do you think your final task would have been better, worse or the same without the CCD? Why? The first two questions were used as a data triangulation technique to verify the information obtained by analysing the audio-recordings. The last two questions were related to the students' opinion and intended to make them reflect on the usefulness of this tool. The focus groups were conducted in Catalan to facilitate comprehension and expression, a technique also employed by Sakamoto (2017). The focus groups were audio-recorded using a mobile phone and the contributions of the students were translated into English by the researcher and are included in Section 5.3.

4.5. Students' productions

Finally, the scripts written by the students during session six were also considered relevant data to answer research questions A and B. Students wrote their scripts in cooperative groups and

then submitted their work on the corresponding task on Google Classroom. The scripts used in this study are the students' version, prior to being corrected by the teachers and the names of the students were removed to ensure anonymity (see Appendix D). The scripts offered information on the groups which were not audio-recorded as well as another opportunity for triangulation by comparing the students' comments in the focus groups against their productions.

In order to analyse the scripts written by the students, and taking Tahmasebi and Yamini (2011) as a reference, the CCD was first divided into sentences or meaningful units and then this information was compared to the scripts. The units that were taken from the CCD verbatim were highlighted in green. For instance, group 2 in 2n B wrote "A tupperware is an alternative to aluminium foil because it's reusable and it keeps food fresh", which is a unit taken directly from the CCD and so it was highlighted in green. Conversely, the units that were taken verbatim but include a minor error were also included. For example, group 2 in 2n A wrote:

"-first you trace the shape,

-Secondly you cut the cloth and velcro,

-After that you glue the velcro in the oilcloth,"

These units were highlighted in green regardless of the fact that a comma was not placed after the linking words since the focus of this study is not on accuracy.

5. RESULTS

In order to detail the most relevant results, this section is organised in four main sections corresponding to the four main data collection tools: observation grid, audio recordings, focus groups and students' productions.

5.1. Observation grid

The observation grid that was created by the researcher from the notes taken during the study includes 6 items, which are 1) Did the students refer to the CCD?, 2) Did they use the CCD?, 3) Were they prompted to use it?, 4) Did they use any other source of info (Google…)?, 5) They did not use the CCD nor any other source of information., 6) Did they mention that they remembered the information because it was included in the CCD? These six items are sometimes observed by more than one observer or teacher.

In 2n A (see Table F1 in Appendix E), only one out of five groups remembered the CCD at first. All of the groups used the CCD but, in all instances, they had to be prompted to use it. None of the groups used any other source of information, such as Google. There were no instances of groups who did not need the CCD nor any other source of information. Finally, none of the groups mentioned that they remembered the information because it was in the CCD without checking it.

In 2n B (see Table F2 in Appendix E), none of the groups mentioned the CCD. However, two students in group 3 remembered it. All the groups used the CCD, though, as in 2n A, all of them had to be reminded of the tool. Two out of four groups (groups 1 and 3) used other sources of information apart from the CCD. Group 3 used the jigsaw reading from session two and one of the students in group 1 remembered some of the information, so they did not have to look it up. Finally, none of the groups mentioned that they remembered the information because it was in the CCD without checking it.

It is worth mentioning that in some cases more than one teacher observed the same group but at different times during the class. For example, group 2 in 2n B was first observed by observer 1 and then by observer 2. Observer 1 noticed that the students did not remember the CCD and that they had to be reminded to use it. When observer 2 witnessed that same group, the participants were already using the CCD and so the answers to these items are exactly the opposite. In order to avoid

confusion with these items, the order in which the observers observed a certain group was also included in the grid. That is to say, if observer 1 was the first one to observe the group and recorded that they did not remember the CCD, this observation was taken into account when obtaining results.

5.2. Audio recordings

Groups 1 and 5 in 2n A and group 3 in 2n B were audio-recorded while they were writing the script. After analysing the recordings, some ideas need highlighting.

First, out of the three groups, only group 5 in 2n A accessed the CCD directly, with little guidance from the teacher, as excerpt 1 (from Subappendix G2) shows.

Excerpt 1

1. T1: Where are you going to find this information ↑
2. S1: **En la cosa esta que** XXX
3. *In that thingy that*
4. T1: **Qué** <u>cosa</u> ↑
5. *which thing*
6. S1: **En la** (.) **esto** XXX
7. *In the   this*
8. S2: **Es esto** ↑ ((pointing at the CCD. They access it))
9. *Is it this one*

Although group 1 in 2n A needed some guidance from the teacher in order to get to the CCD, one of the students did remember the CCD and was trying to tell the rest. The selected excerpt (from Subappendix G1) shows the moment when the group had already decided who was going to do each part and had to start writing. This was the first moment they mentioned the CCD.

Excerpt 2

14.   T1:   And <u>where </u>are you going to find the information ↑

15.   S1:   (.) In Google ↓

16.   T1:   (.) OK (.) because we didn't [do this in class ↑

17.   S2:   **O también en ∞**]

18.   *Also in*

19.   S1:   Or in the papers you: (.) [you

20.   S2:   **en**] **el documento que tenemos en Classroom** ((referring to Google Classroom))

21.   *in the file we have on Classroom*

22.   S3:   °you gave° ((helping S1 to finish the sentence))

23.   T1:   <u>Ah:</u> ↑ Where is this document ↑ Let's see ↑ (.) What document is it ↑

24.   S1:   ((rephrasing her own utterance in English)) °on the document in Classroom°

25.   S2:   **Entra a Classroom**

26.   *Access Classroom*

27.   S4:   I have a picture (2) the last day ∞

28.   T1:   You took a photo ↑ Aha:

29.   S2:   **Vale** (.) **a trabajo de clase** (2) **Sesión tres creo**

30.   *OK in Classwork I think it's session three*

31.   S2:   (2) **No** (.) **eso es una foto** STUDENT ((to another student who is clicking on a file))

32.   *No this is a picture*

33.   S2:   **Es un documento**

34.   *It's a file*

35.   T1:   Where is <u>all</u> the information [that you ha:ve ↑

36.   S2:   **En Student's book]** ↑

37.   *In the Student's book*

38.   T1:   (.) STUDENT do you <u>remember </u>↑ (.) What was it ↑

39.   S2:   In Student's book (.) **no** ↓ **a ver** (.) >**baja baja** <

40.   *no let's see scroll down scroll down*

41. S1: **No ↓** (.) **abajo es lo que hemos visto** (.) **no**

42. *No the file at the bottom is the one we've just seen no*

43. S2: **Baja ↓** >**Es que está abajo**< (.) **yo he entrado**

44. *Scroll down It is at the bottom I've accessed it*

45. S1: Class diary (.) **tiene que ser ∞ claro tiene que ser ese**

46. *Class diary   it must be   yes it must be this one*

47. S2: (2) **Entra**

48. *Click on it*

However, this group was not able to access the CCD at this moment due to internet connection problems and they mentioned the CCD again in line 62 and in line 81, when they were finally able to access it (see Subappendix G1).

As for group 3 in 2n B, one student remembered the CCD. As excerpt 3 (from Subappendix G3) shows, this student was trying to tell the rest where to find it. However, the rest of the group did not pay attention to this comment and they continued trying to find the file.

Excerpt 3

17. T1: <On the papers that we gave you:> (.) maybe you can use them again <u>now</u> ↑

18. for part two (.) and part three ↑ (.) <u>Where</u> is it ↑ (.) Where can we <u>find</u> it ↑

19. SS: In the Classroom (referring to Google Classroom)

20. T1: On Classroo:m ↑ Ok (.) Let's see

21. S3: **Quina sessió ↑**

22. *What session*

23. T1: <u>Where</u> did we write all the information= ↑

24. S3: **Esta arriba** (.) **en la sesión uno ↑**

25. *It's at the top in session one*

26. S1: **Está arriba** (.) °class dairy° (.) °class dairy°

27.		*It's at the the top*
28.	S3:	**Era eso**
29.		*It was this*
30.	S1:	**Eso ↑ El de treinta** (.) **treinta** (.) **sesenta ↑**
31.		*This one the one that reads thirty thirty sixty*
32.	S2:	**No eso no, aqui es como se hacia** (3) **a ver** ((they are trying to get there))
33.		*No it wasn't this one this is how to do it let's see*

Finally, as excerpt 4 (from Subappendix G3) shows, the teacher intervened to help them get there. At this point, two students admitted they did not remember the CCD.

Excerpt 4

34.	T1:	Did you find it or not ↑
35.	SS:	No
36.	T1:	**Nois** (.) **recordeu una cosa que es deia Clas diary ↑**
37.		*Guys do you remember a thing called Class diary*
38.	S1:	**Si**
39.		*Yes*
40.	T1:	**On cada dia escrivim el que anem fent ↑ Ho recordeu això ↑**
41.		*Where every day we write down what we do in class do you remember it*
42.	S1:	**Si**
43.		*Yes*
44.	T1:	OK (.) and where was it ↑
45.	S1:	<u>Arriba </u>**del todo**
46.		*At the very top*
47.	S2:	**Abajo**
48.		*At the bottom*
49.	T1:	<u>We:ll done </u>STUDENT ((addressing student 1))

50. S1: **Es que soy un <u>crac</u>**

51.   *I'm a genius*

52. T1: This can be useful (.) <u>Maybe </u>you don't need to use it because you remember

53.   everything (.) <u>bu:t </u>maybe (2) for example (.) <u>what</u> is aluminium ↑ (.) part one

54.   What else ↑ (.) <u>alternatives</u> (.) part 2 (.) >you can maybe use it<

55. S2: **No me acordaba ni que <u>existía </u>esto ↑**

56.   *I didn't even remember about it*

57. S3: **Ya** (.) **yo tampoco** ((They all laugh))

58.   *I know me neither*

Apart from these moments when the students clearly referred to the CCD, there are also other moments that should be highlighted since they are related to autonomy and collaborative learning. The first one is when group 1 in 2n A were finally looking at the CCD and they realised they have everything they need there (excerpt 6) as opposed to the beginning of the audio-recording (excerpt 5), when they expressed to be at a loss on how to start writing. These two excerpts are taken from Subappendix G1.

Excerpt 5

1. S1: <u>**Cómo**</u> (.) How (.) you (.) start (.) the part 1 STUDENT ↑

2.   *How*

3. S3: <u>I</u> don't know ↑

4. S1: OK (.) nice ↓

Excerpt 6

83. S3: **Vale (.) de <u>aquí</u> podemos coger información ↓**

84.   *OK, here we have information*

85. S1: <u>First</u> (.) What is aluminium fo:il ↑ (.) <u>Aluminium</u> is a metal ((reading from

86.   the CCD))

The second instance that is considered relevant is excerpt 7 (from Subappendix G2), when group 5 in 2n A were trying to remember all the alternatives to aluminium foil mentioned in class. The teacher drew their attention to the CCD (which they had previously accessed) and they realised that in the CCD they could find all the information required to complete the task.

Excerpt 7

18.   T2:   Do you remember the alternatives to aluminium foil ↑

19.   S2:   Eh: (.) no

20.   S1:   <Ah **si si**>(.) The:

21.   *yes yes*

22.   T2:   Any <u>alternatives</u> ↑

23.   S3:   The: ∞ (.) **la cosa que hemos hecho** (2) **del papel de plástico** ((referring to oilcloth))

24.   *the thingy we made with plastic paper*

25.   T2:   In English ↑

26.   S3:   I don't remember

27.   T2:   The <u>alternatives</u>

28.   T1:   (.) They are here (.) right ↑ ((pointing at the CCD, which they had previously

29.   accessed)) Here you have all the information (.) Where is it ↑

30.   S1:   >**El <u>taper</u> el <u>taper</u>**<

31.   *The tupperware the tupperware*

32.   S3:   Yes (.) the tupperware=

33.   T2:   (.) <u>continue]</u> (.) <u>continue</u> (.) <u>continue</u> ((telling them to continue browsing the CCD))

34.   S3:   **Ah <u>mira</u>** (.) The <u>wax paper</u>= ((reading from the CCD))

35.   *Oh look*

36.   T2:   Aha

37.   S3:   Eh (.) <u>reusing aluminium</u>=

38. T2:   <u>reusing aluminium</u>=

39. S3:   and the <u>sandwich wrap</u>

40. T2:   and the <u>sandwich wrap</u> (.) so we have these four alternatives ↑

This excerpt contrasts with the comments made by one of the students, who clearly expresses that she is not able to do the task (more specifically lines 10 and 16 in excerpt 8 and lines 47 and 51 in excerpt 9). Following excerpt 9, the transcription of minutes 08:00 to 09:59 (see Subappendix G2) show that this student was able to complete the task with the help of the CCD, the teacher and her peers.

   Excerpt 8

10.   S2:   **Es que sé cómo ∞ es que no entiendo esto la verdad**

11.   *I don't know how   it's just that I don't understand it*

12.   S3:   **<u>Hay tres partes del video</u>** (.) **yo voy a hacer la última parte** (.) **>o sea temenos**

13.   *The video has three parts   I'm doing the last one   I mean we have to*

14.   **que escribir**< (2) **Yo hago la la última parte**

15.   *write it down   I'm doing the last part*

16.   S2:   **Es que <u>yo</u> no sé inglés** (.) **tio ↓**

17.   *Come on, I can't speak English*

   Excerpt 9

47.   S2:   **Y qué tengo que hacer aquí**] ↑

48.   *And what do I have to do*

49.   S3:   **Decirlo en plan** (.) **<u>explicar</u> las** alternatives

50.   *Say them I mean explain the*

51.   S2:   **>Y tu te piensas que yo he entendido las alternatives para explicarlas**< ↑

52.   *And you think I've understood the alternatives and that I can explain them*

5.3. Focus groups

As mentioned in the data collection section, two focus groups with four participants each were set up. Focus group one had two female and two male participants called "Aisha", "Alba", "Omar" and "Ahmed", and focus group two had one female and three male participants called "Laura", "Axel", "Marc" and "David". In order to refer to the speakers in the two focus groups anonymously, the names of the participants have been changed. This section is divided in four parts according to the four questions asked by the moderators and there is a final section that discusses other relevant contributions from the participants. Contributions from both focus groups are included.

First, the participants were asked if they remembered the CCD. Omar admitted that they did not remember it. The rest of the participants in both focus groups remembered the tool and Alba added that it was "*on hi havia tota la información resumida, no?*" [where we had a summary of all the information, right?].

As for the second question, when asked if their groups had used the CCD and when, Alba stated that their group had used it to write the script. Aisha added that their group had also used it, and that they had taken a picture of some of the slides and used the pictures. Laura did not hesitate to affirm that they had used it and Marc agreed with her. Axel said that their group had used it, even though he admitted they hadn't used it a lot.

Regarding question three "Do you think that the CCD has helped you? Why?", the answer was unanimous and unmistakable. All the participants claimed that the CCD had helped them. When asked why it had helped them, Laura said that they had found all the relevant information to include in the script. Axel and Marc stated that doing the final task was easier with the CCD and Axel added that the CCD had a lot more "knowledge".

As regards the fourth question, all the participants agreed that their final product (the video) would have been worse without using the CCD. Focus group 1 uttered "worse!" without hesitation

and then they all started laughing. In focus group 2 Marc said it would have probably been worse, and Axel remarked that it would have been worse because the information in it would not have been the same. David agreed with Axel. Marc also pointed out the fact that all the relevant information was available to them in the CCD.

Moreover, other aspects were discussed. The moderators asked them if they could have found the same information online and their reactions were similar. They all said that using an online browser to search for the information was an option but that the result would not have been as positive. For instance, Axel commented on the fact that the CCD gave them faster access to the information they needed, and Marc added that finding the information online would have been more difficult for them than checking the CCD. Moreover, Alba said that they preferred the CCD to an online search because the CCD had been built by them day by day. Aisha also mentioned that if they had searched for the information online, they would have found a huge amount of information, which would have not been the same to the one covered in class. She also concluded by stating that it was better to have all the information together in one place (referring to the CCD). Omar and Ahmed agreed.

Finally, focus group 1 added that they had never used a similar tool at school. Alba mentioned some dossiers that are prepared by the school when doing project-based work, but they mentioned that these dossiers do not include content, only instructions. In focus group 2 Marc said they did not remember having used a similar tool and Axel hypothesised that if they had used something similar it did not have as much information as the CCD. David added that they would like to use it in the future and Marc agreed because "it is like a notebook but digital".

5.4. Students' productions

As mentioned in section 4.5, the scripts were compared against the CCD. This data yielded two different results: the number of units that were used by the students as regards the total number of

units in the CCD, and the same number of units as regard the total number of units in each script (see Appendix E).

First, the percentage of the CCD that was used in each script was calculated, that is to say the number of units that were used verbatim. For example, group 2 in 2n A wrote:

Did you know that there are alternatives to aluminium foil? A tupperware is an alternative to aluminium foil because it's reusable and it keeps food fresh. Wax paper is an alternative to aluminium foil because it is light. Reusing aluminium foil is an alternative because it is a resistant material. (Appendix D)

In this excerpt there are four units, and three were taken verbatim from the CCD, as the following figure shows:

Figure 1. Slide from the CCD (2n A)

In 2n A , the CCD included 24 units (see Appendix B) and group 1 included 9 units in their script, which represents 37.5% of the CCD. Group 2 included 12, which represents 50% of the CCD units and was the highest percentage in 2n A. Group 3 used 7 units, 29.17% of the CCD. Group 4 used slightly fewer units, 6 units, which make up 25% of the CCD. Finally, group 4 used 10 units verbatim, which means that they included 41.67% of the CCD (see Figure E1 in Appendix E). In 2n B, the CCD included

17 units (see Appendix C). While groups 1 and 3 included 10, which means 58.82% of the CCD, groups 2 and 4 included 12 units, 70.59% of the CCD (see Figure E2 in Appendix E).

The percentages in 2n B are considerably higher than in 2n A. However, if we consider the number of units used, they range from 9 to 12 in both classes. However, it is worth mentioning that groups 3 and 4 in 2n A only used 7 and 6 units respectively.

The second result that should be highlighted is the percentage of CCD units considering the number of units used in their script. The highest percentage was group 2 in 2n B, who wrote 15 units in their script, and 12 were directly taken from the CCD. This means that 80% of their script was from the CCD. Group 3 in 2n A wrote a script containing 11 units and 7 of them were taken from the CCD, which means 63.64% of their text was taken from the CCD. The script written by group 2 in 2n A and group 4 in 2n B contained 20 units, 12 of which were taken from the CCD. This represents 60% of their script. Then, out of the 18 units that group 5 in 2n A and group 1 in 2n B wrote, 10 were from the CCD, so 55.56% of their work was part of the CCD. With a similar percentage, group 1 in 2n A wrote 17 units and 9 of them were copied verbatim from the CCD, which means that 52.94% of their writing task was included in the CCD. Group 3 in 2n B included 19 units and 10 of them were taken from the CCD so 52.63% of their script was CCD language. Finally, there is a big difference to group 4 in 2n A, who only used CCD to write 31.58% of their script (they wrote 19 units and only 6 of them were copied verbatim from the CCD).

Finally, it is worth mentioning that the number of ideas from the CCD rather than verbatim units was also calculated and, in general, most percentages were higher. However, due to the impossibility to ensure these ideas were taken from the CCD rather than the students remembering them, these data were discarded and are not included in this study.

6. DISCUSSION

After interpreting the results according to the three main areas described in the theoretical framework, the most relevant findings are displayed here in order to answer the research questions.

On the basis of the evidence available, it can be stated that all the students used the CCD, which confirms Meyer and Rose's (2005) idea that universally designed materials serve the needs of all the learners. Moreover, in the focus groups students insist that even though they can access information online, this information is "not the same" as there is such a vast amount of it available, making the task of finding and retrieving the necessary material more challenging. This idea reinforces the validity of the CCD as a scaffolding tool. Likewise, in their study on collaborative note-taking with graduate students, Baldwin et al. (2019) showed that collaboration benefited even passive members of the groups through scaffolding and greater focus on note-taking.

However, it is worth mentioning that none of the participants in the focus group mentioned the CCD as a linguistic assistance tool, but rather a support to access content. This is particularly relevant considering that the CCD was designed in order to scaffold students both with language and content. Despite the fact that they did not mention it, the analysis of the scripts shows that big chunks of language were directly taken from the CCD and therefore it can be concluded that it offered linguistic as well as content assistance. These results concur with Leigh's (2012) findings. In her study with university students, she used exit tickets to foster reflection as well as to increase comprehension, and the study concludes that this tool also helped students absorb new information.

As regards the idea of scaffolding as a way to improve learners' performance, in this study it was clearly expressed and shared by all the participants in the focus groups that they felt their final product would have been worse without the CCD. Therefore, the CCD fulfilled the role of aiding students advance in their ZPD. This idea can be linked to the study by Orndorff (2015) which proved that collaboration in note-taking at University also scored higher in tests. Equally, Awaludin et al. (2017) conducted a study in university ESL classrooms. Their aim was to investigate the students'

perceptions on Padlet, an online tool which also encourages peer interaction, and their results also show that students benefited from this activity.

In terms of collaboration, and taking into account the definition mentioned in the theoretical framework, which considers knowledge negotiation or joint construction of meaning, it is worth mentioning Alba's remark about the CCD as compared to an online search. She stated that the use of the CCD was preferable because it had been "built by us day by day", a statement in line with collaborative learning, which values interaction with peers, teachers and context. Along the same lines, another study that investigates working collaboratively as a means of scaffolding is Tahmasebi and Yamini (2011). The participants in their study are freshmen who were divided in two groups. The experimental group were encouraged to work collaboratively and through private speech, while in the control group the teacher did most of the tasks (summarising, paraphrasing). Results show that the experimental group outperformed the control group in their oral skills. These results coincide with this study and reinforce the idea that collaboration is indeed an essential part of the learning process.

A closer look at the data indicates that the use of the CCD has a direct impact on higher learner autonomy since it provides students with all the necessary information for task completion (see excerpts 5 and 6, and also 8 and 9, in Section 5.2). Nonetheless, that same information was previously put together by the students and teachers collectively, which makes it especially relevant considering Yasmin and Naseem (2019)'s idea of LA, which involves interdependence and social interaction, and Zou (2011), who sees LA as an increase of awareness of learning contexts. Furthermore, in excerpt 7 (see Section 5.2) the students are using the CCD to take a more active role in their learning, which ties in with the concept of LA as well. Finally, in the focus group, students also express their willingness to use this tool again in the future, which shows awareness of the learning process rather than the result itself and thus increases engagement and LA.

Nevertheless, as the observation grid indicates (see Appendix F), all the groups needed to be prompted by the teachers in order to access the CCD, which can be explained because it was the first time that students used this tool. Similarly, Shooshtari and Mir (2014) conducted a study with

university students, and they concluded that peer-peer interaction in combination with instructor's mediation lead to a better performance than peer-peer interaction only. Along the same lines, a study by Cirocki et al. (2019) analysed high school teachers and students in Indonesia in terms of LA. Data were gathered with the help of a questionnaire and focus groups and their findings on readiness for LA revealed a medium level of teacher dependence and capacity to act autonomously. It could be predicted that if this tool were employed in the future, the students would refer to it without the teacher's guidance.

Regarding the CCD, the flexible nature of this tool allows for many modifications, which could place emphasis on reflection or accuracy, to name but a few. Moreover, this tool could be developed further with older students to make it a more participative tool, that is to say that the students could decide the contents included or even agree on the digital tool that should be used to fulfil the needs of each group of students or each teaching unit. This flexibility is especially relevant from a universal design for learning approach. However, in the present study this tool was designed to foster collaboration, to increase LA and, ultimately, to create an inclusive learning environment, and the results show that the CCD achieved these goals. These findings coincide with the study conducted by Harbin (2020) which argued that the collaborative note-taking system she set up in her college lessons (using an online shared document) was a way to transform the classroom into a more inclusive learning environment and improved the classroom discussion standard, as well as fostering collaboration. However, Harbin also mentions that collaborative note-taking has its drawbacks, such as conflict resulting from the difference in approaches to note taking of the students. In a way, the tool presented in this study overcomes this disadvantage by guiding students to help them select the most important information in each session.

To conclude this section, the limitations of this study must be taken into account. First, the results would be more reliable with a greater number of participants and a longer study period. Second, issues regarding bias in students' contributions in the focus group due to the teachers' position of power should also be considered. Third, the focus groups were conducted with open ended

questions and the students were not asked specifically about collaboration or autonomy. While this approach was preferred in order to avoid influencing students' answers in any way, it yielded to less information in this regard.

7. CONCLUSION

In light of the above, this paper claims that a more inclusive classroom can be achieved by using simple tools like the one presented in this study. According to the data gathered and in line with the aforementioned previous research, the CCD constitutes a suitable tool for a universally designed lesson. However, the purpose of this paper was threefold, considering the three research questions put forward at the beginning of the study.

First, regarding research question A, "do the students *refer to* the CCD when preparing the final product of the teaching unit?", the data gathered in this study provided convincing evidence that all the groups used it, even though they had to be prompted by the teachers to use it.

Second, as regards research question B, "do the students feel that the CCD is useful?", students' contributions in the focus groups and the analysis of their productions clearly showed that students valued the tool positively. The students highlighted that the CCD had helped them find the relevant information and that their final task would have been worse without the CCD. Moreover, they even stated that they would like to use it in the future.

Third, research question C, "do the students mention any of the features analysed in this study, namely assistance, collaboration and autonomy?", has not been answered fully. While students in the focus groups did mention the importance of collaboration and assistance, none of them referred to learner autonomy specifically. Conclusions in this regard have been drawn by analysing the audio recordings of the students working on their final task, even though the research question was aimed at identifying if students mentioned the three aforementioned aspects.

These findings are relevant for high school teachers working with big groups of students and who are committed to delivering meaningful lessons for everyone. Other findings of this study are the

relation between the level of proficiency of the students and the use of the CCD. As mentioned in the context section, the cooperative groups were heterogeneous and they remained the same in all the school subjects. However, referring to the level of English, some groups had, generally speaking, a lower level than others. If we compare the percentage of these groups to the rest, higher percentages of CCD units were included in their scripts, which indicates a potential relation between the level and the use of scaffolding tools. Nevertheless, since this was not the scope of this dissertation, these data were not considered of interest. Further research in this area could shed some light on the benefits of such a tool for each learner.

Another finding that should be highlighted is the potential increase in self-esteem resulting from the use of this tool. In the focus groups, some students expressed a direct correlation between them feeling proud of their work and the fact that they had had the help of the CCD. Future research could explore the relationship between the use of such tools and the increase in self-esteem and confidence when doing the task, as well as the shift in attitudes towards foreign language learning of the students.

Research on the use of tools such as collaborative note-taking or the tool presented in this study would benefit from a closer look at high school students, since previous literature seems to focus on university students. Incorporating such tools at early stages in the education system can have an impact on the attitudes towards learning and, ultimately, on the relationship between learners and the education system.

Much of the debate in education over the last decades revolves around the universally designed lessons (Sala-Bars et al., 2020). From my point of view, any efforts towards a more inclusive school that reflects social structure are paramount. However, we must be aware of the limits of UDL and that a universally designed lesson does not mean doing away with special education or meeting everybody's needs (Rose, 2000). All things considered, in the current heterogeneous scenario, 21st century skills such as communication and collaboration are crucial in order to be better prepared for an uncertain future subject to constant and rapid changes. Moreover, considering that students

should become expert learners because the content is already available to them digitally, that is to say, since having access to information is not the same as having access to learning (Rose, 2000; Meyer & Rose, 2005), teachers should strive to provide students with tools that not only focus on content but on the learning process.

It seems to me that all the teachers should attempt to find ways to transform classrooms as well as to take students' opinion into account in order to improve our teaching practice. This dissertation was an example of how to test if the introduction of a simple tool to a classroom can have an impact on the students' learning process from a UDL approach. From my perspective, this study can encourage teachers to experiment and develop tools that help our students become expert learners. At the same time, many teachers carrying out innovative practices will have an impact on policymakers and help move our education system towards a more inclusive, encouraging and meaningful experience.

8. REFERENCES

Ajuntament de Mataró. (2018). Pla d'Actuació Integral del barri de Cerdanyola. https://www.mataro.cat/ca/actualitat/publicacions/plans-pactes-i-convenis-municipals/pla-d2019actuacio-integral-del-barri-de-cerdanyola

Apple, M.T. (2006). Language Learning Theories and Cooperative Learning Techniques in the EFL Classroom. *Doshisha Studies in Language and Culture*, 9, 277-301. https://www.academia.edu/443286/Language_learning_theories_and_cooperative_learning_techniques_in_the_EFL_classroom

Awaludin, F. A., Karim, R. A. B., & Saad, N. H. (2017). Padlet: A Digital Collaborative Tool for Academic Writing. *Journal of Education and Social Sciences,* 8(1), 179-184. https://www.jesoc.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/KC8_84.pdf

Baker, L. (2006). Observation: A Complex Research Method. *Library Trends*, 55(1), 171-189. doi:10.1353/lib.2006.0045

Baldwin, M. P., Fanguy, M., & Costley, J. H. (2019). The Effects of Collaborative Note-Taking in Flipped Learning Contexts. *Journal of Language and Education*, 5(4), 25-35. https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2019.9726

Benson, P. (2006). Autonomy in language teaching and learning. *Language Teaching,* 40, 21-40. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444806003958

Buffum, A., Mattos, M. & Weber, C. (2010). The Why Behind RTI. *Educational Leadership*, 68(2), 10-16. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ913774

Canals, L. (2017). Instruments for gathering data. In E. Moore & M. Dooly (Eds), *Qualitative approaches to research on plurilingual education*. Research-publishing.net, 390-401. https://doi.org/10.14705/rpnet.2017.emmd2016.637

Castro, C. & Furriols, M. (2021). *Biadawrap! Teacher's Book* [Unpublished Work]. Faculty of Education, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

Center for Applied Special Technology [CAST]. (2021). About Universal Design for Learning. https://www.cast.org/impact/universal-design-for-learning-udl

Cirocki, A., Anam, S. & Retnaningdyah, P. (2019). Readiness for Autonomy in English Language Learning: The Case of Indonesian High School Students. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research,* 7(2), 1-18. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1220734.pdf

Decret 150/2017, de 17 d'octubre, de l'atenció educativa a l'alumnat en el marc d'un sistema educatiu inclusiu, Diari Oficial de la Generalitat de Catalunya, 7477 (2017).

Departament d'Educació. (2021, March 19). Educació secundària obligatòria. http://educacio.gencat.cat/ca/departament/estadistiques/estadistiques-ensenyament/curs-actual/eso/

Departament d'Ensenyament. (2015). De l'escola inclusiva al sistema inclusiu Una escola per a tothom, un projecte per a cadascú. http://www.aeesdincat.cat/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/De-escola-inclusiva-al-sistema-inclusiu.pdf

Dolan, R. P. & Hall, T. E. (2001). Universal Design for Learning: Implications for Large-Scale Assessment. *IDA Perspectives,* 27(4), 22-25. http://autismtools.weebly.com/uploads/1/4/4/8/14481562/udl_implications_for_large-scale_assessment.pdf

Donato, R. (1994). Collective Scaffolding in Second Language Learning. In J. P. Lantolf, & G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygostkian approaches to second language research*. Ablex, 35-56.

Dooly, M. & Moore, E. (2017). Introduction: qualitative approaches to research on plurilingual education. In E. Moore & M. Dooly (Eds), *Qualitative approaches to research on plurilingual education.* Research-publishing.net, 1-10. https://doi.org/10.14705/rpnet.2017.emmd2016.618

Eagleton, M. (2021). Universal Design for Learning (UDL). *Salem Press Encyclopedia*.

Gibbons, P. (2015). *Scaffolding Language, Scaffolding Learning: Teaching Second Language Learners in the Mainstream Classroom*. Heinemann.

Gibbs, A. (1997) Focus Groups. *Social Research Update*, 19. https://sru.soc.surrey.ac.uk/SRU19.html

Harbin, M.B. (2020). Collaborative Note-Taking: A Tool for Creating a More Inclusive College Classroom. *College Teaching*, 68 (4). https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.2020.1786664

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed). *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation*. John Benjamins, 13-31. https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.125.02jef

Johnson, R. B. (1997). Examining the Validity Structure of Qualitative Research. *Education*, 118(2), 282–292.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/246126534_Examining_the_Validity_Structure_of_Qualitative_Research

Johnson, D., Johnson, R., Holubec, E. (1994). *Cooperative Learning in the Classroom*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Leigh, S. (2012). The Classroom is Alive with the Sound of Thinking: The Power of the Exit Slip. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 24(2), 189-196. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ996265

Little, D. (1991). *Learner Autonomy 1: Definitions, Issues and Problems*. Authentik. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/259874253_Learner_Autonomy_1_Definitions_Issues_and_Problems

Memari, A. (2019). Collective peer scaffolding, self-revision, and writing progress of novice EFL learners. *IJES*, 19(1), 41–57. https://doi.org/10.6018/ijes.331771

Meyer, A., & Rose, D. H. (2005). The future is in the margins: The role of technology and disability in educational reform. In D. H. Rose, A. Meyer & C. Hitchcock (Eds.), *The universally designed classroom: Accessible curriculum and digital technologies*. Harvard Education Press, 13-35.

Orndorff, H. N., III. (2015). Collaborative note-taking: The impact of cloud computing on classroom performance. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 27(3), 340-351. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1093744.pdf

Punch, K.F., & Oancea, A. (2013). *Introduction to Research Methods in Education*. Sage Publications.

Rose, D. (2000). Universal design for learning. *Journal of Special Education Technology*, 15(1), 67-70.

https://www-proquest-

com.are.uab.cat/docview/228482620/70E4E58137574B63PQ/11?accountid=15292

Roselli, N. (2016). Collaborative learning: Theoretical foundations and applicable strategies to

university. *Propósitos y Representaciones*, 4(1), 219-280.

http://dx.doi.org/10.20511/pyr2016.v4n1.90

Sakamoto, M. (2017). How Effective is Interactive Learning? Investigating Japanese University

Students' Language Patterns in a Collaborative Writing Task. *IAFOR Journal of Language*

Learning, 3 (2), 115-139. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1167258

Sala-Bars, I., Macià-Golobardes, M., Simón-Llovet, J. & Alomar-Kurz, E. (2020). Eines digitals per a

l'avaluació des d'una perspectiva del DUA. *Aloma: revista de psicologia, ciències de l'educació*

i de l'esport Blanquerna, 38(2). https://doi.org/10.51698/aloma.2020.38.2

Salem, A. (2019). Learning in a Sheltered Online Scaffolding Environment (SOSE). *Education and*

Information Technologies, 24, 2503–2521. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-019-09883-6

Shooshtari, Z. & Mir, F. (2014). ZPD, Tutor; Peer Scaffolding: Sociocultural Theory in Writing Strategies

Application. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 1771-1776.

10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.605

Spencer, S. (2011). Universal Design for Learning: Assistance for Teachers in Today's Inclusive

Classrooms. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Teaching and Learning*, 1(1), 10-22.

https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1055639.pdf

Storch, N. (2002). Patterns of interaction in ESL pair work. *Language Learning*, 52(1), 119-158.

Tahmasebi, S. & Yamini, M. (2011). Linking Task-based Language Teaching and Sociocultural Theory:

Private Speech and Scaffolding in Reading Comprehension. *Advances in Language and Literary*

Studies, 2(1), 41- 55. 10.7575/aiac.alls.v.2n.1p.41

UNESCO. (2015). Education 2030: Incheon Declaration and Framework for Action Towards inclusive

and   equitable   quality   education   and   lifelong   learning   for   all.

https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000245656

Wood, D., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Child Psychology &*

Psychiatry & Allied Disciplines, 17(2), 89–100. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-

7610.1976.tb00381.x

Yasmin, M. & Naseem, F. (2019). Collaborative Learning and Learner Autonomy. *IEEE Access*, 7,

71493-71499. 10.1109/ACCESS.2019.2918756

Zhang, Y. (2010). Cooperative Language Learning and Foreign Language Learning and

Teaching. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 1(1), 81-83, 10.4304/jltr.1.1.81-83

Zou, X. (2011). What happens in different contexts and how to do learner autonomy better? Teacher

Development, 15(4), 421-433. https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2011.635268

9. APPENDICES

9.1. Appendix A: CCD template

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1jrLMv1ejMlPJ6rueg5MnVizRweOdsCCX/view?usp=sharing

9.2. Appendix B: CCD (2n A)

https://drive.google.com/file/d/156cafMoQTK5dQycg5gsHVSGUFeiO2GW7/view?usp=sharing

9.3. Appendix C: CCD (2n B)

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1PAErw0MrT7z_Fe1OI4dQV2yHdt2d1R13/view?usp=sharing

9.4. Appendix D: Scripts

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1QbMo1rJ3_U_Q_D3MhT1WyQoS20adE0gi/view?usp=sharing

9.5. Appendix E: Script analysis grid

2n A	total units in CCD	CCD units used verbatim	% CCD used	Total units in script	CCD units	% CCD in text
group 1	24	9	37.50%	17	9	52.94%
group 2	24	12	50.00%	20	12	60.00%
group 3	24	7	29.17%	11	7	63.64%
group 4	24	6	25.00%	19	6	31.58%
group 5	24	10	41.67%	18	10	55.56%

Figure E1. 2n A

2n B	total units in CCD	CCD units used verbatim	% CCD used	Total units in script	CCD units	% CCD in text
group 1	17	10	58.82%	18	10	55.56%
group 2	17	12	70.59%	15	12	80.00%
group 3	17	10	58.82%	19	10	52.63%
group 4	17	12	70.59%	20	12	60.00%

Figure E2. 2n B

Group 1 *RECORDING AVAILABLE	Observer 1	Observer 2	Observer 3
ORDER		1st	2nd
Did they remember the CCD?		Not at first. Salma did	Yes
Did they use the CCD?		Yes	Yes
Were they prompted to use it?		Yes	Yes
Did they use any other source of info (Google…)?		No (they mention it but when reminded about CCD they decided to use the CCD)	No
They didn't use the CCD nor any other source of info		No	No
They remember the information because it was included in CCD		No	
Group 2	Observer 1	Observer 2	Observer 3
ORDER		1st	
Did they remember the CCD?		No	
Did they use the CCD?		Yes	
Were they prompted to use it?		Yes	
Did they use any other source of info (Google…)?		No	
They didn't use the CCD nor any other source of info		No	
They remember the information because it was included in CCD		No	
Group 3	Observer 1	Observer 2	Observer 3
ORDER	1st		
Did they remember the CCD?	No		

Did they use the CCD?	Yes		
Were they prompted to use it?	Yes		
Did they use any other source of info (Google…)?	No		
They didn't use the CCD nor any other source of info	No		
They remember the information because it was included in CCD	No		
Group 4	*Observer 1*	*Observer 2*	*Observer 3*
ORDER			1st
Did they remember the CCD?			No
Did they use the CCD?			Yes
Were they prompted to use it?			Yes
Did they use any other source of info (Google…)?			No
They didn't use the CCD nor any other source of info			No
They remember the information because it was included in CCD			No
Group 5 *RECORDING AVAILABLE	*Observer 1*	*Observer 2*	*Observer 3*
ORDER	1st	2nd	
Did they remember the CCD?	No	Yes	
Did they use the CCD?	Yes	Yes	
Were they prompted to use it?	Yes	Yes	
Did they use any other source of info (Google…)?	No	No	
They didn't use the CCD nor any other source of info	No	No	

They remember the information because it was included in CCD	No	No	

Table F1. 2n A

Group 1	Observer 1	Observer 2	Observer 3
ORDER	1st		
Did they remember the CCD?	No		
Did they use the CCD?	Yes		
Were they prompted to use it?	Yes		
Did they use any other source of info (Google…)?	Yes (one student remembered all the information)		
They didn't use the CCD nor any other source of info	No		
They remember the information because it was included in CCD	No		
Group 2	Observer 1	Observer 2	Observer 3
ORDER	1st	2nd	
Did they remember the CCD?	No	Yes	
Did they use the CCD?	Yes	Yes	
Were they prompted to use it?	Yes	No	
Did they use any other source of info (Google…)?		No	
They didn't use the CCD nor any other source of info		No	
They remember the information because it was included in CCD		No	
Group 3 *RECORDING AVAILABLE	Observer 1	Observer 2	Observer 3
ORDER		1st	2nd

		One student remembers / two other students admit they don't	
Did they remember the CCD?			
Did they use the CCD?		Yes	Yes
Were they prompted to use it?		Yes	No
Did they use any other source of info (Google…)?		Yes (from jigsaw reading task)	No
They didn't use the CCD nor any other source of info		No	No
They remember the information because it was included in CCD		no	No
Group 4	*Observer 1*	*Observer 2*	*Observer 3*
ORDER			1st
Did they remember the CCD?			No
Did they use the CCD?			Yes
Were they prompted to use it?			Yes
Did they use any other source of info (Google…)?			No
They didn't use the CCD nor any other source of info			No
They remember the information because it was included in CCD			No

Table F2. 2n B

9.7. Appendix G: Session 6 transcripts

Relevant excerpts are transcribed here using the following symbols adapted from the *Jefferson Transcript Notation System*:

T1, T2	Teacher 1, Teacher 2
S1, S2, S3	Student 1, Student 2, Student 3
STUDENT	When a name is mentioned
(.)	A brief pause
(# of seconds)	A timed pause
XXX	Unclear speech
<text>	Speech delivered more slowly than usual for the speaker
>text <	Speech delivered more rapidly than usual for the speaker
=	Latching
<u>underlining</u>	Rise in volume or emphasis
:	Prolongation of a sound
(( ))	Non-verbal activity
bold	Another language is used
italics	English translation (when another language is used)
↑	Rising pitch or intonation
↓	Falling pitch or intonation
∞	Unfinished sentence
[ ]	Start and end points of overlapping speech
°text°	Whisper, reduced volume, or quiet speech

9.7.1.   Subappendix G1: Group 1 2n A

From minute 02:55 to 04:28

1.   S1:   **<u>Cómo</u>** (.) How (.) you (.) start (.) the part 1 STUDENT ↑

2.   *How*

3.   S3:   <u>I</u> don't know ↑

4.   S1:   OK (.) nice ↓

5.   T1:   OK (.) STUDENT said it ((talking to another group))

6.   SS: XXX

7.   T1:   Ok girls (.) are you deciding who: (.) [does what ↑

8.   S2:   **Si**]

9.   *Yes*

10. SS: Yes

11. S1:   STUDENT have part one (.) [STUDENT and STUDENT have part two: (.) and she have part

12.   three

13. S4:   I do part three]

14. T1:   And <u>where</u> are you going to find the information ↑

15. S1:   (.) In Google ↓

16. T1:   (.) OK (.) because we didn't [do this in class ↑

17. S2:   **O también en ∞**]

18.   *Also in*

19. S1:   Or in the papers you: (.) [you

20. S2:   **en**] **el documento que tenemos en Classroom** ((referring to Google Classroom))

21.   *in the file we have on Classroom*

22. S3:   °you gave° ((helping S1 to finish the sentence))

23. T1:   <u>Ah:</u> ↑ Where is this document ↑ Let's see ↑ (.) What document is it ↑

24. S1:   ((rephrasing her own utterance in English)) °on the document in Classroom°

25. S2:   **Entra a Classroom**

26.   *Access Classroom*

27. S4:   I have a picture (2) the last day ∞

28. T1:   You took a photo ↑ Aha:

29. S2:   **Vale** (.) **a trabajo de clase** (2) **Sesión tres creo**

30.   *OK in Classwork I think it's session three*

31. S2:   (2) **No** (.) **eso es una foto** STUDENT ((to another student who is clicking on a file))

32.   *No this is a picture*

33. S2:   **Es un documento**

34.   *It's a file*

35. T1:   Where is <u>all</u> the information [that you ha:ve ↑

36. S2:   **En Student's book]** ↑

37.   *In the Student's book*

38. T1: (.) STUDENT do you <u>remember</u> ↑ (.) What was it ↑

39. S2: In Student's book (.) **no ↓ a ver** (.) >**baja baja** <

40. *no let's see scroll down scroll down*

41. S1: **No ↓** (.) **abajo es lo que hemos visto** (.) **no**

42. *No the file at the bottom is the one we've just seen no*

43. S2: <u>**Baja**</u> ↓ >**Es que está abajo**< (.) <u>**yo he entrado**</u>

44. *Scroll down It is at the bottom I've accessed it*

45. S1: Class diary (.) **tiene que ser** ∞ **claro tiene que ser ese**

46. *Class diary it must be it must be this one*

47. S2: (2) <u>**Entra**</u>

48. *Click on it*

49. S1: <**Esperate:**> **chiqui:lla** (4) **entra des del movil tu** (.) **porfa** (2) **que yo no tengo el wifi**

50. *Wait baby access from your mobil phone please that the wifi is not working for me*

51. S2: **Sí** (.) **entra tu** XX

52. *Yes access it*

53. S1. **Que yo no tengo el wifi** ↑

54. *The wifi is not working for me*

From minute 05:20 to 05:55

55. S1: **Vale ya esta** (3) <**Classroom**> (3) >**Vale ahora sí que**< **podemos**

56. *OK that's it Classroom Alright now we can see it*

57. SS: XXX

58. S1: **Va:le** (.) **aquí:**

59. Alright here

60. S2 **A tarea=trabajo de classe**

61. *In Classwork*

62. S1 <u>**En Class diary**</u>

63. *In Class diary*

64. S2: **Entra**

65.   *Click on it*

66. S1:   **Vale** (.) **<u>aquí</u>** (.)°**joder no deja**° ((they can't access the CCD from the tablet))

67.   *Alright oh damn it won't work*

68. S2:   **Me imagino que no es este**

69.   *I guess it's not this one*

70. T1:   What if you try using a <u>laptop</u> (.) maybe: ↑= You don't have <u>any computers</u> ↑

71. S1:   Yes (.) he have= she have

72. S3:   **[No puedes sacar el tuyo ↑**

73.   *Can't you get yours*

74. T1:   So (.) come <u>o:n</u> (.) we cannot work] without the laptop

From minute 09:46 to 10:35

75. S3:   **On és ↑** ((student 3 has a laptop and is trying to get to the CCD))

76.   *Where is it*

77. T2:   (.) You (.) go (.) to ∞ Exactly (.) uhm = Well is class diary you want (.) right ↑=

78.   What do you want ↑ (.) [What are you looking for ↑

79. S3:   **Donde temenos que entrar ↑]** ((asking the other students))

80.   *Where do we have to click*

81. S1:   **Al Class diary**

82.   *On Class diary*

83. S3:   **Vale (.) de <u>aquí</u> podemos coger información ↓**

84.   *OK, here we have information*

85. S1:   <u>First</u> (.) What is aluminium fo:il ↑ (.) <u>Aluminium</u> is a metal ((reading from

86.   the CCD))

87. T2:   Aha (.) <u>ve:ry good</u> (.) <u>ve:ry good</u> (.)

From minute 00:34 to 00:49

1. T1: Where are you going to find this information ↑

2. S1: **En la cosa esta que** XXX

3. *In that thingy that*

4. T1: **Qué <u>cosa</u>** ↑

5. *which thing*

6. S1: **En la** (.) **esto** XXX

7. *In the   this*

8. S2: **Es esto** ↑ ((pointing at the CCD. They access it))

9. *Is it this one*

From minute 03:15 to 03:28

10. S2: **Es que sé cómo** ∞ **es que no entiendo esto la verdad**

11. *I don't know how   it's just that I don't understand it*

12. S3: **<u>Hay tres partes del video</u>** (.) **yo voy a hacer la última parte** (.) **>o sea temenos**

13. *The video has three parts   I'm doing the last one   I mean we have to*

14. **que escribir<** (2) **Yo hago la la última parte**

15. *write it down   I'm doing the last part*

16. S2: **Es que <u>yo</u> no sé inglés** (.) **tio** ↓

17. *Come on, I can't speak English*

From minute 04:35 to 05:20

18. T2: Do you remember the alternatives to aluminium foil ↑

19. S2: Eh: (.) no

20. S1: <Ah **si si**>(.) The:

21. *yes yes*

22. T2: Any <u>alternatives</u> ↑

23. S3: The: ∞ (.) **la cosa que hemos hecho** (2) **del papel de plástico** ((referring to oilcloth))

24. *the thingy we made with plastic paper*

25. T2: In English ↑

26. S3: I don't remember

27. T2: The <u>alternatives</u>

28. T1: (.) They are here (.) right ↑ ((pointing at the CCD, which they had previously

29. accessed)) Here you have all the information (.) Where is it ↑

30. S1: >**El <u>taper</u> el <u>taper</u>**<

31. *The tupperware the tupperware*

32. S3: Yes (.) the tupperware=

33. T2: (.) <u>continue</u>] (.) <u>continue</u> (.) <u>continue</u> ((telling them to continue browsing the CCD))

34. S3: **Ah <u>mira</u>** (.) The <u>wax paper</u>= ((reading from the CCD))

35. *Oh look*

36. T2: Aha

37. S3: Eh (.) <u>reusing aluminium</u>=

38. T2: <u>reusing aluminium</u>=

39. S3: and the <u>sandwich wrap</u>

40. T2: and the <u>sandwich wrap</u> (.) so we have these four alternatives ↑

From minute 06:45 to 07:05

41. S3: **Tía** (.) **tía** STUDENT (.) <u>STUDENT</u> **tu haces las alternativas** (.)

42. *Hey   hey   you do the alternatives*

43. **Es esto básicamente** ((pointing at the corresponding slide of the CCD))

44. *It's basically this*

45. S1: [**La** STUDENT **y yo hacemos la** solution

46. STUDENT *and I do the*

47. S2: **Y qué tengo que hacer aquí**] ↑

48. *And what do I have to do*

49. S3: **Decirlo en plan** (.) <u>explicar</u> **las** alternatives

50.		*Say them I mean explain the*
51.	S2:	>**Y tu te piensas que yo he entendido las alternatives para explicarlas**< ↑
52.		*And you think I've understood the alternatives and that I can explain them*
53.	T2:	Well (.) but you can have the script (.) **tendrás el guión** (.) and you'll read
54.		*You'll have the script*
55.	S2:	**Uala que muerte**
56.		*Wow it's impossible*

From minute 08:00 to 09:59

57.	S2:	Alternatives (.) **qué: qué hay que explicar** ↑ (.) **Lo del** aluminium **lo de**: ∞ **lo que**
58.		*what what do we have talk about about about what we*
59.		**hemos ido haciendo=**
60.		*have been doing*
61.	T2:	Exactly (.) you need to explain these four alternatives o:f (.) aluminium foil (.) yes ↑
62.	S2:	**O sea hem d'explicar** (2) >**he d'explicar lo de**< (2) **lo de** (3) **lo de reciclar el papel** ↑
63.		*So we have to talk about about recycling paper*
64.	T2:	<u>Aha</u> (.) reusing
65.	S2:	**lo del aluminio**
66.		*about aluminium*
67.	S3:	**Esto está bien** ↑ ((asking about her part of the script))
68.		*Is that correct*
69.	S2:	**Lo de reciclar aluminio <e:sta maravilla (.) mierda> esto de aquí (.) Y: tu (.) pper (.)**
70.		*About recycling aluminium this great crappy thingy this and what does tupperware*
71.		**ware (.) qué es** ↑ ((struggling to pronounce the word tupperware))
72.		*mean*
73.	T2:	Tupperware ↑ Tupperware ↓ ((emphasising pronunciation))
74.	S2:	**Un taper** ↑
75.		*A tupperware*
76.	T2:	<u>Exactly</u> (.) Tupperware ↓ Tupperware ↓ ((they laugh)) In <u>English</u> ↑ <u>(.)</u> <u>Tupperware</u>

		(.)
77.		>**en** e**spañol** ↑ (.) **taper**<
78.		*in Spanish*
79.	S2:	**Y no podemos decir taper** ↑
80.		*Can't we just say* **taper**
81.	T2:	No (2) that would be in <u>Spanish</u> but this is in <u>English</u> so you need to say <u>tupperware</u>
82.	S2:	(.) **No me sale a cuenta esto** ((the teacher laughs))
83.		*It's not worth it*
84.	T2:	It's very e:asy (.) <u>tupperware</u> ↓
85.	S2:	<u>Tupperware</u>
86.	T2:	<u>Exactly</u>
87.	S2:	<u>Tupperware</u>
88.	T2:	You see (.) <u>tupperware</u>
89.	S2:	**Flipa flipa** >tupperwa:re< ((faking a British accent)) ((the student laughs)) Bueno (.)
90.		*That's amazing* *Well*
91.		tupperware is an alternative to aluminium foil because it's ((reading from CCD))
92.	S3:	<u>Becau:se</u> ((helping S2 pronounce this word correctly))
93.	T2:	<u>Because</u> ↓ ((pronouncing the word properly))
94.	S2:	Because ↑
95.	S1:	<u>Becau:se</u> ((offering correct pronunciation))
96.	S2:	Because ↑ ((the student pronounces the word properly))
97.	T2:	<u>Aha</u>
98.	S2:	Because it is re: (.) e:h ↑ ((the student continues reading from the CCD))
99.	T2:	<u>Reusable</u> ((helping the student to pronounce this word))
100.	S2:	Reusable and it (.) keeps (.) food (.) fresh
101.	T2:	<reusable>
102.	S2:	Reu (.) sable
103.	T2:	<u>Aha</u> (.) and <u>because</u>
104.	S2:	And because

105. T2: <u>Exactly</u> (.) What about <u>wax paper</u> ↑

106. S2: Wax paper is an alternative to aluminium foil <u>becau:se</u> it is (.) light ((reading from CCD

107. and emphasising pronunciation))

108. S1: <u>Light</u> ((helping with pronunciation))

109. S2: Light ↑ (the student laughs))

110. T2: <u>Good</u> (.) <u>good</u>

9.7.3. Subappendix G3: Group 3 2n B

From minute 01:10 to 02:05

1. S2 Teníamos la primera parte=

2. *We already have part one*

3. T1 Oh (.) OK (.) <u>fantastic</u>

4. S1 **Dónde estaba** ↑

5. Where was it

6. T1 Oh (.) very <u>goo:d</u> (.) And where did you find the information for the <u>first</u> part ↑

7. S1: >**Yo yo**<

8. *Me me*

9. T1: <u>Where</u> did you find this information ↑

10. S1: Twenty-six seconds (.) twenty-six=

11. T1: STUDENT (.) can you <u>listen</u> ↑ (.) I'm asking a <u>question</u> (.) <u>Where</u> (.) did you find

12. this information ↑

13. T1: (2) <u>This</u> information ↑ ((pointing at their document from the previous day, where

14. they wrote part 1)) (.) <u>where</u> did you find it ↑

15. S2: **En los papeles estos que nos disteis** ((referring to the jigsaw reading activity))

16. *On the papers that you gave us*

17. T1: <On the papers that we gave you:> (.) maybe you can use them again <u>now</u> ↑

18. for part two (.) and part three ↑ (.) <u>Where</u> is it ↑ (.) Where can we <u>find</u> it ↑

| 19. | SS: | In the Classroom (referring to Google Classroom) |

19. SS: In the Classroom (referring to Google Classroom)

20. T1: On Classroo:m ↑ Ok (.) Let's see

21. S3: **Quina sessió ↑**

22.   *What session*

23. T1: <u>Where</u> did we write all the information= ↑

24. S3: **Esta arriba** (.) **en la sesión uno ↑**

25.   *It's at the top in session one*

26. S1: **Está arriba** (.) °class dairy° (.) °class dairy°

27.   *It's at the the top*

28. S3: **Era eso**

29.   *It was this*

30. S1: **Eso ↑ El de treinta** (.) **treinta** (.) **sesenta ↑**

31.   *This one the one that reads thirty thirty sixty*

32. S2: **No eso no, aqui es como se hacia** (3) **a ver** ((they are trying to get there))

33.   *No it wasn't this one this is how to do it let's see*

From minute 04:26 to 05:08

34. T1: Did you find it or not ↑

35. SS: No

36. T1: **Nois** (.) **recordeu una cosa que es deia Clas diary ↑**

37.   *Guys do you remember a thing called Class diary*

38. S1: **Si**

39.   *Yes*

40. T1: **On cada dia escrivim el que anem fent ↑ Ho recordeu això ↑**

41.   *Where every day we write down what we do in class do you remember it*

42. S1: **Si**

43.   *Yes*

44. T1: OK (.) and where was it ↑

45. S1: **<u>Arriba </u>del todo**

46. *At the very top*

47. S2: **Abajo**

48. *At the bottom*

49. T1: <u>We:ll done </u>STUDENT ((addressing student 1))

50. S1: **Es que soy un <u>crac</u>**

51. *I'm a genius*

52. T1: This can be useful (.) <u>Maybe </u>you don't need to use it because you remember

53. everything (.) <u>bu:t </u>maybe (2) for example (.) <u>what </u>is aluminium ↑ (.) part one

54. What else ↑ (.) <u>alternatives </u>(.) part 2 (.) >you can maybe use it<

55. S2: **No me acordaba ni que <u>existía </u>esto ↑**

56. *I didn't even remember about it*

57. S3: **Ya** (.) **yo tampoco** ((They all laugh))

58. *I know me neither*