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Abstract

This thesis investigates oral digital storytelling (DST) in the young learner foreign language (L2) classroom and was motivated by my practice as a Swiss primary teacher and English language methodology lecturer at the teacher training college in Zug. To date, there has been little research on the potential role of oral task-based DST in the L2 classroom at primary level. This year-long study explores opportunities and challenges of collaborative oral task-based DST in English L2 classes in a Year 4 primary classroom (ten-year-olds). It examines how L2 learning can be promoted, and what prior knowledge is needed to engage in the tasks. It further explores the effect of collaborative DST on speaking proficiency, and the use of language(s) - and notably translanguaging. The main data consist of video- and audio-recordings of four pupils working in dyads on collaborative oral tasks, and semi-structured interviews with the children and their Year 4 teacher. My original research and data-collection plans were significantly affected by the COVID-19 lockdown, making adaptations necessary. These included: analysis of an English lesson observed before lockdown; an individual DST task for the children to complete as part of home-schooling; a pupil questionnaire about their different experiences of DST in pairs at school and at home alone; and an interview with the children’s Year 5 teacher to gain some qualitative insights into her perception of the impact of DST on the children’s English. The data were analysed using reflexive thematic analysis and the underlying approach to the research was ecological constructivism. The findings suggest that DST can provide a bridge between the mandated textbook to connect it with the children’s lives and play a motivating role in supporting the development of L2 oracy, particularly where supported by: the explicit teaching of effective collaborative work; the provision of task-based language support resources; and the presence of an audience. A further significant finding was the positive role of using L1 and translanguaging in the L2 classroom. Translanguaging, little-known in Switzerland, is unsupported by Curriculum 21, the recently implemented curriculum to harmonise education across the various cantons in Switzerland. My findings also give insights into how structured oral task-based DST can enhance pupils’ oracy in an L2, pupils’ and teachers’ Information and Communication Technology skills, and pedagogy more generally – an important set of findings given the necessity for more theoretical insights in technology-supported task-based DST.
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Chapter 1 Introduction

In this chapter I introduce the context of my research. I start with my motivation (1.1) to explore long-term collaborative digital storytelling (DST) in English as a foreign language (L2) in a primary state school in Switzerland. I embed my study in the educational background of federalist Switzerland seeking to establish a common curriculum across the various cantons through the recent implementation of Lehrplan 21 (Curriculum 21) (1.2). One major consequence of the reform is that Media and Information Technology (MIT), which includes media education, media use, and ICT, is now embedded in other subjects up to Year 5 (eleven-year-olds). This is followed by a discussion of the debates about which L2 should be taught first in primary in the German speaking parts of multilingual Switzerland, their impact on education, and how English classes were introduced in primary school education (1.3). I set the scene for my young learner (YL) context (1.4) and outline my choice of software used in this research (1.5). The chapter closes with a discussion of the 2019/20 academic year, which is when my main study took place, and the impact the COVID-19 pandemic and resultant school closure in Switzerland had on my research (1.6).

1.1 Rationale for my study

My main pedagogical interest for researching oral DST in L2 lies in my professional background. Initially being trained as a Swiss primary teacher teaching all subjects including German, my L1, I became interested in teaching Information and Communication Technology (ICT) and English long before these became part of the primary school curriculum in Switzerland. I became an English teacher for Swiss secondary schools, adults, and when English was introduced to primary from 2005 to 2011, I finally became a primary English teacher. In my current role as a primary teacher at a Swiss state school in canton Zug and English language methodology lecturer at the Pädagogische Hochschule Zug (PH Zug), the Initial Teacher Education (ITE) college in Zug, my ambition is to improve L2 teaching and pedagogy.

When the Education Lab at the PH Zug, with the aim of offering innovative approaches for using digital media for teacher trainees and primary teachers, opened in September 2015, I made ICT the topic for my Masters in Adult and Professional Education thesis in which I discussed innovative implementations of
tablet computers at the PH and in primary English. For this reason, I trialled new
digital formats in both institutions. Whilst I first focused on literacy in primary English,
I changed to oracy because of its prioritisation in our YL context. Furthermore, often
conventional YL speaking is still imitative and reproductive (Legutke et al., 2009),
and realising or fostering freer expression is more difficult as the learners need to
‘learn how to manage more complex tasks’ (Pinter, 2017, p. 69). This explicit
learning can be linked to digitalised learning, the trends of which point to learner-
centredness, reflection, collaboration, and mutual support (Kukulska-Hulme, 2021)
which recently has become even more pertinent with the COVID-19 lockdown, and
its impact on digitalisation. All this together has influenced my EdD journey and
shifted my initial research focus on the use of software to improve oracy to DST
using multimodal software with attention to:

- L2 pedagogy
- task-based learning
- task design and task expectations
- collaboration
- oracy/L1 use in L2 classes/translanguaging
- ownership
- agency and empowerment
- audience design
- individualised and personalised learning

1.2 Curriculum 21

One of the drivers for my project was the advent of Curriculum 21: an effort to
harmonise education across all twenty-one German-speaking and multilingual
cantons in Switzerland through the development of a common curriculum.

Curriculum 21 is competence-based and sets out learning objectives for each
subject. It also requires the embedding of Media and Information Technology (MIT)
across the curriculum. All three of these posed demands for teachers, especially the
expectation that MIT be embedded through challenging, thought-provoking, and
activity-oriented projects (Krieg and Hess, 2017; Kanton Zug, 2016), which allow for
personalised learning (D-EDK, 2016a). Even though teachers have been trained to embed and teach the subject, they are overwhelmed with the implementation as guidance on implementing such an innovative approach has been largely lacking. For example, in the primary stage, the only recommendations for combining L2 learning and MIT are through the use of online dictionaries, writing with a word processor, and virtual and real encounters of people and artifacts of the English culture (D-EDK, 2018a). Not surprisingly, teachers find embedding MIT into their lessons in a supportive, effective, and efficient way difficult, and so are slow to embrace the new possibilities. One of the drivers for my project was to support this innovative approach to embedding MIT in L2 classes.

Not only were the teachers in canton Zug faced with the challenge of implementing the competence-based Curriculum 21 during 2019/20 (the year I carried out my main study) but this was also the school year that was disrupted by the COVID-19 lockdown, which boosted the use of ICT in home-schooling (1.6).

1.3 English in primary school in Switzerland

Switzerland is a federalist state with four national languages (German, French, Italian, and Romansh) which are anchored in the Federal Constitution of the twenty-six cantons (Wehrli, 2014). D-EDK (2018a) acknowledges that whilst multilingualism promotes identity development and cultural diversity, it is both an enrichment and a challenge for such a small country: there are multilingual regions and distinct Swiss German dialects. Knowledge of another national language is promoted for economic and social reasons, and English is recognised as being important for international business, politics, and digitalisation.

In the German speaking part, Standard German is the language of instruction, but the children are also expected to embrace the linguistic diversity of Switzerland. However, there are currently no federal requirements regarding plurilingualism, the teaching of non-native languages, or the incorporation of Swiss German.

In the 1970s the Cantonal Ministers of Education suggested moving learning the first L2, which had to be a national language at that time, from secondary school to primary. This implementation lasted up to the 1990s when the Cantonal Ministers considered having two L2s in primary to foster multilingualism (D-EDK, 2014). This was a European trend which prioritised English (Stotz, 2009) for its economic advantage (Stotz and Meuter, 2003). The ministers also considered that given the
prevalence of English as a world language and its presence in everyday culture, its inclusion would strengthen state schools, influenced by the example of innovative schools which had embraced teaching English from early years onwards (Wehrli, 2014), and social equality for children from a lower socio-economic background (Stotz and Meuter, 2003).

While non-national languages have been tolerated in everyday life, they are problematic in the school context and a politically delicate topic. There was a fear, for example, that English might endanger the national languages (Wehrli, 2014). Stotz and Meuter (2003) describe how around the millennium, reform-driven state schools in canton Zurich launched a project to promote equal opportunities for low-income families who could not afford private English classes. In this project, English was integrated into other subjects so as not to endanger French as a national language. However, the inclusion of English songs, chants, and storybooks resulted in minimal language gains: one-word answers or one or two-morpheme utterances because of too little exposure; unsystematic instruction; shortage of material; lack of language support; and probably limited productive language opportunities. Later trials of embedding English into Humanities proved too difficult for all: insufficient teacher training, resources too difficult, too demanding for the children. Cameron (2001) argues that the effective embedding of content in an L2 is very challenging: if the concepts are unfamiliar to the children in their L1, they will struggle to acquire them through the L2. Nevertheless, a positive attitude towards the language and the motivational focus on content remained a constant (Stotz, 2009). Furthermore, canton Zurich focused on action-orientedness and language-awareness, and published Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) (2.3.1) and task-based learning (TBL) (2.3.2) resources for primary.

Then the Cantonal Ministers of Education decided that Switzerland needed to stay competitive within Europe and should take advantage of its multilingualism (EDK, 2004). They agreed on the introduction of a first L2 in Year 3 at the latest in the academic year 2010/11 and a second L2 in Year 5 in 2011/12, but apart from the requirement that one of the L2s must be a national language (D-EDK, 2014), they left the coordination of the language teaching to intercantonal collaboration because of the different needs of the different parts of the country. While the German bilingual cantons and those close to the French speaking part opted for French as their first L2, all the other monolingual German speaking cantons chose English as their first L2 (Figure 1).
In canton Zug, where my study is located, English (with a focus on oracy) was introduced in Year 3 in 2005/6 (Kanton Zug, 2005). The Cantonal Teaching Resources Committee decided to use the textbook *Young World*, a soft CLIL book, to start in Year 3 as soft CLIL is language-led and designed to enable a smooth start to L2 learning (2.3.1). *Young World* is used in twelve German-speaking cantons. This textbook series mainly fulfils the requirements of *Curriculum 21*, but the original version is considered dated and does not include any task-based learning activities. In their absence, teachers were therefore not motivated to build in MIT tasks with their L2 classes as the demands of embedding any MIT, given the lack of guidance on this in *Curriculum 21* (1.2), were already challenging.

### 1.4 Young learners

The participants in my study were ten-year-olds in Year 4 (3.4). Having mastered the basics of their L1 and started with English in Year 3 (1.3), they still have emotional, physical and cognitive needs, which teachers can find challenging. Nunan (2011) argues that YL want to please their teacher, are emotional, and can be motivated easily if teachers meet their affective needs. They try hard to reach their learning aim and are engaged by competitive games. Furthermore, collaborative tasks can heighten their self-esteem. Pinter (2017) argues that the
systematic support of social learning and interaction can help YL achieve better results. Both are a focus in my research (2.7/3.1).

For teachers it is important to keep in mind YLs’ physical and mental needs. According to Piaget, ten-year-olds are still in the concrete operational stage. This means they can reason logically if they can relate to the situation (Pinter, 2017). Generalisation beyond that is difficult (Nunan, 2011). Nunan (2011) also considers the decrease in motivation if YL are faced with monotonous work, their short attention span, and heterogeneity in class. Hence, the ideal method is a mixture of: motivating aims; reachable goals and age-appropriate expectations; giving support and strategies; and building on previous learning. Consequently, it is important to maintain motivation, which can be achieved by drawing on the combination of: meaningful content; authentic communication; (language) support; personalisation of work; collaboration; and evidence of improvement (Legutke et al., 2009).

Pinter (2017) argues that the use of short videos on YouTube and virtual learning have also proved motivating for YL. Embedding MIT projects in L2 learning fosters digital literacy, which is best learnt in situated and problem-based guided learning within interdisciplinary competences (Tour, 2020), a key point of Curriculum 21 (1.2). However, Tour deplores the current lack of both theory and useful guidelines on embedding digitalisation in L2 teaching methodically and comprehensively, and argues that insights into theory and practice are needed to improve teaching efficacy. My research aims to narrow this gap by offering theoretical and practical insights.

1.5 Software Adobe Spark Video

When I developed my research idea, canton Zug was finalising its planning for Curriculum 21 and MIT. The eleven districts that make up the canton agreed on a common implementation policy for MIT (Interessengemeinschaft Gemeindeinformatik Zug, 2018): the new subject MIT was to be embedded in lower grades and every class supplied with five laptops, and twelve additional devices shared across the school. From Year 5 onwards, MIT is taught as a separate subject, and as part of this, every pupil is provided with their own device. As we have worked with Windows devices in the past, the same operating system was chosen (Schauber et al., 2018). Considering these circumstances, I searched for a free online software package that would be appropriate for children and found Adobe Spark (AS) which is ‘a robust, sleek, and easy to use creation and production
platform with a wide variety of modern templates, images, fonts, and uses’ (van Arnhem, 2017, p. 61). Further investigation revealed that Adobe Spark Video (ASV) had previously been used by researchers to investigate the teaching of pronunciation (Yoshida, 2018) and speaking practice of adults (Arispe and Burston, 2017; Schenker and Kraemer, 2017), both with positive effects (2.1.2). ASV seemed to be a good choice for my purpose, especially as it had been praised by Chung and Wang as ‘one of the most user-friendly’ (2020, p. 7), an important consideration when working with YL and hoping to encourage other teachers to integrate it into their teaching.

![Figure 2: Adobe Spark Video](https://spark.adobe.com/sp/design/video/wmaixahpc4u3hedc0bl3-e99a-4ba7-86d4-b7c7x12w191d.png)

As Figure 2 shows, the ASV user interface is clearly structured and allows users to insert videos, text, licence-free photos, and icons. With the options on the right, the children can choose different layouts, different backgrounds and fonts, and soundtracks. Pressing the red button in the middle enables them to audio-record themselves. The simplicity of the interface guided my task design (2.5).

### 1.6 COVID-19 state school closure

The academic year 2019/20 started with the implementation of Curriculum 21 in canton Zug. Related to this, the teachers received inputs on how to use OneNote and Microsoft Teams, and had an in-service day about the new subject MIT. All seemed set for a smooth transition to the new curriculum and then COVID-19 hit, proving disruptive not only to schooling but also to my research plans (3.8).
Originally primary school closure was planned for three weeks and then extended several times to six weeks which was, including a two-week spring break, from 16 March to 10 May 2020. This lockdown made data collection at school impossible and the uncertainty about the duration even made reconsidering my methodology more difficult (3.3/3.6/3.8/3.9/3.10).

In response, I read various research reports about COVID-19 and home-schooling, paying particular attention to those relevant to YL in Switzerland. Huber et al.'s (2020) questionnaire involving more than seven thousand one hundred participants (pupils, parents, teachers, headteachers, schoolboards) compared home-schooling in Switzerland, Germany, and Austria during the lockdown, and in Lucerne nearly twenty-three thousand participants (pupils, parents, teachers, vocational trainers) evaluated their experiences of home-schooling in online questionnaires after the lockdown (BKD, 2020).

In hindsight the above-mentioned ICT training in canton Zug served as valuable preparation for the Swiss lockdown. Though teachers were highly motivated to prepare for home-schooling, Huber et al. (2020) discovered that their intermediate level of digital competence was a challenge, and BKD (2020) reports that contact with Year 3-6 children was maintained with e-mails or phone calls, and content delivery with YouTube.

The school closure posed particular difficulties in schooling and teaching for primary children. Children from Year 5 onwards had their own school laptop, but younger pupils had to rely on their parents’ or caregivers’ devices (BKD, 2020), or worked with pen and paper. This highlighted the urgent need for greater access to ICT (Huber et al., 2020) and canton Lucerne has plans to implement 1:1 devices from Year 3 onwards (BKD, 2020).

As the situation was very challenging for all parties involved (Huber et al., 2020), canton Zug offered practical recommendations in a handbook for teachers in March and further updated it in April and May, and the L2 department of the PH Zug then also offered resources and support for primary teachers on a dedicated website (Pädagogische Hochschule Zug, 2021). I contributed instructions on how to use ASV, and my first AS video, ‘Introducing, and practising weather words’, originally created for my Year 3 pupils on the first day of the lockdown, inspired me to design more videos, including topics for other classes (6.4).
Parents highly regarded both the work of the school and teachers (BKD, 2020; Huber et al., 2020), the clear instructions, and 75% of the Lucerne parents were pleased with the home-schooling arrangements (BKD, 2020). There were advantages: the individual pace of self-determined work, and new digitalised educational formats, but also disadvantages: self-structuring of the work; too much studying time; an overload in this difficult home-care situation with an unstable or slow internet connection; and lack of motivation (Huber et al., 2020). BKD (2020) claims that even though 58% of the Lucerne primary children had more free time, the academic performance was good or even better than usual. On the other hand, Huber et al. (2020) reports that teaching staff estimated that pupils only worked about eleven to thirteen hours per week while the student-reported median is twenty hours per week (primary children would normally spend twenty to twenty-nine hours in school and on homework), with some children working very little and some more than usual, which resulted in a scissors effect which was challenging for everyone after the lockdown. Furthermore, half of the children reported missing school (Huber et al., 2020) and the Lucerne study specifies that the children missed their peers (BKD, 2020).

Huber et al. (2020) argue that COVID-19 home-schooling had the biggest effect on digitalisation, which is important for social and economic development, and Swiss teachers reported feeling well-prepared and most taught online. Nevertheless, there remains a demand for innovative approaches, appropriate tools and textbooks, and also support for teachers (BKD, 2020): local authorities and policy makers need to take advantage of the movement and advance it. My research can hopefully contribute to this in several ways.

1.7 Conclusion

In this chapter I outlined my motivation and rationale for this enquiry (1.1), described my Swiss context which sought to harmonise education with the recently implemented Curriculum 21 (1.2), the Swiss language dilemmas about language selection in a multilingual society, and how English language teaching was introduced in lower primary (1.3). I then explored YL needs and effects of these for teachers (1.4), the software used in this research (1.5), and concluded with the COVID-19 lockdown (1.6) which impacted my data collection.
1.8 Organisation of the thesis

Based on my aims and the context I have outlined above, Chapter 2 explores the literature relevant to my context starting with DST. I investigate theories of English language methodology, followed by oral language production in L1 and L2, specifying the framework by Goh and Burns (2012). Then I outline my approach to task design, translanguaging, and group work, grounded in Mercer's (1995) discussion of effective collaborative talk.

In Chapter 3, I discuss the methodology I adopted and the methods I used for data collection and analysis. Starting with my paradigm of ecological constructivism (Lafford, 2009), I argue for a case study approach, my research design, and provide pen portraits of my participants. I then clarify the methods and analyses used, and end with a discussion of ethical considerations.

Chapter 4 presents the findings of the year-long research of YL oral DST. Whilst drawing on multiple methods, I generated the findings through reflexive thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2020; 2006), and related them to the RQs.

Chapter 5 describes and discusses the research findings and relates them to the existing literature. I argue for various motivational aspects in task-based oral DST, suggest the importance of design, and end with some insights about translanguaging.

In Chapter 6, I examine the fulfilment of the research. I summarise the findings and draw implications. Afterwards, I consider the limitations of my research design. I then outline the contributions I have already made before suggesting recommendations for future research. I conclude this thesis with a personal reflection.
Chapter 2 Literature review

This chapter reviews and explores research and theories relevant to this thesis. The reviewed literature relates to oral DST and L2 teaching especially in the YL L2 classroom. Appendices, Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 respectively, illustrate my use of keyword searches and organisation of the literature review by topic.

I start this chapter setting the scene for DST (2.1). Reviewing the literature of oral YL L2 DST research (2.1.1) and previous research using the ASV software (2.1.2) helped me identify gaps in the literature which I addressed in my research (2.2). I then draw on theories of English language methodology (2.3) which are cornerstones in my Swiss YL L2 context and in my research: soft CLIL (2.3.1), TBL (2.3.2), and chunking (2.3.3), a combination of words which often occur together (Thornbury, 2005). Chunking, especially important in oral language production (2.4), leads to L1 oracy (2.4.1) and L2 oracy (2.4.2). The latter is more important than literacy in my YL context. However, imitative and reproductive activities which lack support and creativity (Legutke et al., 2009) dominate, which can be circumvented with the holistic model by Goh and Burns (2012) (2.4.3). This background enabled me to design DST tasks tailored to my context (2.5). While carrying out these tasks, young L2 beginners draw on all means of meaning making, they translanguage (2.6). I supported the learners’ negotiation processes drawing on Mercer's (1995) types of talk (2.7).

2.1 Digital storytelling

The emergence of computers has had an impact on teaching in general, including L2 classes. With the advent of mobile technology, opportunities were increased due to learner mobility and the portability of devices (Burston, 2014). Flexibility, multifunctionality and shared screens on a table can enable collaboration and interaction, and open-ended programmes enhance commitment and collaboration through talk (Alhinty, 2015). With the internet on hand in most Swiss classrooms, it enables learners to have access to resources ‘appropriate to their immediate situation’ (Kukulska-Hulme et al., 2015, p. 11).

Most software or applications such as for learning lexis or grammar still follow the behaviourist approach of ‘drill and repetition’ (Burston, 2014, p. 346). This is the case with the software that is a component of the recently revised version of our textbook Young World: Quizlet/VocaTrainer provides vocabulary practice, and
Interactive Exercises comprise matching or gap-fill exercises. Such practice facilitates specific learning but does not allow for creative language use or develop productive skills such as speaking. Since primary teachers find it challenging to embed MIT in other subjects (1.2/1.3), are often short of time, and language teachers are not always tech-savvy (Toohey et al., 2012), they need more support in terms of what tools to use and how to use them to overcome any technological limitations and reduce learner frustration (Chwo et al., 2018). This support could encourage teachers to implement digital projects, produce appropriate and creative task-designs that are competence- and learner-based (2.5), and enhance performance and task-engagement (Alhinty, 2015). DST is one such possible approach.

Frazel (2010) asserts that storytelling dates back to narration around campfires and cave paintings during the ice age and DST resumes these cultural techniques by including multimodality. On the other hand, Lambert and Hessler claim that storytelling has its origins in traditions of poets and singers of the Celts and DST ‘is rooted fundamentally in the notion of a democratized culture that was the hallmark of the folk music, reclaimed folk cultures, and cultural activist traditions of the 1960s’ (2018, p. 25).

Joe Lambert, a professional theatre-maker and director, became influential in the development of DST. Lambert and Hessler (2018) describe how Lambert was inspired by the art of Dana Atchley. In the 1970s and 1980s, Atchley, a video producer and graphic designer, had been on tour with his show of singing and telling stories of unconventional Americans and projecting photos of these people. He further developed his performance, and in 1990 a burning campfire with a car cinema and photos of the characters were shown on a screen behind him, while he told his stories and connected them to the pictures on the screen. His show became so complex that Lambert became his stagehand. Three years later, the American Film Institute asked Atchley to conduct a workshop in their recently established Digital Media Computer Lab. The participants would learn how to tell stories similar to the ones he performed. Lambert joined Atchley’s first DST workshop and afterwards they offered DST workshops together. This was so successful that in 1994 Lambert founded the Center for Digital Storytelling (now called StoryCenter) and one year later, Apple Computer commissioned them to write a DST handbook. Atchley then pursued his own path, and Lambert was head-hunted by the University of California, Berkley, to teach the DST method there as a new development in
education. This all happened with the advent of the Internet which permitted digital production of videos and simplified their sharing (Macleroy, 2020).

DST is a core element of our world with stories on YouTube, Instagram, TikTok etc., and fosters crucial skills for our children’s future, for their studies and work (Frazel, 2010). Today’s user-friendly technology can already enable YL to create stories easily and use an L2 imaginatively (Macleroy et al., 2021), and serve as an innovative learning tool to talk about personal matters, learning content, or visual information. In these ways, DST can boost learner understanding and empower them by actively engaging in meaning-making (Hur and Suh, 2012) which promotes ‘authentic and meaningful learning experiences’ (Nguyen, 2017, p. 72). Macleroy et al. (2021) argue that by having ownership over their creative digital story, DST not only combines language learning with ICT and is an innovative and imaginative method but can also have positive effects on language learning for YL.

According to Lambert’s StoryCenter, DST includes seven components (Lambert and Hessler, 2018, pp. 37-38):

- self-revelatory (narration of new knowledge)
- personal or first-person voice (personal insights)
- experiential (from their own lives)
- photos more than moving images (to have the focus on the narration)
- soundtrack (music/sounds to support the meaning of the story)
- restrained length and design (short videos)
- intention (importance of the individual, superiority of the evolvement of the story over the product)

These cornerstones characterise general DST. For education, Kervin and Mantei define DST as ‘multimodal texts that combine audio, linguistic, and visual modes to create unique stories’ (2017, p. 3). These multimodal stories combine spoken or written narrative and still or moving pictures with music or sound effects ‘to add emotional depth’ (Frazel, 2010, p. 10) and can be made using computer software to create a short film. This three-part combination is aimed to ‘enrich and enhance the written or spoken word’ (Frazel, 2010, p. 9). Such personal stories are often short and easy to share (Nguyen, 2017) with the outside world (Frazel, 2010).
DST had not always been my focal point. At the beginning of my enquiry, I was more interested in how digital devices enhance L2 language learning than the story the children told. This stems from my background as a primary and English teacher, and English methodology lecturer (1.1): for me it was important to promote the English language in my primary classroom, and at the same time fulfil the requirement of Curriculum 21 (1.2) of integrating MIT into other subjects (D-EDK, 2018c). For my understanding of these two, ICT should offer an added value, support, and foster language learning.

In Swiss YL English teaching, speaking and listening (oracy) are more important than reading and writing (literacy) which is also reflected in Curriculum 21 in that an L2 should be heard and spoken from the outset (D-EDK, 2018b) while writing is gradually built up and near-correctness is the aim (D-EDK, 2018a). This influenced my focus on oracy and the fact that speaking skills should be used in as authentic situations as possible. This, paired with interesting and real-life topics from the pupil’s world (D-EDK, 2018b), made it clear for me that the children should perform end-of-unit tasks in which they can repeat the lexis and structures learnt and demonstrate what they can do.

Reflecting on authenticity, I considered dialogues superior to monologues and given the fact that interdisciplinary competences that aim for successful life management and combine personal, social and methodological competences (D-EDK, 2016b) play another significant role in Curriculum 21, it was evident that my dialogic tasks would be more engaging if developed as real-life tasks (2.5) and foster collaboration in terms of gaining reasoning skills (2.7).

At the beginning of my doctorate, we still worked with desktop computers and had three in each classroom. Therefore, I concentrated on computer-assisted language learning (CALL). Having reviewed the literature, I noticed that most YL L2 studies were with mobile devices. The fact that our school started working with laptops and Alhinty’s (2015) review of applications that are suitable for YL changed my viewpoint to mobile-assisted language learning (MALL). Alhinty claims that mobile devices are superior to permanently installed desktop computers as, apart from advantages of the hardware, they foster interaction and collaboration because of a shared screen on a table; they are ‘practical and enjoyable’ (2015, p. 47); and these ubiquitous devices can therefore revolutionise learning. However, Burston (2014) points out that the pedagogical potential of MALL needs to be more fully recognised in terms of encouragement of collaboration and TBL, which is what I aimed to achieve with
my enquiry. Both collaboration during the tasks and the product that was targeted to entertain a specific real-life audience finally made me fully understand the importance of recognising and building on the connection between the process and the product, and that the children were telling stories, digital stories that were meaningful to them and their audience of peers.

This shift in my thinking led me to recognise the potential advantages of incorporating DST in the language classroom, which I summarise as follows:

DST is a ‘multimedia activity’ (Frazel, 2010, p. 10) that:

- tells a short story with a voice-over
- is accompanied by photos/icons and music (i.e., it entails multimodality)
- has a clearly defined audience (their peers and their teacher)
- has clear aims based on the curriculum and the children’s prior learning (practice and repetition of language already acquired)
- includes child-oriented and playful tasks that are achievable for all learners because of differentiation, scaffolding, and language support
- stretches the children’s linguistic abilities because of the free(r) manner of expression
- allows for rehearsal of the spoken text in a safe environment
- is collaboratively done in their L2 (drawing on their L1 and translanguaging strategies to facilitate the process and production)
- engages YL affectively, so they also build up interdisciplinary competences such as reasoning skills

DST entails literacy and oracy. While most DST research is on writing (Hwang et al., 2016), I excluded these studies (e.g., Lantz et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2018; Hull and Katz, 2006) because I did not focus on literacy as writing is less important in Swiss primary L2 teaching. Oral DST provides practice in speaking as learners plan and rehearse before making a recording and then listen, correct and repeat to produce a final version, thus fostering their fluency (Nguyen, 2017). There have been numerous studies of oral DST. However, as my target group is ten-year-old L2 learners, I decided to exclude oral DST studies involving the following less relevant groups from my literature review:
• in L1 with very YL (e.g., Kervin and Mantei, 2017; Falloon and Khoo, 2014; Kucirkova et al., 2014) because the children were much younger and DST was in their L1

• in a heritage language (e.g., Stavrou et al., 2021; Rizvic et al., 2019; Anderson et al., 2018) because my focus was not on L1 or the representation of a heritage language

• in L2 with teenagers (e.g., Yang et al., 2020; Tahriri et al., 2015; Sadik, 2008) because they were more advanced L2 and older learners, or the focus was on the DST method rather than on learning the L2

• in L2 with adults (e.g., Kallinikou and Nicolaidou, 2019; Liang, 2019; Lee, 2014) because this learner group is more advanced and has a different worldview and strategic knowledge than my participants, or they dived into virtual worlds

2.1.1 Oral TBL DST in the YL L2 context

Appendix 1 details the inclusion and exclusion criteria of my literature search. The studies I present here are summarised in Appendix 2.

2.1.1.1 Requirements

Embedding of tasks in the curriculum and in L2 classes

In her study of English teaching in Year 1-4 in Germany researching the potential of oral and written DST, Dausend (2017) found that the embedding of digital tools could foster the kind of open-ended interaction between students which she otherwise found lacking. Teachers, she suggests, judged that the students lacked the ability to engage in free speaking, that it was too challenging for them, and so the teachers preferred to stick to repetitive choral practice rather than engage with an innovative pedagogy. To solve this problem, she chose topics that the children were familiar with, or involved the children in selection processes as co-decision-making increased participation.

Several studies have shown the value of letting students have free choice over their DST tasks. In her study involving Year 1-4 children in Canadian immersion schools, Pellerin (2014) found that taking a more flexible view of TBL allowed personalised language learning, made the tasks more meaningful to pupils, and fostered collaboration. This free task design by the children involved their active creation of authentic and relevant language learning, recycling of lexis and structures
previously learnt, problem-solving, and peer-scaffolding. The children must have set their own aims and learning trajectories, but in this sense, TBL is not linked to the curriculum.

A similar finding appears in Kirsch and Bes Izuel (2019) and Kirsch (2016) in Luxembourg too. They observed structured and unstructured DST with Year 1/2 children and claim that retelling a story or creative storytelling had clear aims: to be watched by an audience. While a specific outcome is a defining characteristic of TBL (2.3.2), exercises and vocabulary training such as practising a given sentence structure by using a substitution drill in Kirsch and Bes Izuel's (2019) study are not.

In Sun et al.'s (2017) study, Year 1 beginners in China were asked to complete English sentence starters about everyday life for homework and recorded their responses online. But it is not clear if the sentences were embedded in the curriculum.

In contrast, Hwang et al.'s (2016) Year 6 students in Taiwan were more advanced and more widely experienced English learners. Their DST activities were related to their daily life in order to heighten learner engagement.

However, the tasks discussed in these studies are not embedded in a curriculum with specified learning outcomes such as *Curriculum 21* (1.2/2.4.2), leaving a clear gap in the research for a study of embedded task-based DST with YL.

**Task-based DST with differentiation**

Heterogeneity and differentiation were supported by open projects which facilitated natural differentiation. This is true for all studies reviewed. Pellerin demonstrated that the children designed ‘their own learning environment and meaningful language tasks’ (2014, p. 1) by telling a digital story according to their current capabilities, and Sun et al.'s YL were given a set of sentence starters which they then had to complete with statements that were true for their own lives, (e.g. ‘My best day is ______ because ______’ (2017, p. 310)).

In addition to open projects, Dausend (2017) claims that open productive applications enable all learners to be successful because they can work according to their abilities, and they can control their work (Kirsch and Bes Izuel, 2019). However, apart from open projects and ‘open-design apps’ (Alhinty, 2015, p. 47), which foster creativity, the studies do not mention other types of differentiation, such as by quantity (longer/shorter presentations and texts), quality (amount of language
support to integrate), and level (different learning levels), or explicit differentiated learning aims.

**Scaffolding/language support**

Studies have reported the positive effects of various forms of scaffolding and language support. Hur and Suh (2012) and Pellerin (2014) argue that the software provided a powerful scaffolding tool that helped the children plan and conduct their tasks. Having resources (e.g., the internet, software) at hand, the children composed and rehearsed their text, making the recording of several shorter texts feasible.

Other research provided language support. Hwang et al. (2016) presented an online vocabulary list that was relevant to the task, which was related to the children’s everyday life, and which contained audio files. Whilst the list seems to contain words only, the audio files were nonetheless helpful for pronunciation.

Sun et al. (2017) offered sentence starters which the Year 1 beginners had to complete at home by recording themselves using the application Papa, similar to Soundcloud. The sentence starters provided were certainly helpful. Nevertheless, it remains unclear if/how other language support (e.g., possible endings) was offered, and if/how the sentence starters/endings were practised.

Whereas no other study mentioned supplying of language support and/or scaffolding, only Dausend (2017) discussed the need for it, but did not say she provided any. Nonetheless, in my understanding of L2 teaching, both are a prerequisite for productive activities and tasks. As a result, I adopted the framework by Goh and Burns (2012) in my study (Figure 9) and supported the children with language to accomplish the task (language support) which I introduced and practised prior to the task (3.3).

**Collaboration and individual work**

Support is not always dependent on teacher intervention; studies of collaborative peer-scaffolding have also proved it can help learners achieve their aims. Pellerin (2014) describes how social interaction involved supplying words, planning, reflecting on the text and the recording, and correcting each other, all of which enabled the children to achieve better results.

Kirsch and Bes Izuel (2019) claim that the children took on the role of a learner, teacher, and assessor in this collaborative co-constructing sociocultural process.
Because collaboration can support DST in many ways, its type is decisive in reaching the shared aim, as working in a group is not the same as working as a group. Mercer has identified three types of talk that are characteristic of less and more successful collaboration (2.7): in disputational talk the children disagree with and criticise each other, in cumulative talk they simply accept each other’s talk without engaging with it, while in exploratory talk, they ‘engage critically, but constructively with each other’s ideas’ (1995, p. 104) by requesting further explanation or reasoning their assumption.

Kirsch (2016) discovered much supportive and exploratory talk in peer-interaction, peer-instruction, and working with the application. This was supported by mindful listening and improved language learning. On the other hand, Kirsch and Bes Izuel (2019) found that the children mostly drew on cumulative talk, supported each other, and stayed on task. Dausend (2017) noticed that the children were arguing with one another, but finally found a compromise when sharing the tablets, deciding on the storyline or multimodal choices. None of these studies followed Mercer’s (1995) dictum that if children are to collaborate effectively, they need to be taught how to do so explicitly, and the elaboration of a set of agreed rules of engagement is key to the production of exploratory talk. I decided to fill this gap.

Pellerin noted that shared creation also fostered individual storytelling. Whilst it is not entirely clear how this happened, she claims that the children somehow became engaged in DST and that working at their own pace allowed them to ‘increase their level of competency’ (2014, p. 12). Hwang et al. (2016) found individual DST superior to collaborative DST because the children were more focused, and Hur and Suh (2012) claim that the learners drew on the support of internet searches for individual DST, which enabled them to construct sentences and practise their pronunciation as part of a ‘book report’ activity. Having the internet at hand, I also wanted to explore its use by the children.

Translanguaging

Translanguaging is an approach that embraces the use of all available meaning-making resources (García and Lin, 2017), and acknowledges the languages and language practices of bi- or multilinguals as one holistic linguistic repertoire. From my reviewed YL DST studies in an L2, only Hwang et al. (2016) claim that their Year 6 students were immersed in their individual and collaborative L2 DST talking about
topics relevant to their life, while all the other studies on collaborative DST report on learners drawing on the L1.

The children often provided their peers with the word or expression they needed in their target language (Kirsch, 2016; Pellerin, 2014). Translating was a fast help to move on, while Kirsch (2016) claims that the YL also used their L1 to assist their peers, develop and examine the spoken text, illustrate the meaning, assess the text, and amend it.

Dausend (2017) acknowledges that negotiation processes in the children’s L1 provided a good basis for practice of their discursive competences which they could then translate into other languages. Furthermore, these negotiation processes in their L1 about the task involved them in creating the digital story in L2. They drew on both languages while planning the plot, recording the speech, and reflecting on the spoken text. It seems from these collaborative DST studies that translanguaging enhanced communication, common understanding, and building of identity (Kirsch, 2018). However, apart from Kirsch and Bes Izuel (2019) and Kirsch (2018), research on YL L2 DST theorising translangauging seems rare.

Regarding requirements, in their synthesis of the literature, Chong and Reinders (2020) reviewed a vast amount of general TBL research but found a lack of studies that focused on technology-mediated TBL. They identified an urgent need to create an efficient theoretical concept that enables the design of powerful pedagogical DST tasks with the potential to improve language learning. To reach this, the DST task design should include different levels or sequences, scaffolding, learner interaction, and teacher feedback. In addition, tasks should focus on meaning-making, and mirror real-life situations to which the learners can relate. Realistically, given their limited L2 resources, YL will need to draw on their L1 and this area has not been widely researched in the translanguaging literature. My research seeks to help fill this gap.

2.1.1.2 Outcomes
Language gains and reasons for these

Having summarised the requirements, I will now turn to outcomes of DST as Burston (2021/2014) argues that results in learning with technology are weak. Hwang et al. compared DST to using a not further defined ‘traditional method’ (2016, p. 224) and claim that the experimental group who created five individual and four collaborative digital stories improved their oracy significantly in comparison to the control group.
Because of the repeated practice and recording involved, they recalled more lexis. In addition, the inclusion of animation increased their recollection and stimulated speaking. However, this seems to be only true for individual storytelling due to higher concentration levels and individual practice. Working on their own, the children were not distracted by other children.

Also Sun et al.'s (2017) Year 1 beginners, who audio-recorded their sentence-completion-homework, outperformed the control group in the post-tests. The control group only audio-recorded their homework using a tool of their choice, but did not hand it in. The experimental group showed better results in accuracy and fluency while improvements in pronunciation were the same. Sun et al. (2017) attribute these improvements to the fact that speaking was less embarrassing. These results from short-term studies are substantial whereas Kirsch (2016) claims general improvements in skills of collaborative DST for her longitudinal research, but her data does not specify them. This lack implies the need to identify language gains for collaborative DST.

Reviewing the recordings enabled the students to show and develop their metacognitive awareness (Hwang et al., 2016; Kirsch, 2016; Pellerin, 2014). The children corrected their partner or themselves as they noticed grammatical errors, reorganised the speaking, or memorised their text. In addition they developed strategies such as retrieving a lexical item previously used in a prior recording (Kirsch, 2016).

Pellerin (2014) claims that DST even improves other-regulation (scaffolding and support by another person) when collaborating, and self-regulation (self-monitoring and self-reflection) as the children reflected on their ability and improvement in speaking. Both other- and self-regulation (2.7/3.1.2) enabled more control, autonomy, and learner-centredness (Chong and Reinders, 2020).

In addition to linguistic and metacognitive skills, in their qualitative research synthesis, Chong and Reinders (2020) assert that the children also developed ICT knowledge such as typewriting, use of software, or searching on the internet, and intercultural understanding. This combination of ICT and L2 learning spurred ideas and creativity that fostered commitment and motivation in L2 learning (Hwang et al., 2016; Pellerin, 2014).
Positive effects

Most DST research has been short-term. Hur and Suh (2012) conclude from their intensive English summer program that producing a book report was valuable for speaking practice and creative video design. They and Dausend (2017), whose participants mainly did one project too, consider whether the novelty effect would diminish if DST was repeatedly applied as so far most oral YL L2 DST research I have reviewed has been short-term or does not explicitly mention the duration (e.g., Pellerin, 2014). While the studies in Luxembourg with a nursery class and Year 1/2 children are long-term (Kirsch and Bes Izuel, 2019; Kirsch, 2018/2016), and as mentioned above they claim positive effects, my study seeks to validate these findings with older children.

Motivation

Chong and Reinders (2020) identified increased motivation in all the sixteen studies they had synthesised. These were: a more general positive attitude; reduced anxiety led to greater confidence in speaking; and solving authentic problems created different learning opportunities.

This is also true for the literature I reviewed. Increased motivation can heighten children’s concentration when generating a digital story, recording, assessing and re-recording it (Kirsch and Bes Izuel, 2019; Pellerin, 2014). The reason for this was the children’s immersion in DST. As they liked the activity, this also led to a greater interest in L2 learning (Hwang et al., 2016), and developed their speaking (e.g., Hwang et al., 2016; Kirsch, 2016).

Sun et al. (2017) argue that the user-friendly software made the work enjoyable and allowed the children to predominantly work on their own. The fact that this type of audio-recording and completion of a sentence for homework was different, made it really special.

The open applications encouraged creativity and also fostered their interest in digital literacy as a project with ICT was something remarkable which the children wished to do again (Dausend, 2017). Based on this, product-oriented applications (productivity apps) are suitable for DST. Hur and Suh add that the children experienced their agency by using ICT. Because they were responsible for recounting their selected story, they investigated the topic, learnt to pronounce difficult lexis, and repeated the text which shows that ‘they also took ownership in
their learning’ (2012, p. 333). I considered these facts when choosing the software (1.5) and wanted to investigate long-term motivation using the software ASV whose use in the YL L2 classroom had not been previously reported on as far as I know (2.1.2).

**Audience design**

Having a real audience motivates learners to practise the language. Four positive effects have been found to result from having a real audience.

Firstly, sharing their stories with the class made DST more meaningful as the children were given a voice and heard by more people (Kirsch and Bes Izuel, 2019; Dausend, 2017; Sun et al., 2017; Kirsch, 2016; Pellerin, 2014). This was especially true for Sun et al.’s (2017) Year 1 beginners who would have normally practised the sentences at home with their family, but as they were engaged in DST, they knew their teacher might listen to their homework. Furthermore, they voluntarily listened to each other’s work, which spurred their ambition, and they became more passionate and creative doing their homework. It would be interesting to find out the impact on these if the digital stories were shared with a wider community too.

Secondly, multimodality opened up multiple channels of communication. Dausend (2017) acknowledges that DST made the children become producers by inspiring their imagination and visualisation. Collaborative planning of a plot enabled them to tell a story predominantly in English. Pellerin (2014) adds that instead of being passive learners, they created their own learning and assessed it. This creation involved opting for an activity and demonstrating their learning. Moreover, the children were motivated to hand in neat work, ‘an accurate and comprehensible text’ (Kirsch and Bes Izuel, 2019, p. 214), as they designed ‘something meaningful, relevant and comprehensible to an audience’ (Kirsch, 2016, p. 2261). Their work was not only practice, but it had a real aim. Furthermore, DST offers more than just speaking: Hwang et al. emphasise that learning with DST can be enhanced by visual and verbal presentation which stimulates more channels and thus improves understanding and recollection, by providing lexis for storytelling online, and by drawing on interactive software which made the digital story ‘more meaningful and comprehensive’ (2016, p. 228).

In addition, Kirsch and Bes Izuel (2019) claim that this autonomous collaborative creation enabled pupils to become independent risk-takers, and develop teaching and learning and metacognitive strategies. Through reflection and by exploiting
Vygotsky’s (1978) *Zone of Proximal Development* (ZPD), the distance between individual and guided problem-solving, the children deepened their language and cultural knowledge (e.g., of a story) which affected them socio-cognitively (Kirsch, 2016). Pellerin (2014) had also observed this practice and called it other- and self-regulation, as mentioned above.

Finally, whilst consideration of the teacher’s role and the presence of their scaffolding are largely absent from these DST studies, Dausend (2017) argues that the teachers were surprised how well and freely the children used their L2 as their stories were predominantly in their L2. She concludes that DST fosters L2 discourse competences but argues at the same time that the children used their L1 for planning and evaluation. The literature demonstrates that children collaborate to produce an effective audience design and this process of audience design has, in turn, an impact on their own learning. This is supported by my findings, however, how the children design their texts in an L2 for an audience is, as far as I am aware, as yet unexplored and my study provides some evidence on this.

Recapping the advantages, individual DST research shows improvement in lexis, accuracy, and fluency (Sun et al., 2017; Hwang et al., 2016) because of increased speaking practice, metacognition, and ICT knowledge. Collaborative DST enhances learning through meaning-making by drawing on peer-scaffolding and the affordances of multimodality. Furthermore, the children were highly motivated to work with digital devices and for a real audience (Chong and Reinders, 2020).

**Drawbacks**

Having identified the advantages of DST reported in the literature, I shall now discuss three negative features that have been found. Firstly, difficulties using the technology impacted the learning. Hwang et al. (2016) acknowledge that some learners had difficulties recording or uploading illustrations. Apparently, their self-produced online software was not straightforward, and the children had to figure out how to use it. Secondly, Hwang et al. (2016) concede that technology also led to misbehaviour or unproductive collaboration at school. These could stem from the above-mentioned problems with their web-based program. As a result, they conclude that only individual storytelling was beneficial because of improved concentration and more speaking practice although they report that the children still preferred collaborative DST. Thirdly, Hur and Suh (2012) found that their participants disliked DST because they were required to re-record their input to have
a neat narration. The learners thought that this tedious work took too much time. However, their digital stories included words above the children’s language level which were difficult to pronounce for the Koreans. These drawbacks had implications for my enquiry: with ASV I selected a simple software (1.5). I put effort into the task design (2.5) to support the children and foster their collaboration, and scaffolded the learning drawing on the teaching speaking cycle (2.4.3). Furthermore, the pupil grouping had been thoroughly thought through to allow for effective collaboration. Task design and allocation need to be considered by the teachers as Kirsch and Bes Izuel (2019) observed some meticulous learner planning, while sometimes others appeared to work unsystematically and just audio-recorded the story.

**Teaching methodology**

As seen, several studies have mentioned that DST requires a different teaching method which can unsettle teachers. Kirsch and Bes Izuel (2019) claim that teachers felt uncertain about employing a new approach as it meant they had to rethink the teaching and learning. They had to be inventive but systematic when creating tasks and concentrated more on the software than on the task. Chong and Reinders (2020) argue that the absence of clear expectations can result in unproductive collaboration and ineffective learning. Furthermore, teacher scaffolding needs to be integrated in all stages of work. Such a task design is time-consuming and teachers might be disappointed about errors and mistakes in products, especially as language teachers do not typically seem to be technophile masters (Toohey et al., 2012). In addition, Dausend (2017) considers that dealing with mistakes, reworking and correction work are still unsolved problems, something I addressed in my study employing the teaching speaking cycle (Figure 9).

In conclusion, previous research suggests that mainly individual DST seems to generate language gains, while both collaborative and individual work are motivating for multiple reasons, especially as the children had a real audience for their work. The YL also liked the creativity, and teachers the enhanced speaking practice, while some children disliked having to make multiple recordings. There is also some question as to whether collaborative DST can improve oracy as research on task design in this area has been lacking. This might be the case because oral DST for young L2 learners is a fairly new approach, which needs more research.
2.1.2 Studies with ASV

Most of the YL studies reviewed above used tablet computers or smartphone applications. Because of their technological affordances and their straightforward usage, handheld devices are popular in the YL classroom. They offer numerous ‘open design apps’ (Alhinty, 2015, p. 47). Based on its previous experience of working with Windows, the ICT committee of canton Zug decided to introduce Windows laptops (Schauber et al., 2018). To avoid permissions issues around installing software, I sought out an online software package that could be safely used without needing approval. I found ASV, and decided it was suitable for my YL context (1.4). Despite ASV’s straightforward and user-friendly interface (1.5), my literature search to date has so far only uncovered studies of ASV being used with adult learners to improve out-of-class oral proficiency.

Implementing a teaching model, Arispe and Burston researched the achievement of presentation skills, the impact of ASV on learner autonomy and language proficiency of advanced L2 Spanish students during one course at university. They claim that ASV helped the students effectively organise their speech, encouraged creativity, and choosing ‘the level of the task’ (2017, p. 49) facilitated personalised learning. Their survey results of seven students revealed that ASV enabled practising of L2, as most students believed that their oral proficiency improved. Insights into language gains and learning in a longitudinal study are required.

Schenker and Kraemer (2017) investigated the effects of additional speaking on oral proficiency, fluency, and complexity of syntax of German beginners in the USA. In their experimental design, in a study conducted over the course of one semester, they compared sixteen participants completing thirty-four ASV projects with forty-two students of the control group employing pre- and post-tests. While the analysis of fluency and complexity did not show significant statistical differences, the participants’ oral proficiency improved demonstrably. They conclude that the additional oral practice offered by mobile devices is beneficial in improving learning. Further research on fluency, pronunciation, and accuracy is needed to determine language enhancement, and if this is applicable to YL too.

2.2 Research questions

The previous sections have summarised oral L2 DST research and highlighted gaps in knowledge which I aimed to address in my research. By focussing on the needs of teachers and pupils to foster the knowledge of both (Legutke et al., 2009), I
intended to clearly embed DST into the curriculum and create tasks that were meaningful in terms of: real-life language use; recycling of language; offering language support; and demanding but doable for all learners because of differentiated learning aims. So far, such an explicit and embedded model of task design has been of less importance and I, therefore, promote the importance of embedding the task design in curriculum planning (2.5). For that purpose, the situatedness of Curriculum 21 with its expectation of challenging tasks that allow for differentiated learning, which in turn motivate, and arouse curiosity (D-EDK, 2016a), meshed well with my intentions to foster interdisciplinary, social, and linguistic competences (D-EDK, 2016b). These are the reasons I chose collaborative tasks that promote teamwork and metacognitive skills, and I decided to teach these explicitly, something that had not been a feature of previous YL DST studies. Both collaboration and metacognition can be effectively supported by translanguaging, i.e., meaning making by drawing on all linguistic and non-linguistic resources. At the time of writing, translanguaging is a rather unfamiliar concept in Swiss educational circles, and I wanted to explore its potential and capture its effect, especially as it has been only drawn on in the DST research with YL in Luxembourg (Kirsch and Bes Izuel, 2019/Kirsch, 2018/Kirsch, 2016). While DST matches all these requirements and the ones of cross-curricular TBL (Anderson et al., 2018), I am interested in finding out if collaborative oral L2 DST is effective in improving the oracy of YL as reports on learning gains with technology have been vague apart from studies about vocabulary learning (Burston, 2021/2014) and the more general findings mentioned above, and if it is motivating in a yearlong project with ten-year old children as to date long-term research has only been done with younger children. With my enquiry I was able to gain these insights and preferences for ways of working (single/pair work) drawing on a questionnaire which all the children of the class filled out, a new method in long-term YL oral DST research.

My review of the existing literature has identified many opportunities for enhancing the teaching and learning of English by combining a task-based learning approach with DST. However, it also uncovered various gaps in the research that I needed to address for my particular context and purposes. This led to the emergence of the following three key research questions:

1. What are the opportunities and challenges in teaching oral DST?

1.1. Can oral DST promote oracy? If so, how can it be used to do so effectively?
1.2. What kind of prior knowledge is required to negotiate meaning during DST speaking tasks? How can this prior knowledge be built and fostered?

2. What is the effect of task-based speaking practice on pupil’s overall speaking proficiency in DST applying the teaching speaking cycle?

3. Can the use of L1 support the development of L2 oracy in task-based DST?

These questions recognise my context (Chapter 1) and my literature review (2.1) and are taken into account throughout my thesis. Next, I illustrate key points of English language methodology (2.3), oracy (2.4), task design (2.5), translanguaging (2.6), and Mercer’s (1995) types of talk (2.7) which underpin my research approach.

2.3 English language methodology

2.3.1 Content and Language Integrated Learning

2.3.1.1 Definition

Coyle et al. define CLIL as ‘a dual-focused educational approach’ (2010, p. 1), a combination of additional language and subject learning which ‘is linked to the processes of convergence’ (2010, p. 4). Thus, CLIL has two educational foci: both content and language are learnt and taught through an additional language. By that, meaning-making of useful language can support motivation and curiosity (Pinter, 2017).

2.3.1.2 CLIL in primary teaching in Switzerland

CLIL theory is very important in Swiss foreign language teaching. CLIL is similar to how children learn their L1: they further develop their L2 through content learning at school (Mehisto et al., 2008). Therefore, focusing on content of cross-curricular teaching is an attractive method in the YL context (Legutke et al., 2009). Based on this, canton Zurich opted for this approach at the turn of the millennium (Stotz and Meuter, 2003). Stotz and Meuter (2003) illustrate that the initial focus of instruction was on listening, understanding and literature, but these language ‘showers’, i.e., songs, games, stories etc. for thirty minutes per day, resulted in: minimal language gains; one-word answers or one or two-morpheme utterances because of too little exposure; unsystematic instruction; shortage of material; lack of language support; and probably limited productive language opportunities. As a result, canton Zurich produced CLIL and TBL resources for primary. In the two textbook series provided,
First Choice and Explorers, the language demands were found to be too high, the structure unclear and the topics did not engage children sufficiently to result in genuine communication (Lustenberger, 2013; Bildungsdirektion Kanton Zürich, 2011; Criblez and Nägeli, 2011). They were replaced by the soft CLIL textbook Young World, which is now also being used in canton Zug for Year 3-6 (2.3.2.5). Young World has just been revised to meet the requirements of competence-based Curriculum 21: more language awareness raising; learning strategies; cultural aspects and content-related work; online vocabulary and language practising software; and TBL have been added.

2.3.1.3 History
Mehisto et al. (2008) argue that CLIL is by no means a recent phenomenon but has in fact been practised for five thousand years, first in Iraq and was also popular in the Roman Empire where children were instructed in Greek to learn the language for social and work reasons. It came to fresh prominence in the 1960s when immersion programs in bilingual Canada became popular as a way to strengthen both the students’ English and French. Finally, as Coyle et al. (2010) claim, societal demands for L2 proficiency have increased and previous practices proven insufficient to meet them. Consequently, in European education CLIL grew in prominence in the mid-1990s targeting both the learning of language and content. Mehisto et al. (2008) claim that the primary aim was to achieve language proficiency and academic and professional success, and also extend intellectual and social skills that are valuable for understanding different cultures. Drivers behind this were globalisation, economic development, and social integration: a higher level of proficiency in a second language should improve international communication, intercultural awareness, and tolerance, and foster economic and personal well-being. Globalisation, language proficiency, and economic reasons were decisive for introducing CLIL English in Switzerland (1.3).

2.3.1.4 Theory
While CLIL is driven by the content, its approach is flexible to different contexts (Legutke et al., 2009). As an ‘umbrella term’ (Mehisto et al., 2008, p. 12), CLIL includes different settings and models (Bentley, 2010). Figure 3 depicts the continuum: in soft CLIL, some content is taught in language classes, whereas in hard CLIL, which is driven by the subject, up to 50% of the curriculum is taught in L2. In subject-led, in the middle, some lessons in e.g., Art or Sports are held in L2,
Language-led or soft CLIL is more common in primary (Pinter, 2017) because of the children’s development (1.4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soft CLIL</th>
<th>Type of CLIL</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language-led</td>
<td>45 minutes once a week</td>
<td>Some curricular topics are taught during a language course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-led (modular)</td>
<td>15 hours during one term</td>
<td>Schools or teachers choose parts of the subject syllabus which they teach in the target language.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-led (partial immersion)</td>
<td>about 50% of the curriculum</td>
<td>About half of the curriculum is taught in the target language. The content can reflect what is taught in the LI curriculum or can be new content.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: Different models of CLIL (Bentley, 2010, p. 6), reproduced with permission

Pinter (2017) claims that CLIL is mainly used in Europe with a content-based focus and draws on the 4Cs framework (Figure 4). Its interlinked components are content, communication, cognition, and culture/community (Bentley, 2010; Mehisto et al., 2008). Coyle et al. (2010) argue that integrating these four units allows for holistic language learning: by connecting the content to learning and cognition, thought processes permit analysis of the language that is linked to the context. All this is done collaboratively to become part of a community and learn about the wider culture. This stance is mirrored in the English component of Curriculum 21 by: embedding content in learning; a focus on the four skills (reading, writing, speaking, listening); developing intercultural awareness; and reflecting about language and learning strategies.

Figure 4: The 4Cs framework (Coyle et al., 2010, p. 41), reproduced with permission

As language development is the key to CLIL, the Language Triptych (Figure 5) identifies the cognitive demands of the language and its use. Coyle et al. argue that the language of learning includes the language of ‘concepts and skills’ (2010, p. 37), language for learning means the language needed to perform the CLIL activities,
and language through learning includes the language acquired while doing the interactive tasks.

![Figure 5: The Language Triptych (Coyle et al., 2010, p. 36), reproduced with permission](image)

2.3.1.5 **Advantages/disadvantages**

Pérez-Cañado (2012) claims many advantages for CLIL: due to its holistic concepts CLIL is superior to language-driven tuition and heightens language learning outcomes in receptive skills and oral fluency. Because of the focus on meaning, learners become more creative, willing to take risks and enhance their emotional intelligence. Mehisto et al. (2008) argue that content-driven learning is more motivating than mere language learning and can foster willingness to understand as the development of metalinguistic skills can empower learners. These skills can be translated to other languages and lead to multilingualism as stipulated by the Council of Europe and anchored in Curriculum 21. Multilingualism can enhance the chances of employability, inclusion, and equity in education (Coyle et al., 2010), an economic aim of fostering language learning in Switzerland (1.3).

While Pinter (2017) claims that there are many good resources on the internet, and digitalisation might also make CLIL more accessible around the world, others have argued that these can also be a disadvantage: Mehisto et al. (2008) and Cameron (2001) assert a scarcity of materials results in more work for teachers which impedes teaching and learning as for successful language learning, content needs to be tailored to learners and their contexts (Klapper, cited in Coyle et al. 2010). In addition, the consideration of language learning progression is crucial for learning progress. Pinter (2017) exemplifies this with the use of more challenging language which can overstrain learners. Furthermore, learning academic and content-related language might cause them to neglect language needed for interpersonal
communication (Pérez-Cañado, 2012). These language gaps are likely to be more prevalent in children from disadvantaged backgrounds needing more language support (Barrios and Acosta-Manzano, 2020), hence CLIL has been regarded as somewhat elitist (Mehisto et al., 2008).

2.3.1.6 CLIL in the YL context

In the primary classroom, CLIL can foster the children’s general and abstract knowledge and expand ‘cognitive, metacognitive and social strategies as well as motor skills’ (Legutke et al., 2009, p. 107). This only succeeds with attention to balanced language and content needs (Pinter, 2017). Furthermore, language support, visualisation, real objects, and scaffolding reduce cognitive load (Chen and Chang, 2017). They are important (Legutke et al., 2009; Cameron, 2001) and can be supported by, for example, chunking (2.3.3), stock phrases or words which often occur together such as How are you? or I like your…, or code-switching, the use of both languages in the beginner’s classroom. This is necessary and effective for meaning-making and understanding due to the learners’ restricted vocabulary (Pinter, 2017; Legutke et al., 2009). Code-switching is part of translanguaging (2.6).

Students’ limited knowledge of the L2 can make it tempting for teachers to rely on activities that require lower-order thinking skills, and to avoid more complex, cognitively challenging tasks that would involve more sophisticated language (Pinter, 2017). CLIL can be seen as a challenging approach for teachers as it seeks to integrate L2, content, and cognition (Cameron, 2001).

2.3.2 Task-based learning

While the Zurich resources are CLIL and task-based (1.3/2.3.1.2), Young World is soft CLIL and only the revised version has end-of-unit tasks. However, tasks foster collaboration, real communication and focus on meaning which is a focus of my research.

2.3.2.1 History

TBL emerged out of communicative language teaching in the 1980s (Keller, 2013): Prabhu introduced TBL in India having become dissatisfied with a more traditional grammar-led approach, and developed the theoretical framework based on Krashen’s psycholinguistic hypothesis (Robinson, 2011) with its emphasis on the role of the learner’s active acquisition in the process as opposed to passive learning (Krashen and Terrell, 1983). Prabhu’s initial theory evolved around its communicative focus that facilitated independent and creative target language use,
and according to Nunan (2004a), Hatch extended the theory with the focus on interaction that generates an output from which grammar rules could be induced. While this innovation emerged some time ago, current course books still tend to concentrate on the reproduction of knowledge rather than competence-based learning (Keller, 2013).

2.3.2.2 Definition

The reason for this might be the vague definition of TBL (Foster, 2009). Willis defines TBL as ‘activities where the target language is used by the learner for communicative purposes (goals) in order to achieve an outcome’ (2005, p. 23). This implies, the learners need to manipulate the target language collaboratively to reach a result. For Nunan (2004a) a task with a beginning, a middle and an end also involves understanding in the L2, manipulating the language, generating new knowledge, or collaborating. While most theorists agree that this is done with a focus on meaning-making as meaning is more important than form, and tasks intend to stretch the learners’ grammar, Skehan’s holistic task design focuses rather on accurate and fluent language production (Robinson, 2011) that has a real-world focus and clear aims (Coultas and Booth, 2019). Given the limited language skills of my YL, I rejected Skehan’s model in favour of Ellis (2003) which I deemed more appropriate for my context. For Ellis (2003), a task:

- has a conversational outcome
- is a working plan to guide activities
- focuses on meaning
- includes real-world use of language
- includes one or more language skills
- utilises cognition

Cameron defined features to take account of the children’s social and cognitive development. Tasks:

- ‘have coherence and unity for learners (from topic, activity and/or outcome)
- have meaning and purpose for learners
- have clear language learning goals
- have a beginning and an end
involve the learners actively’ (2001, p. 31)

Complying with the aforementioned definitions, for YL, a task needs to be purposeful and appropriate in language use and requires cognitive engagement. Legutke et al., (2009) argue that playfulness and creativity need to be added to the mix to bolster YL confidence and motivation.

2.3.2.3 Task framework

According to Willis's (2005) framework (Figure 6), TBL normally takes place in three phases. The pre-task phase prepares the learners for the task. In the task cycle, they accomplish the task under teacher guidance, plan their feedback to the class, and present their findings. Only in the third phase are new language features analysed, which is followed by further language practice. Keller (2013) enhanced the framework to make it competence-based in line with the Swiss Curriculum 21 and added evaluation and reflection to the last phase. He suggests that these enable the learners to edit their previous work, store relevant parts in their portfolio and reflect on learning gains. The publishers of the textbook we use (Young World) have acknowledged the value of TBL and presentations by learners, and these are incorporated in the revised edition. However they have no plans to include Keller's (2013) evaluative and reflective components, which I have included in my research design as part of the teaching-speaking cycle (Figure 9).
Figure 6: Components of the TBL framework (Willis, 2005, p. 38), reproduced with permission

Willis's **TBL framework** is generally flexible: closed tasks follow certain structures and have concrete outcomes, open tasks are less structured and have fewer clear-cut outcomes, and some tasks are midway. Tasks with specific goals are easier as they are more tangible, and include simpler (independent) work for learners, and are straightforward for teachers to rate (Willis, 2005). Nonetheless, whether TBL is the optimal L2 teaching design is controversial (Foster, 2009) as it requires learners to draw on linguistic knowledge that they have not yet fully processed (Thornbury, 2005).

2.3.2.4 **Advantages and disadvantages of TBL**

Robinson (2011), Willis (2005) and Cameron (2001) identified advantages and drawbacks: TBL can boost learner confidence to try out new language; help them communicate and personalise concepts; develop excellent listening and pronunciation skills; and elicit similarities and differences to their L1. With this focus on meaning-making and many opportunities to do real-time communication, students learn new modes of expression and benefit from other contributions. However, this is strenuous on the learners’ cognitive load (Chen and Chang, 2017;
Sweller, 1988) and requires high language demands (2.4.2), especially as the language focus follows the task and might not be practised sufficiently. Furthermore, Cameron (2001) argues that there are fewer ‘real-life’ or authentic tasks for YL in L2 teaching and since their metalinguistic repertoire has not been fully developed, they cannot fully engage solely in the target language in TBL. They need to translanguage which I outline below (2.6), but as skill comes with practice, they might eventually become more confident in speaking.

2.3.2.5 Requirements of TBL for children
A TBL course is the most radical form of communicative language teaching because of the focus on meaning, use of real-world language, difficult cognitive processes, and communicative outcome (Ellis, 2003). In order not to overburden the L2 beginners in Year 3, the Cantonal Teaching Resources Committee of canton Zug opted for Young World, a soft CLIL and TBL resource.

For Year 4-6, we initially changed to Explorers which follows radical CLIL and TBL. However, teachers found it difficult to adapt both content and tasks to weaker learners as language and language learning demands are too high (2.3.1), and the children could not work as independently as mandated (Criblez and Nägeli, 2011). Together with the unclear structure and the inaccessible topics (Lustenberger, 2013; Criblez and Nägeli, 2011), these were the reasons Explorers was replaced by the other volumes of soft CLIL Young World in canton Zug in 2014/15. While the first edition of Young World does not comprise any tasks, the recently revised edition has end-of-unit tasks and follows a task-supported approach, i.e., it incorporates tasks in traditional communicative language learning (Ellis, 2003). This is a more accessible approach for YL as they need meaningful and motivating activities which foster communication (Pinter, 2017).

End-of-unit tasks recycle the content of the unit, which is helpful for YL as it is crucial to balance the demands and the support of tasks for children. Nevertheless, YL need language support such as formulaic language/chunks (2.3.3) or familiar phrases to master tasks cognitively (Foster, 2009; Willis, 2005). Cameron (2001) argues that if given insufficient support, YL lose interest or fail, but if given too much support, they are not stretched. As a result, teachers need to anticipate the various demands on cognition, language, interaction, metacognition, collaboration, and physical demands, and support the children accordingly. In line with Vygotsky (1978), this support of a more knowledgeable person raises the learners’ current developmental level to achieve the task. He defined this distance between individual
and guided problem-solving as the *Zone of Proximal Development* (ZPD). Such teacher or learner support or scaffolding can gradually be reduced as the children gain more confidence.

### 2.3.2.6 DST tasks in the YL classroom

Technology is transforming task creation and conduct (Pinter, 2017), but clear guidance for collaborative work is lacking in digital TBL (Kukulska-Hulme and Viberg, 2018). This might be because of the different ways tasks can be designed (Thomas and Reinders, 2012), the different requirements of tasks, or attributes of the technology (Chong and Reinders, 2020). As we saw above (2.1.1) so far task-based DST has often been guided by the children's creation of their own tasks (e.g., Kirsch, 2018; Pellerin, 2014). In response, there is still a need to theorise task-based DST in the YL classroom.

### 2.3.3 Chunking

As argued, TBL emerged from the communicative approach which dates back to the 1980s (2.3.2.1). This communicative approach revolutionised L2 teaching, and oracy (2.4.2) became more important and, as argued above, *chunking* can support this, particularly in the early stages of language learning.

*Chunking* originates from cognitive psychology from the mid-1950s when Miller (1956) developed the concept from his observation that people more easily receive, process, and remember series of digits if arranged in groups. This grouping or *chunking* was applied to language learning: rather than learning and producing isolated words, storing and recycling groups of familiar units enables language recall and accelerates output (Pinter, 2017). Lewis, a leading proponent of *chunking*, proclaimed that ‘language consists of grammatical lexis, not lexicalised grammar’ (1993, p. vi). According to him, lexis is more important for meaning-making than grammar which is applied to the YL classroom because of the children’s cognitive development (1.4).

Thornbury defines *chunks* or *chunking* as a combination of lexical items which often appear together. He also calls them ‘lexical phrases, holophrases, formulaic language, and ‘prefabs’” (2005, p. 23). Keller (2013) exemplifies *chunks* as combinations of lexical and functional words such as *the same to you* or combinations of lexical words or collocations such as *break a leg*. The fixed order of these *chunks* enables learners to recall them easily and use them as components of their speaking or writing (Biber et al., 2011). Pinter (2017) specifies: fully-fixed
chunks, as mentioned above, are ready-for-use, while additional words need to be added to partially-fixed chunks, e.g., *Do you like...?*

Given the primacy of speech over writing in my context, teaching *chunking* is relevant to my approach for several reasons. Productive language builds on language that has been encountered beforehand, learnt in its entirety and without analysis (Cameron, 2001; Lewis, 1993). As a result, the pattern does not need to be entirely known, but will develop speaking skills (Cameron, 2001) because of the repeated formulae of oracy (Biber et al., 2011). While *chunking* helps all speakers (Pinter, 2017), beginners and YL rely on chunks for fluency (Thornbury, 2005; Lewis, 1993) as automatised language reduces language processing as I suggest below.

Learners may reproduce chunks without fully understanding them (Cameron, 2001), but Swan (2006) argues that only a vast amount of exposure to them actually results in L2 fluency, and even their correct use does not guarantee they have been fully acquired (Lewis, 1993). To learn them, Thornbury (2005) recommends drills or using them in games or substitution tables, but Keller (2013) claims chunks need to be learnt and analysed to acquire skills and build grammar competences, which is not applicable for YL because of their cognitive development (1.4).

YL of L2 employ more chunks without reflecting on the grammar than adults (Pinter, 2017). Cameron (2001) argues that *chunking* enables YL to produce grammatically correct sentences and that they are able to split them up and use the component parts to create new combinations. They acquire *chunking* from songs, chants, rhymes, stories, or dialogues, many of which are familiar elements of primary classrooms. Based on this, teaching chunks explicitly or implicitly is significant for using, reusing, and meaning-making as lexis and grammar are interlinked and stored together (Pinter, 2017). This can be the case in CLIL and TBL where learners need chunks that might be beyond their current knowledge (Nunan, 2004a). As a result, chunks can provide very useful language support and vital scaffolding, i.e., tailored support that enables learning. They can be given as scaffolds on written language support sheets and then removed gradually as they become part of the learner's repertoire.

### 2.4 Oral language production

Oracy, a term coined by Alexander Wilkinson in 1965, includes the capability to comprehend and employ spoken language (Jones, 2017). It is the basis of learning
in general from infancy onwards (Britton, 1970) apart from acting and doing, and promotes the growth of personality, experience of contentment, and well-being (Wilkinson, 1970). While in Curriculum 21 the L1 focus is on literacy (2.4.1), in L2 oracy has primacy (2.4.2). A central feature of oracy and my research is Vygotsky’s concept of the ZPD, ‘the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem-solving under adult guidance, or in collaboration with more capable peers’ (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86). This accounts for the process whereby learners jointly construct knowledge through discussion (the intermental exchange leading to intramental change) and supports the use of collaborative task-based learning to achieve this.

2.4.1 Oracy in L1

Oracy is ubiquitous, including in education, and cannot be separated from literacy or any other subject (Wilkinson, 1970). Although research by Rosen et al. (1971) on language use and learning in the 1970s acknowledged the importance of speaking, curriculum standards were still based on literacy as in our previous central Swiss curriculum from 1988 (Kommission Deutsch der Innerschweizer Erziehungsdirektorenkonferenz, 1988), and teachers lacked the pedagogical knowledge of applying these insights (Jones, 2017).

However, more recently, talk has once again been recognised as an important social, cultural, and cognitive tool (Jones, 2017; Alexander, 2012; Mercer and Hodgkinson, 2008), which is fundamental to thinking and learning, the main principle in education. Talk fosters relationships, enables identity building, and facilitates understanding and learning (Jones, 2017). These three functions are based on Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory, i.e., learning is a social process happening through collaboration in the cultural environment, and on social constructivism, i.e., knowledge is socially constructed through collaboration with others; both relevant theories for my research (3.1.1). In these ways, talk supports progress in understanding and collaborative development of knowledge. Mercer (2015) argues for the importance of oracy in education and claims that ground rules for collaboration need to be taught, practised, and reflected upon to be effective and sustainable. In 2.7, I will outline how Mercer’s concept of exploratory talk can foster reasoning, important for my research.
But despite these reasons, oracy is often underrated, not highly respected, or not seen as a special skill or talent (Alexander, 2012), and policy makers do not give oracy equal status to literacy, which remains the basis of assessment (Mercer, 2015). This is true for Switzerland as *Curriculum 21* focuses on building all four skills (reading, writing, listening, and speaking) equally in German, but has separate sections with grammar and orthography, and literature (D-EDK, 2018b), which means the focus on assessment and high-stakes testing stays on literacy. Oracy is mainly valued for its role in developing social competences.

### 2.4.2 Oracy in L2

In Swiss primary English, on the other hand, the emphasis is on oracy (D-EDK, 2018b), and *Curriculum 21* specifies the competences for dialogic speaking in English for Year 4 as follows: ‘the pupils

- can establish contact with others and communicate with very simple words (e.g., say hello, goodbye, thank you, order something)
- can communicate in familiar situations in a simple way if the interlocutor is considerate and helpful; can talk about familiar topics by asking simple questions and answer using single words or short sentences (e.g., during play, free-time, school)
- can ask simple questions on familiar topics and answer using single words, phrases, or short sentences (e.g., date, time, health, colour)
- can exchange and gather information in everyday situations using simple words (e.g., role-play, group-work)
- can ask and answer simple questions on familiar topics, briefly say something about them or react to what has been said (e.g., teaching, shopping)’ (D-EDK, 2018a, p. 10, translated by the author)

#### 2.4.2.1 Cognitive demands on speaking

While speaking an L1 usually happens effortlessly, the cognitive demands on speaking processes in an L2 are complex (Goh and Burns, 2012): fluency and accuracy are difficult to master for learners as different cognitive demands are involved (Pinter, 2017). Levelt’s model (Figure 7) demonstrates this complexity of the three interconnected steps of conceptualisation, formulation, and articulation. Conceptualisation is the preparation of the talk by choosing the content, lexis, structure, genre, and staging. This constructed information needs to be appropriate
for the topic, the context, and the audience which leads to formulation. Formulation is complex and challenging. It involves the strategic choice of structuring the information by selecting meaningful lexis and suitable verb tenses to build a syntactically correct sentence. Sentences need to fit the register and context. This is demanding, so speakers often draw on chunking (2.3.3), which facilitates easy retrieval and accelerates output (Thornbury, 2005). Finally, speech is articulated. While some L2 phonology might be automatized, intonation, insecurity about pronunciation, and apprehension must be overcome. All these three steps are constantly monitored by metacognitive self-reflecting processes (Goh and Burns, 2012).

![Figure 7: Cognitive demands of speech production on L2 learners based on Levelt's model of speech production (Goh and Burns, 2012, p. 36), reproduced with permission](image)

2.4.2.2 YL L2 speaking

Whereas children might not be entirely proficient in their L1, planning and monitoring their speech, noticing mistakes and correcting them require a vast amount of practice to become fluent and accurate (Pinter, 2017). Because of these cognitive, language, speech, and interactional demands (Cameron, 2001), YL L2 speaking practice is based mainly on imitation and reproduction (Legutke et al., 2009) of chunks (2.3.3). These blocks consist of useful language for unanalysed parroting and reproduction (Legutke et al., 2009). Nunan (2011) cautions that even though these drills are important for children’s speaking development, because of the missing interactional aspect, they can get boring. Based on this, children need
meaningful and engaging activities and games, something I was mindful of in my task design for this research project.

2.4.2.3 Aspects of L2 competence

To engage learners and foster their speaking, cognitive demands and support must be kept in mind, and L2 speaking competences need to be considered (Figure 8). According to Goh and Burns (2012) they consist of three aspects:

- **Knowledge of language and discourse**: grammar, phonology, knowledge of lexis and discourse. Learners need to distinguish between spoken and written interaction and receive adequate language support to master these systems (Nunan, 2011).

- **Core speaking skills**: pronunciation, speech function, interaction management, and discourse organisation. These four categories are a framework referring to speaking goals. Teachers can draw on them for planning, and as an aid to determine which skill(s) the learners should focus on.

- **Communication strategies**: cognitive, metacognitive, and interactional strategies, which help learners maintain a conversation. However, as YL are still learning to structure their L1, and the capability to negotiate meaning grows with age (Pinter, 2017), it is crucial to give them structures and models as scaffolding.

![Figure 8: Aspects of second language speaking competence (Goh and Burns, 2012, p. 53), reproduced with permission](image)
Goh and Burns (2012) argue that speaking is a complex skill drawing on various physical, metacognitive, and linguistic demands to accomplish diverse conversational expectations. In response, to help learners progress, demands need to be reasonable and meaningful. Teachers should offer guided and structured practice that facilitates the development of oracy instead of just practising oral language, support learning by meaningful selection of core speaking skills, and provide learners with communicative strategies.

2.4.2.4 Fostering oracy in the YL L2 classroom

This is in stark contrast to L2 oracy practice in the primary classroom. Speaking practice often consists of isolated activities with little consideration of wider learning goals, which can render it meaningless (Goh and Burns, 2012). Legutke et al. (2009) claim that YL classroom observation and research demonstrate that teachers’ conceptions of approaches are problematic. Teachers often provide imitative and reproductive activities lacking interaction and support, while children would like to practise meaningful language. Cameron (2001) suggests that teachers could take advantage of Vygotsky’s shared construction of meaning by harnessing the social and emotional atmosphere, and Bruner’s scaffolding by providing ample support, which I have included in my design. While dialogues are popular for adults, rewritten child-friendly dialogues or adaptations that take account of learners’ levels and requirements can engage YL (Nunan, 2011; Legutke et al., 2009). Despite the artificial, neat versions of dialogues concocted for a textbook, some valuable and real-life patterns are worth practising (Cameron, 2001). Dialogues could entail completing or reassembling a text, short exchanges or role-plays, or storytelling (Legutke et al., 2009) drawing on relevant language (Nunan, 2011), which all should be supported. Cameron (2001) argues that this effective support needs to be carefully chosen by the teacher, introduced, and practised. Having done their activity, the children should receive feedback. I adopted this approach for my study and extended it with a reflection phase, which I outline in the next section.

2.4.3 A model for teaching speaking

Guidance on teaching speaking is needed as so far little attention has been paid to fostering oracy in both L1 and L2 classrooms in Switzerland.

Goh and Burns (2012) claim the importance of the teacher’s role for input, support, and feedback, which means that teachers need to systematically prepare the stages, tasks, and information needed. For this reason, the teaching speaking cycle
(Figure 9) can be a useful model as individual steps support different speaking goals and encourage learner collaboration which stimulates speaking.

![Teaching speaking cycle diagram](image)

**Figure 9: The teaching speaking cycle** (Goh and Burns, 2012, p. 153), reproduced with permission

The different steps of Goh and Burns's (2012) model can be used standalone or for a series of lessons. As it shares similarities with our cantonal support cycle, which I describe below (Figure 10), I adopted it entirely to my research context. Goh and Burns (2012) demonstrate that after raising learners' awareness of the upcoming speaking activity by presenting it, they receive plenty and meaningful language and planning support which helps them conduct the speaking task. While most teaching ends at this stage, the teaching speaking cycle offers further scaffolding to develop students' knowledge of speaking skills and communication strategies. Having analysed their weakness and ways to improve, learners receive an input and repeat the task. Then they reflect on it and receive teacher or peer-feedback.

Goh and Burns (2012) argue that most classroom teaching only contains two of these stages, but the model helps plan L2 speaking holistically and improve learner performance by allowing planning time and task repetition which reduce mental pressure. Their framework is based on pedagogical and theoretical principles to guide teachers' task and material design and optimise speaking lessons. In my research I followed all seven steps. Knowing the method of instruction, in the next section, I outline how I adapted the DST task according to Goh and Burns's (2012)
framework (Figure 9) and our support cycle (Figure 10), the needs of my participants, and the textbook, and then come back to oracy with oral language expectations for YL to engage with these tasks.

2.5 Task design

While Curriculum 21 was implemented in Zug in August 2019 and the revised edition of the mandated textbook Young World had just been published, we were still working with the original version of Young World which is based on communicative language teaching and soft CLIL (2.3.1). However, it does not contain any tasks, while the recently revised edition, which fully matches the requirements of Curriculum 21, contains end-of-unit tasks which recycle both language and content acquired during the unit. The tasks in the revised Young World 2 textbook for Year 4 (I conducted my research in a Year 4 class (3.4)) include: games; gathering and a compilation of data; individual and group presentations; and designing a town and interviewing professionals. Since these end-of-unit tasks focus on different language skills and cannot be translated to be used with ASV (1.5), I adapted the textbook material to my needs.

2.5.1 Material adaptation

As suggested above (2.3.2), the cornerstone of TBL is the use of the target language for communication to accomplish an outcome (Willis, 2005). Prabhu, cited in Castillo et al. (2018) fine-tunes this general definition by adding comprehension, manipulation, production of, and interaction in the target language.

The main pedagogical criteria to achieve this are creation of meaningful learning, facilitation of oral production (recall, use), collaboration (Castillo et al., 2018), an appropriate context, and a clear start and ending (Cameron, 2001). Furthermore, it is crucial to:

- adapt the textbook material appropriately to the learners’ needs and capabilities (1.4)
- attend to ecological conditions (3.1.2) such as the situated context to create real-world tasks for value-laden language learning
- take into account the particular requirements of the learning resources (Tomlinson, 2012; Ellis, 2003), in my case the software ASV (1.5)
In response, the main aim of the adapted tasks was to be more beneficial to the learners by providing personalised learning, requiring genuine decision-making by the learners, triggering communication, supporting learner autonomy, and activating high(er)-level thinking skills. For my context, I aimed to engage the children affectively and cognitively to process and use the language actively. Collaboration was fostered through dialogue. This dialoguing was supported by translanguaging (meaning making by drawing on all resources available) (2.6), fostering *exploratory talk* (analytic, but constructive reasoning and justifying) and the *Intermental Development Zone* (IDZ) (joint meaning-making) (2.7).

### 2.5.2 ASV task design

While tasks should be central to the curriculum and planning (Robinson, 2011), they can be constructed in different ways (Ellis, 2003). My decision was based on Nunan's (2004a) framework of having clear outcomes (production of a short video), a specific language input (repetition of the lexis and structures learnt), targeted activities for language production (a real-life problem connected to the respective textbook unit), in a social setting (dyad), with clear roles for the teacher (scaffolding) and pupils (responsible for their learning).

To achieve this, I applied a *backward design* proposed by Wiggins and McTighe (1998). Wiggins and McTighe (1998) argue that while teachers often look at activities in the textbook and use these randomly to teach a fun lesson, the goal-orientation is lacking. As a result, a *backward design* starts with learning aims and seeks means and activities to achieve these, which allows a clear focus on teaching and assessing.

This *backward design* is also reflected by the *support cycle* (Figure 10), a teaching aid developed by canton Zug. It views teaching as a process that fosters the children’s learning and helps teachers realise competence-based teaching. The *support cycle* starts with *Curriculum 21*, generating outcomes out of competences which makes rough and detailed planning possible. While teaching, teachers observe and formatively assess the children, which impacts further teaching. A summative assessment demonstrates learning gains and needs, and results in the formulation of new goals related to competences of *Curriculum 21*. Based on that, the *support cycle* regulates teaching processes from planning to assessing (Kanton Zug, 2011).
For my task design, I took these considerations into account, started with Curriculum 21 and identified goals first, then chose methods and activities to reach them, as proposed by our support cycle (Figure 10) and Castillo et al. (2018). I added inputs by Goh and Burns (2012) and Ellis (2003) and followed the ideas of Young World 2:

*Curriculum 21 - aims/outcomes - thematic content*

learner group/pairwork

task type

ASV affordances

language features

Figure 11: *Backward design of ASV tasks*
In accordance with the steps depicted in Figure 11, based on my reading of the above-mentioned literature, I started with the dialogic speaking section of the English part of Curriculum 21 (2.4.2), and conforming to our support cycle (Figure 10), I generated differentiated learning aims that fitted the respective unit as differentiation offers real choice to learners and draws on their higher order cognitive skills, which is valuable for learner progress (Tomlinson, 2012). In my experience, clear structures provide helpful guidance in my YL context.

I tailored these aims to my YL (1.4) who are still building up a lot of personal, social, and world knowledge (Nunan, 2011). For YL, the familiarity of topics and contexts in their L2 is important, and real-purpose or imaginary dialogues inspiring (Cameron, 2001).

The task type included the pedagogic classification by Ellis (2003). As the children worked collaboratively on a given topic, and created a video, the task type category is a creative dialogic task.

As a video was to be the final product, the tasks needed to be adapted according to ASV affordances (1.5), i.e., arranging and practising a dialogue, (re-)recording, selecting a photo, layout, theme, and music. Furthermore, the software enabled interaction (Tomlinson, 2012). With these prerequisites in mind, I modified the content to fit the requirements.

The nature of the task and the structure of its delivery made the language demands apparent. Following Goh and Burns’s (2012) the teaching speaking cycle (2.4.3), when introducing the task, I focused the pupils’ attention on lexis I provided in additional language support materials, and gave inputs for their planning. This is supported by Castillo et al. (2018) who claim that presenting lexis at the pre-task stage heightens student confidence and supports learner achievement.

I planned end-of-unit tasks for all five Young World 2 units from September 2019 to May 2020. Due to COVID-19 and the Swiss lockdown from 16 March to 10 May 2020, I had to change my research design (1.6/3.3/3.8) and created a single home-school-task in which every child talked about how they worked at home. For this video, they repeated saying the time and lexis of daily activities they had learnt in Year 3/the previous school year.

Having discussed the teaching speaking cycle and the task design, we turn to the expectations of collaboration, the first of which is what communicative resources the
learners have to draw on. Standard L2 pedagogy in Switzerland is based on the use of the target language in principle but based on my practical experience and observation of the natural language practice of the children, I decided to include translanguaging in my design and turn to this in the next section.

2.6 Translanguaging

Storytelling apps such as ASV (1.5) promote collaboration and heighten language learning (Kirsch, 2018). To engage in collaborative DST, YL beginners need to draw on their L1 or a combination of languages because of their limited L2 knowledge (Pinter, 2017; Cameron, 2001), i.e., they ‘translanguage’. However, translanguaging is currently generally an unfamiliar concept in the Swiss context, particularly in L2 methodology, a situation I hope my research will help change.

2.6.1 History

García and Li (2013) point out that the term translanguaging dates back to 1994 when Cen Williams, then a PhD student, coined the term to describe the practice he encouraged his students to engage in (switching between English and Welsh) to maximise their linguistic resources in a bilingual classroom setting. This flexible discourse habit of bilinguals and pedagogical practices that ensued, have subsequently been developed theoretically to comprise the full complex linguistic knowledge of bilinguals to teach content and develop academic language. Recognising languages as one holistic linguistic repertoire, translanguaging differs from translating or code-switching which originally consider languages as detached monolingual codes with separate grammars of individual languages.

The term translanguaging is used to refer to the continuous use of all available linguistic resources to gain knowledge, make meaning, express, and communicate (Garrity et al., 2015). The present progressive indicates the transformative process of knowledge development beyond one or more languages, which disrupts the hierarchy of languages (Li and Lin, 2019), and the prefix trans- covers

- trans-systems/-spaces (fluid processes beyond defined languages and educational habits to heighten participation in learning, creation of meaning and subjectivities)
- transformation (empowering individuals by teaching and learning practices that involve subjects, cognition, and society, and generate new language)
• trans-discipline (effects of languaging and education analysis on society, comprehension and learning, relationships, and social hierarchies) (García and Li, 2013)

2.6.2 Use

While some academics (Li and Lin, 2019; García and Lin, 2017; Garrity et al., 2015) have a holistic view of trans languaging comprising all resources for meaning-making, Lin and He (2017) distinguish between trans languaging and trans-semiotising which includes artifacts, gestures, and media. Although all agree that employing all existing resources significantly contributes to educational meaning-making, different conceptions result in ‘continuous redefinitions and extensions by translanguaging specialists in their consecutive publications’ (Jaspers, 2018, p. 2). For my research I adopted the holistic definition of embracing all resources for meaning-making because of my participants’ limited knowledge of the L2 and their operating in a multimodal context interacting with each other physically and with technology.

From Williams’s start in 1994, translanguaging practices have obviously developed and become more complex in nature with increasing effects of globalisation and advances in technology. Due to technology and multimodal content, new genres are more frequently used in nowadays generally multilingual classrooms (García and Li, 2013). As a result, translanguaging can support many academic practices such as pedagogical scaffolding, e.g., assisting negotiation of focused meaning-making by the flow of dynamic collaboration. It can, accordingly, support and maintain peer-learning and mutual respect (Lin and He, 2017).

2.6.3 Advantages/disadvantages

Translanguaging has been and still is primarily seen as being valuable in multi-ethnic, multilingual classrooms to strengthen discussion, motivation, academic language and literacy, and positively reinforce identity (Cenoz, 2017). The idea of incorporating translanguaging into L2 pedagogy is a recent one (Chalmers, 2019) as the focus has generally (and in my context specifically) been on excluding all but the target language. Translanguaging can foster learner development and identity by comparing and contrasting languages and raising metalinguistic awareness. It can increase participation and engagement, improve comprehension, but also support learning an L2, save time for explanations, and enable bilingualism (Menken
and Sánchez, 2019). Translanguaging in this sense of holistic, fluid, and collaborative meaning-making is critical in my YL L2 research context.

Palmer et al. (2014) indicate the necessity of a shift from viewing language as a problem to seeing it as a resource. Code-switching within a multilingual classroom is seen as a natural, intelligent, and socially valid practice that enables meaning-making and translation as a pedagogical strategy (Fallas Escobar, 2019; Li and Lin, 2019; Vaish, 2019), which draws flexibly and strategically on the whole linguistic repertoire (Menken and Sánchez, 2019). This holistic conceptualisation of emergent multilinguals acquiring another language allows a holistic view of languages (García and Li, 2013). Such an ecological perspective (3.1.2) focusing on different language practices among learners in a specific context (Lafford, 2009) enables learners to draw on different languages and repertoires, which positions them as competent dynamic multilinguals (Palmer et al., 2014).

Critically, Allard (2017) warns that translanguaging can have negative impacts on learning: learners might feel a lack of exposure to L2 due to switching to their L1, and if their teachers’ understanding of translanguaging is vague, too easy a task might have an impact on learner motivation, and, consequently, on learners’ progress. This makes it harder to establish a good learner-teacher relationship, especially if learners hold a monoglossic view of language learning. Jaspers (2018) cautions that translanguaging could become a practice dominating teaching simply for the sake of it with an ideology promising too much in terms of learning and social justice. He concedes that it might work in lower grades where cognitive demands are lower. But adult learners need to be instructed monolingually, since discourses at universities and among researchers are monolingual, and ‘inclusiveness is only partially reconcilable’ (Jaspers, 2018, p. 6) in a particular setting. As language is omnipresent in school and key to decreasing social inequality, he suggests the focus needs to be on strengthening the standard variety. In contrast, Palmer et al. (2014) assert that translanguaging should be taught explicitly to be effective in order to change students’ and teachers’ attitude towards meaning-making, enable everyone to participate, and co-construct knowledge (Garrity et al., 2015). Furthermore, student teachers need to be instructed on how to translanguage if they are to be persuaded to adopt it in their practice (Caldas, 2019; Allard, 2017).

Translanguaging has been widely researched. While Allard's (2017) case study highlights the dangers of vagueness in translanguaging and Jaspers's (2018) selective studies show benefits in wellbeign and attainment but no academic
increase, other translanguaging literature demonstrates examples of effective pedagogical practices (Li and Lin, 2019; Vaish, 2019). These include: empowerment of students and teachers; transformation of power relations; a focus on teaching, learning, and meaning-making; and the development of identity (Li and Lin, 2019). However, studies have mainly been done in immersion or culturally diverse schools with a minority language (Pacheco et al., 2019; Palmer et al., 2014), or outside the classroom (Fallas Escobar, 2019; Cenoz, 2017). My research adds to our understanding of how translanguaging operates in the L2 classroom with YL’s confined L2 knowledge, especially as translanguaging is not supported in Switzerland.

### 2.6.4 Swiss context

According to the didactical guidelines of the recently implemented Swiss *Curriculum 21* (1.2), the language of instruction in the English class is principally English to ensure a 'great input and a rich linguistic environment to learn foreign languages’ (D-EDK, 2018a, p. 5, translated by the author). This policy was adopted from former cantonal curricula (e.g., Zentralschweiz, 2004), and position papers (e.g., Kanton Zug, 2016), and stems from the assumption that an L2 is best learnt by listening to it and speaking it. Such a theoretical background is based on communicative language teaching which recommends avoiding the use of L1 as much as possible, and ideally using the L2 entirely (Seals et al., 2021). *Curriculum 21* only provides transmission for the four skills (listening, reading, speaking, writing): summarising key concepts from L2 in L1 (D-EDK, 2018a), with no regard to the more holistic concept of translanguaging.

As seen, traditional ideologies still dominate language education (Fallas Escobar, 2019; Jonsson, 2019; Lin and He, 2017) and schools in particular tend to stick to monolingual methods (García and Li, 2013), such as *Curriculum 21*. Reasons for this can be sociocultural, political, or economic (Lin and He, 2017), fear of confusing languages and reducing the speed of learning the L2, or as with *Curriculum 21* the assumption that it is best to learn English by using the language itself by replicating learning the L1 (Chalmers, 2019). Chalmers asserts that banning L1 lowers the development of both L1 and L2, and the comprehension of the content, crucial for CLIL. Consequently, monolingual instruction ‘is a barrier to good pedagogy’ (2019, p. 22), disregards multilinguals and their skills, and focuses on a model of deficit and dysfunctional language use of plurilinguals (Li and Lin, 2019). This artificial pedagogy is similar to subtractive plurilingualism (Hutterli et al., 2014), and leads to
double or parallel monolingualism (Figure 12). Jonsson (2019) and Palmer et al. (2014) propose seeing the use of multiple languages in the classroom as a resource rather than a problem. Researchers agree upon the mutual support of L1 and L2 (Chalmers, 2019).

![Parallel monolingualism vs Translanguaging](image)

Figure 12: Parallel monolingualism versus translanguaging (Jonsson, 2019, p. 343)

### 2.6.5 Justification for adoption

Pinter (2017) claims that the use of L1 alongside L2 can be powerful in early CLIL stages and Palmer et al. (2014) show how children instinctively explore similarities and differences in languages. This practice of *language mediation* or translation will feature in the revised version of our textbook *Young World* for reflection on grammar mainly, but at the time of writing, *Curriculum 21* stipulates that L2 classes are to be taught principally in the target language (D-EDK, 2018b). Furthermore, translanguaging is still in its infancy in Switzerland (Krompàk, 2014) and it is not strongly encouraged in English language methodology. Hence, for multilingual Switzerland with many multilingual companies, Lüdi claims that the ‘conception of multilingual competences’ (2010, p. 495) should be revised and seen as resources to draw on and use appropriately according to the situation. By focusing on speakers rather than on language(s), fluid communication becomes visible as the speakers draw on the full range of their communicative resources to convey meaning. This implies an ideological and epistemological shift (Jonsson, 2019) as language is seen as socially and socioculturally constructed. Based on this, the current Swiss policy might need reconsideration.

This holistic view of translanguaging corresponds to my paradigm of ecological constructivism (3.1.2) with its holistic view on language(s), language learning, interaction, and inherent processes (Hoven and Palalas, 2011). My research is innovative in its use of translanguaging in this context and examines its efficacy in oral collaboration. My data show that translanguaging can support explanation, clarification and extend previously gained insights (4.3).
2.7 Types of talk

For my research, teamwork was key for oral L2 DST. As a result, I adopted Mercer's theory of the types of talk.

2.7.1 Mercer's theory

Mercer's approach is based on Vygotsky’s theory, which sees language as a psychological tool, for the construction of thoughts, analysis, planning, and assessment of performance, and a communicative and cultural tool, for the collaborative development of understanding (Mercer, 2000; Mercer, 1995). Based on these premises, Vygotsky (1978) developed the ZPD that shows how learning can be fostered by using language for intellectual interaction: a more knowledgeable person can guide another to achieve better results by reducing the mental load (Mercer, 2000). What has been learnt through such an interaction (intermental/other-regulation), can be applied on their own at a later stage (intramental/self-regulation) (Lantolf and Thorne, 2006; Vygotsky, 1978). Vygotsky’s theory is the basis of both social constructivism and sociocultural theory (3.1.1) which my paradigm ecological constructivism (3.1.2) comprises.

While sociocultural theory mainly studies intermental/collaborative processes to account for intramental learning, Mercer researched the impact of collaboration on individual thinking (2000), and claims that efficient collaboration at school is the prerequisite for efficient teamwork in professional life (2015). However, he also points out that collaborative activities in school often fail because children have only learnt language strategies for collaboration informally (1995), so they cannot yet support others to participate in a dialogue as their comprehension is limited to their social and intellectual understanding (1.4), and especially in an L1 they still have to arrange their talk (Cameron, 2001). Mercer (2000) argues that teachers need to explicitly teach children how to collaborate effectively, and to provide them with the linguistic tools they need. With these explicit instructions of collaboration, YL have explicit goals (Mercer, 1995), and work more willingly and efficiently (Mercer et al., 1999) which in turn shapes their individual thinking allowing them to apply this knowledge when working on their own and achieve better results (Hardman, 2019). In addition, policy makers undervalue the importance of oracy for collaboration, emotional well-being, moral reasoning, and employment (Mercer, 2000).
2.7.2 Explicit teaching

Accordingly, Mercer has developed a programme of *Talk Lessons*. His interthinking approach is based on collaboration, trust, and willingness to take risks (Littleton et al., 2005) as dominant people inhibit other members sharing their opinion (Mercer, 1995). His process:

1. Ground rules for collaboration are jointly discussed and agreed.
2. Ground rules are rehearsed and practised.
3. The children apply them collaboratively and reflect on their collaboration.

This process needs to be taught explicitly to assure that children stick to the rules they had agreed upon, and use them effectively, which aims at resulting in better collaborative and individual achievement (Littleton et al., 2005).

Mercer's (2000) approach with ground rules makes arguing and justifying visible and reveals understanding as a transformation of the individual mind (Mercer, 2013). He coined the term *Intermental Development Zone* (IDZ), as a concept to uncover interaction in teaching and learning, and contrasted it to the above mentioned ZPD: 'unlike the original ZPD, the IDZ is not a characteristic of individual ability but rather a dialogical phenomenon, created and maintained between people in interaction' (Fernández et al., 2015, p. 56-57). Mercer's (1995) *Talk Lessons* have revealed this joint exploration of the problem to reach a joint decision if the children had an appropriate task, a good understanding of the agreed rules, and applied them. He identified the following three types of talk and increases in *exploratory talk* following an intervention:

- **disputational talk**: disagreements and individual deciding, short interactions with short affirmations and contradictions

- **cumulative talk**: constructive, but uncritical assertions, reiterations, acceptances, and elaborations on details

- **exploratory talk**: critical and constructive/productive engagement with ideas, justifying, and offering other ideas. ‘Compared to the other two types, in exploratory talk *knowledge is made more publicly accountable and reasoning is more visible in the talk.*’ (Mercer, 1995, p. 104, emphasis in the original)
Mercer et al. (1999) suggest that *exploratory talk* enables successful collaboration, fosters the IDZ, and results in improved individual reasoning. Chabanne (2016) argues that *exploratory talk* is infrequent in education because of the low benefit of groupwork. This belief is common as effective cooperation is assumed, but not taught, as illustrated above. As a result, collaboration can only be improved by inducted guided instruction, meaningful activities (Mercer, 1995), and more classroom practice (Littleton et al., 2005), and still nowadays teachers need professional development to improve dialogic teaching and learning (Vrikki et al., 2019).

Mercer (2004) drew on both qualitative and quantitative analysis: he analysed the talk qualitatively using the criteria mentioned above. He also drew on statistical data to show growth in the use of *exploratory talk* post-intervention. For this purpose, he conducted an analysis of the corpus data using a concordancer and identified a list of key words in context (KWIC) that indicated the presence of *exploratory talk*, e.g., *because, I agree, I think, what*. The use of these words is taken as indicative of the speakers justifying their own thinking and collaborating positively with others by arguing or asking another person for their opinion.

### 2.7.3 Rationale for adoption

Mercer's (1995) theory is relevant for my research. Firstly, the tasks I had set the children (creating an oral digital story) involved them in some problem solving. They had to agree on a plan of action, compose a script in English, assign roles and record the dialogue, select appropriate images and soundtracks, and then put it all together using the ASV software. While Mercer’s research was undertaken in the L1 context, I applied his theory to my YL L2 DST context, something that has not been widely researched yet to my knowledge (2.1.1). To foster the pupils’ talk in L2 and L1, I followed his guidelines, elicited the ground rules, and asked the children to give reasons for their proposals or counter-proposals during the tasks. As the ground rules were not adopted in other lessons, I supported the children with the KWIC I had adapted and translated to my context, which I wrote on their task sheets (Appendix 10-Appendix 13).

Secondly, analysing their reasoning helped me answer my RQs (2.2) and discover the children’s resources and development of meaning-making. To do that, I drew on Mercer's (1995) definition of the types of talk, which I adopted for my analysis, and the translated KWIC, and applied the same sort of analysis to my data (2.7/Appendix
6). I analysed the children’s collaboration qualitatively (3.11) and quantitatively (3.12).

2.8 Conclusion

This chapter defined DST and reviewed oral DST research in the YL context (2.1) to identify gaps and pose research questions (2.2). I then turned to theories in English language methodology related to my research and context: CLIL because of our soft CLIL approach (2.3.1), TBL because of collaboration, real communication, and meaning (2.3.2), and chunking (2.3.3) that supports learners in TBL and also in oral language production. Next, I drew on L1 oracy (2.4.1) which is often neglected whereas L2 oracy (2.4.2) plays a prominent role in my YL context, even though its practice is often imitative or reproductive. With the teaching speaking cycle, I offered a holistic model to teach speaking (2.4.3). This theory and literature on task design informed my approach (2.5). I ended this chapter by discussing translanguaging with its holistic view on language use for meaning-making (2.6), and types of talk (2.7) to foster collaboration both of which I related to my context. In the next chapter I discuss the methodology used for this enquiry.
Chapter 3 Methodology

The purpose of this chapter is to describe and discuss the paradigm, methodology, and analytical methods selected for this research. It examines my paradigm ecological constructivism (3.1), which allowed me to explore situated DST holistically. I justify my rationale for a case study design (3.2), my research design (3.3), and the selection of participants (3.4). Then I describe the methods I used to collect and analyse data, which are observations of my four participants conducting the tasks in a dyad (3.5), interviews with them and their class teachers (3.6), and the transcription of this data (3.7). Next I discuss the impact the Swiss COVID-19 lockdown had on my methodology (3.8) and outline how I had to adapt the methodology to fit the new reality, i.e., by incorporating a classroom observation (3.9) and a pupil questionnaire (3.10). I further explain my data analysis starting with reflexive thematic analysis (3.11), key words in context (3.12), audience design (3.13), and consider the impact on method and data triangulation (3.14) in my study. Finally, I address ethical considerations (3.15) that shaped my research.

3.1 Paradigm

Research methodologies that combine L2 and ICT have evolved from different ontological and epistemological premises (Jones, 2013). Early mobile-assisted language learning has been linked with behaviourism and programs with ‘drill and kill’ style activities as standard (Burston, 2014; Jarvis and Achilleos, 2013) which still feature in the revised edition of our textbook Young World for vocabulary and language practice (2.1). While these applications were designed for individual learning (Burston, 2014), mobile-assisted language learning nowadays promotes collaborative L2 learning (Kukulska-Hulme and Viberg, 2018). In my research I have adopted this socio-cognitive perspective: the software is a medium for fostering learning, interaction, and discussion (Jarvis and Achilleos, 2013), and my research focuses on understanding social, cultural and organisational aspects (Traxler, 2013). As a result, I have rejected a positivist paradigm that is grounded on facts and adopted an interpretivist viewpoint.

Within interpretivism, I considered the following design frames which seemed appropriate for my research questions: firstly, Activity Theory, because of its holistic view on cultural aspects of the research setting in which the participants are in action, but rejected it because the creation of my activity is not based on systemic tension which includes conflicts or disagreement in the system ‘that encourage
collective learning through change’ (Nussbaumer, 2012, p. 39). My study sought to explore new opportunities to improve oracy that are linked to the current teaching and the recently introduced *Curriculum 21*. Secondly, ethnography, because I adopted ethnographic research methods such as observation and interviews, and I am interested in my participants’ development, but rejected it because I did not fully immerse myself in the daily lives of my participants (Hammersley, 2006). This was not needed because my focus was not on teaching English, but on developing oracy by applying DST as a new method.

I chose ecological constructivism as my research paradigm because it offers a dynamic view on contextualised language use which considers ICT, assumptions, and teaching holistically (Lafford, 2009). Furthermore, ecology in my L2 and ICT context

- entails capturing ‘the interconnectedness of psychological, social, and environmental processes’ (Lam and Kramsch, 2003, p. 144) in L2 learning
- entails social interactions scaffolded by the teacher, other learners, or resources
- combines social constructivism and sociocultural theory, both theories are relevant to my teaching background and methodology

Given the above and my context, ecological constructivism seemed the best fit to explore my research questions. In the next section, I first outline both theories (social constructivism and sociocultural theory) by explaining their ontology, what is there, and epistemology, what/how we can learn about what is there (Grix, 2002), and relate them to my context. I then elaborate the eight basic tenets of ecological constructivism identified by Lafford (2009).

### 3.1.1 Social constructivism/sociocultural theory

The ontology of social constructivism is the active individual who negotiates and creates learning in interaction (Coyle et al., 2010) by co-constructing knowledge. This knowledge is generated through collaborative construction and reconstruction of understanding (Packer and Goicoechea, 2000), resulting in understanding as a social construction. Students working together to produce (even) short multimodal videos inevitably co-construct their learning. Such co-construction enables the development of identity and understanding (Hung et al., 2011; Powell and Kalina, 2009). This collaborative learning makes DST a social constructivist approach. From
this social constructivist perspective, software can support language learning and socialisation (Kirsch, 2018) when used to support collaborative activities (Kukulska-Hulme and Viberg, 2018), i.e., learners engage collaboratively in a task on a digital device in my research context. Learning is then seen as ‘complex, dynamic and continuous active processes of ongoing adaptations’ (Hoven and Palalas, 2011, p. 704) with negotiation processes. Negotiating such adaptations in the YL L2 class poses particular challenges given the children’s limited English. What I observed was that they naturally drew on all their linguistic resources, using translanguaging to support the collaborative co-construction. This threw up other issues in relation to official policy and guidance on L2 methodology in Switzerland, which I have discussed (2.6.4) and further discuss below (4.3/5.4/6.1.3/6.2).

In social constructivism, thought is epistemologically analysed as located in the individual mind, and collaborative cognitive action allows the construction of individual knowledge (Packer and Goicoechea, 2000). This construction and reconstruction generally occurs in conversational collaborative projects (Jackson and Klobas, 2008). In my context the children collaboratively created DST videos to improve their L2 oracy. They helped each other, negotiated meaning, and gave feedback. This collaboratively constructed social knowledge is then internalised by the individual. Such a learning environment with the application of an online software for taskwork is more meaningful than employing behaviourist software especially as the learning and real context are combined through authenticity (Tour, 2020).

As storytelling per se reflects the culture of the storyteller (Ellis and Brewster, 2002), it makes DST also a sociocultural approach. In sociocultural theory, ontology looks at the individual developing in social interaction. ‘[D]evelopmental processes take place through participation in cultural, linguistic, and historically formed settings’ (Lantolf and Thorne, 2006, p. 197) which are mediated by culturally relevant material that helps the children grow into their culture (Packer and Goicoechea, 2000). The children’s social interaction, construction, and understanding lead to collaborative construction of knowledge. This collaborative meaning-making is mediated by language, which is viewed as a psychological and cultural tool. In response, language transforms participation into cultural recognition and awareness (Vygotsky, 1978): learning happens between learners first and then within the individual in a cultural and political context.

Packer and Goicoechea (2000) define this epistemological view of sociocultural theory as the construction of identity that develops through collaboration in a society.
ZPD and IDZ (2.7) draw on this sociocultural concept by enabling individual learning, meaning-making, and reasoning. These happen through collaborative problem-solving that takes place in a particular culture and with cultural artifacts. This scaffolded learning and meaning-making happens between the learners during interaction (other-regulation) and can then be applied by the individual (self-regulation) (Moate, 2010; Lantolf and Thorne, 2006). My participants employed contextual concepts such as *exploratory talk* and translanguaging to negotiate meaning to create culturally appropriate DST tailored to their audience. This explicit realisation of collaborative knowledge construction (Mercer, 1995) was assisted by the software ASV.

Mercer (2013) argues that humans have a ‘social brain’ which allows mental processes and social interaction. Both are supported by language which is seen as a cognitive and social tool. But while the focus of sociocultural theory research is on intermental (other-mediation) and intramental (self-mediation) processes, it neglects to show the development of individual agency and identity which social constructivism does (Hung et al., 2011). With these different foci, together they see the individuals as active people who construct meaning, and who engage in social activities to grow into a certain culture (Packer and Goicoechea, 2000). This view is fundamental to my choice of ecological constructivism as my research paradigm.

3.1.2 *Eight basic tenets of ecological constructivism*

Ecological constructivism views language, language learning, interaction, and inherent processes as a holistic system (Hoven and Palalas, 2011), a sum of relationships (van Lier, 2004), in which socialisation occurs through interaction in a community (Lam and Kramsch, 2003). This ecological view of the language is paired with constructivism, which originates from the French *construir* which means both *construct* and *construe*, i.e., the development and evolvement of meaning (Hoven and Palalas, 2011) to which Lafford (2009, p. 674-5) assigned eight basic tenets. I summarise and illustrate these, and demonstrate their fit with my research context and aims.

1. **Studying language is a phenomenon in a situated context:** acknowledging all linguistic aspects involved and connections inside and outside the 'linguistic ecosystem' (Lafford, 2009, p. 674) comprises ‘social, cultural and organisational factors’ (Traxler, 2013, p. 10) and allows for the inclusion of linguistic and non-linguistic factors in the analysis. The situated and language-related tasks
developed for my study were designed to support my participants’ learning creating digital stories, and the children’s use of exploratory talk and translanguaging assisted their meaning-making. Researching this phenomenon in context, I captured the interrelation of mental, collaborative, and cultural processes in language teaching and learning (Lam and Kramsch, 2003), and sought for validity within the system researched (Boase and Humphreys, 2018).

2. **Use of an emic approach:** an insider-perspective helps contextualise the descriptive and interpretive data of a mainly longitudinal process. Being a primary teacher at the school and lecturer at the PH Zug, I knew about cantonal and school specific rules, and Curriculum 21, which helped my understanding of the situation. In addition, informal talk and interviews with participants and teachers revealed insights into their practice and the processes involved, and allowed a deeper understanding and contextualisation of the participants’ experience of collaborative DST.

3. **Language is the tool of mediation between humans and the world:** challenging the primacy of the individual brain, ecological constructivism focuses on collaboration (Frielick, 2004). To foster collaboration, negotiation was made an expectation of the task. The children’s use of exploratory talk was evidence of the socialising potential of oracy work in the language classroom. As these language practices were done in Swiss German and English, the children drew on all their linguistic and multimodal resources, which enabled learning and understanding through modelling and scaffolding (Lindaman and Nolan, 2015): intermental (other-regulation) led to intramental (self-regulation) processes (Lantolf and Thorne, 2006). Their collaboration and learning was assisted by software, which has been shown to improve teamwork (e.g., Ducate and Lomicka, 2013), change the way we communicate, and the nature of education (Traxler, 2013). This social and cultural mediation of the collaborative experience relied on previous learning and knowledge, and allowed me to have insights into individual learning (Hoven and Palalas, 2011).

4. **Diverse requirements can advance language learning:** my participants were able to draw on multiple resources, e.g., the task sheet, each other, the teacher, online resources. As a result, DST altered common classroom practices in terms of access and creation (Traxler, 2013), and lowered the cognitive burden (Ducate and Lomicka, 2013) of oracy. All these requirements offered different pathways of learning, and individual learning processes were possible and
encouraged. As these requirements were situated in the sociocultural context and the environment, they provided me with a holistic view of the practice (Hoven and Palalas, 2011).

5. **Language use is contingent on the communicative needs of participants in particular speech situations** (Lafford, 2009, p. 675): collaborative language use was meaningful for the children and the context. It consisted of translanguaging and the types of talk for meaning-making, supported the process of their work and enabled them to create an online presentation. This revealed the process of learning and collaboration among the emergent needs (Hoven and Palalas, 2011).

6. **Learner feedback is flexible, contingent on pupils’ products, and criteria-based:** firstly, collaboration and co-creation of learning with software enabled the children to assess their planning and recording (Hoven and Palalas, 2011). Secondly, *the teaching speaking cycle* by Goh and Burns (2012) allowed individualised teacher and peer feedback during the process and to the product. Thirdly, the explicit learning aims derived from competence-based *Curriculum 21* and the respective unit acted as a reference point for the children.

7. **Real-world tasks allow for meaningful L2 learning:** the tasks were related to the textbook *Young World* which is close to the children’s world based around topics related to their daily experiences and interests (Lustenberger, 2013). The end-of-unit tasks created for the study, for example, recycled and applied language and structures that could be useful when travelling or meeting English speakers. Hence, the children’s language production was authentic (Hoven and Palalas, 2011) and provided authentic learning, which Kukulska-Hulme and Traxler define as ‘learning that involves real-world problems and projects that are relevant and interesting to the learner’ (2019, p. 186). This in turn allowed for personalised and situated DST (Traxler, 2013) that ‘recognizes diversity, difference, and individuality in the ways that learning is developed, delivered, and supported’ (Kukulska-Hulme and Traxler, 2019, p. 186), and is specific to the situation.

8. **Language learning is ‘value-laden and potentially interventionist’** (Lafford, 2009, p. 675): my intervention, using software to foster L2 oracy, was value-laden to the extent that it was based on a belief in learning as a sociocultural process, hence my promotion of *exploratory talk* and translanguaging, both innovative in terms of L2 teaching in my context, but, in my view, consistent with the
aims of the newly introduced *Curriculum 21*, or urgently needed, and integration of *MIT* in L2 English. Such situated interactions with DST allowed an ecological perspective of teaching and learning (Frielick, 2004).

To conclude, ecological constructivism illuminates knowledge about the powerful interplay of diverse aspects that influence personal L2 learning (Lafford, 2009). This dynamic interaction of numerous mental, social, intellectual, and circumstantial factors (Lindaman and Nolan, 2015) influence L2 acquisition in different situations of learning through which power and identity are negotiated by problem-solving using language. Based on this, ecology combines psychological, societal, and environmental L2 learning processes. In such an ecological setting, collaborative DST can create communication that leads to the transformation of collaborative and individual learning (Lafford, 2009). A case-study approach was chosen as an appropriate way to explore and illustrate this transformation.

### 3.2 Case study

Noticing discrepancies of L2 abilities and communication intent, researchers became interested in case studies in language education. In my small-scale study, I focused on the collaboration of two dyads of the participating Year 4 class, and their Year 4 and 5 teachers (3.4). In this ecology, the children, the class, and the teachers are cases in a sense as single, bounded units (Richards, 2011). To capture collaboration and learning among these, I opted for a case study design.

#### 3.2.1 Definition

Bassey (1999) argues that while education aims at individual and social development, research is critical investigation aimed at improving understanding. As a result, educational research can be seen as a form of critical inquiry generating knowledge and findings to improve teaching and learning and inform policy. Case study is one such form.

Different researchers have defined the method and types of case studies differently (Cohen et al., 2007; Burton, 2000; Bassey, 1999). Bassey (1999) outlines in broad terms some of the key building blocks such as specific localisation, distinct aspects of activities, distinct contexts to inform professionals, policymakers or theory, and comprehensive data collection which needs to be reported plausibly and related to theory. However, he fails to define the term *case* which can be a person, an
organisation, a state, continent, event or the implementation of something new (Burton, 2000).

Stake, cited in Bassey (1999), differentiates between intrinsic and instrumental case studies. Whereas the former focuses on the case, the latter explores the situation or a community to get a theoretical understanding.

Richards (2011), Nunan (2004b), and Burton (2000) acknowledge that case studies can be conducted qualitatively or quantitatively and draw on different, and a mix of methods. They are common in social science to study the phenomenon in context and, as a result, focus on the cultural context (Nunan, 2004b). Alternatively, experiments can examine practice and performance in actual life (Burton, 2000). Case studies can be valuable in offering an innovative approach to reporting and portraying participants (Nunan, 2004b; Bassey, 1999).

Yin (1984), cited in Cohen et al. (2007), Burton (2000), and Bassey (1999) defined three types of case studies:

- **descriptive**: experiments and evaluations of contextualised phenomena/educational programmes to gain theoretical understanding on their rewards and achievement

- **explanatory**: detect cause and effect to test a theory

- **exploratory**: development of educational practice or policy or surveys such as the piloting of a large-scale study

To these three, one might add a fourth category, the **evaluative** case study (Bassey, 1999; Merriam, 1998). Evaluation illustrates, evaluates and assesses educational programmes or insights (Merriam, 1998). These four types of in-depth investigation result in thick description of the collected data of the case or the population. This can be interpreted and shown in story- or picture-telling, or fuzzy generalisation, a form of generalisation that leads to generalisation or predictions of the population under observation (Bassey, 1999). Alternatively, results can contribute to pedagogical recommendations or development of a theory (Richards, 2011). As a result, both description and evaluation apply best to my research as I investigated individuals creating digital stories, I describe and evaluate a novel practice.
3.2.2 Reliability/validity and generalisation in case study research

As the appreciation of the case and its particularity is crucial in case studies (Nunan, 2004b), separating understanding and inference is difficult (Cohen et al., 2007). In response, reliability and validity can be problematic. Reliability, the consistency of measuring, can depend on the case and cannot always be predictable, but a truthful and stringent account can level it out. Validity can ‘be achieved through the honesty, depth, richness, and scope of the data achieved’ (Cohen et al., 2007, p. 133). Nunan (2004b) claims internal validity is crucial for case studies, especially for the explanatory type. Construct validity can be subjective and external validity possible if predictive. He also considers Yin’s (1984), cited in Nunan (2004b) critical tests:

- **construct validity**: have practicable measures
- **internal validity**: causal relations among requirements
- **external validity**: choice of cases that allow generalisation of findings
- **relatability**: replication with similar results

Results cannot generate scientific generalisation because of insufficient rigour, and as generalisation can be problematic in case studies (3.2.1), particularisation, i.e., an accurate narrative, is important (Bassey, 1999). However, retrospective generalisation can be achieved by accumulating data and drawing conclusions about the case. These representations may be generalised to a similar wider community, e.g., a multiplicity of cases with the same characteristics (Cohen et al., 2007). Cohen et al. (2007) also claim that relating the findings to theory, i.e., analytical generalisation rather than statistical generalisation is advisable to develop theory and assist other researchers’ comprehension of similar cases, aspects, or circumstances. This can happen through naturalistic generalisation which indicates the reader's general conclusions when interpreting the case study (Bassey, 1999).

3.2.3 Advantages and limitations of a case study approach

The case study methodology is appealing because of the six advantages mentioned by Adelman et al., cited in Cohen et al. (2007) and Nunan (2004b):

- **depicting reality**: reproducing reality by observation in natural environments offering unique insights not gathered with other methods that are appealing
to professionals. As the method is very flexible, it puts great expectations on
the researcher (Burton, 2000).

- **viewpoints**: numerous evidence points from different sources allow a rich
  and detailed interpretation that can influence democratisation and decisions.

- **alternative interpretations**: the complexity of insights can serve multiple
  purposes, challenge existing spaces, or create new ones.

- **database for prospective research**: (inter)active research processes can
  have socio-political consequences suitable for future research (Bassey,
  1999).

- **generalisation**: as seen above (3.2.1/3.2.2), qualitative and quantitative
  generalisation from a case about a particularity or to a wider population can
  be possible.

- **accessibility**: deep insights allow understanding of the phenomena to
  various groups.

Because of their flexibility, case studies can be challenging to implement (Burton,
2000) and can cause problems of methodology, ethics, and inference:

- **methodology**: choice of suitable methods to avoid uncontrolled intervention
  which might impair cases and falsify reporting and perspectives (Bassey,
  1999). As a consequence, I reflected on the impact a method could have and
  justify my choices below (3.5/3.6/3.9/3.10).

- **anonymity/confidentiality**: given the possibility of identification of the
  case/institution, especially in small institutions because of its informality and
  structure, ethical considerations are very important (Richards, 2011; Burton,
  2000). My setting is small and based on this, I put in place safeguards that
  were approved by the Open University’s Human Research Ethics Committee
  (HREC, number 3292), and data protection, and I repeatedly re-examined
  my ethical approach (3.15).

- **systematisation**: flexibility of conduct and singularity of cases can impact
  inference. Analysing results of unsystematic procedures may be ambiguous
  or open to multiple interpretations and produce biased self-evaluation. Based
  on this, inference and cause-effect conclusion are limited (Cohen et al., 2007;
Bassey, 1999). I considered these points when selecting the cases (3.4) and during the data gathering period (3.3/3.5/3.6/3.9/3.10).

- **generalisation** (3.2.1/3.2.2): analysis can support the development of theory for further research. If the theory correlates with previous theory and results, analytical generalisation may be claimed and replication can be possible (Cohen and Manion, cited in Bassey, 1999). Because of researcher reflexivity (Cohen et al., 2007), outcomes can result in fuzzy generalisation (Bassey, 1999) or recommend beneficial practices (Richards, 2011). Building on this, I related my findings to theory and previous research (Chapter 5).

### 3.2.4 Rationale for my choice and application of a case study method

As outlined in the definition (3.2.1), Bassey (1999) claims that educational research should inform educational knowledge and decision-making to improve teaching and learning, and can be relevant for policy-making. As a participant-observer I intended to refine an innovative teaching practice in a naturalistic environment and with specific events (Bassey, 1999), in line with ecological constructivism (3.1): integrating *MIT* into English lessons and using *ASV* for DST, the pupils drew on *exploratory talk* (2.7) and *translanguaging* (2.6), an uncommon concept in Switzerland, to improve their oracy in English as an L2 (2.4.2).

My descriptive and evaluative case study enabled me to investigate the features of individuals, interpret these, and draw conclusions on the innovative practice. It also aided matching ideas to theoretical concepts (Cohen et al., 2007). Drawing on the opinion of the participants enabled me to assess the intervention tentatively (Nunan, 2004b) and inform professional discourse about YL collaborative oral L2 DST. This can inform educational research anew (Bassey, 1999) as my illustration shows (Figure 13). My research allowed me to disseminate the findings in both my workplaces, primary school, and teacher education, and it is already being used to inform policy (6.4).
My exemplifications might elucidate principles that can be observed elsewhere (Cohen et al., 2007), and encourage practitioners to experiment in their classes or inspire researchers to investigate the concepts further (Bassey, 1999).

I drew on descriptive and evaluative case studies to assess and test theories applied in a new context. According to Cohen et al., these theories are supported by insights and evidence of observation, interviews and a questionnaire. Although I did not teach in the class but only introduced the tasks, my participants recognised me as part of the staff, as ‘one of the group’ (2007, p. 258). This had many advantages. As we shared the same context and languages, relationships could be built more easily, the children worked in their natural setting, and the investigation was less intrusive. Therewith, according to Bassey (1999), it was possible to depict events and interpret them. As actions are grounded upon social beliefs, but education can change social behaviour, as a researcher I can highlight insights and may induce educational development. There are, of course, drawbacks, which I will discuss below (3.15).

### 3.3 Research design

In my small-scale case study, I was a participant observer as I was embedded in the class and had an insider role (Cohen et al., 2007): I was in charge of the classwork and at the same time collected data. As explained above (2.5), the end-of-unit tasks I designed for my case study are tailored to my context and purpose. These tasks are intended to be integrated into regular English classroom teaching in Year 4 and because of differentiation and language support they were feasible for all children. Therefore, in my main study, all the nineteen children (ten-year olds) of the participating Year 4 class of Ms Marple (self-chosen pseudonym), the class/English teacher (3.4), created digital stories with ASV. Ms Marple agreed to
participate under the condition that I did all the task-related work. I was happy to do this to ensure her collaboration and to acknowledge the additional workload and stress that the presence of a researcher in a classroom can cause, as well as to recognise the concerns teachers inevitably have about being required to integrate MIT into their curriculum.

On 19 September 2019 I had my first lesson with the pupils and showed them how to use ASV by projecting the computer screen onto the wall. I explained them how to

- find the video I had labelled with the unit and their names (e.g., Unit_4_Tina_Fritzli)
- change the layout
- search for photos/icons
- audio-record themselves
- listen to their recordings (one slide and full video)
- change the music track

Then I demonstrated how to work with the online dictionary www.pons.de (PONS, 2018). We searched the word Wiesel (i.e., weasel), suggested by the children, and listened to the pronunciation feature. This was followed by my introduction of the first task. We read through the learning aims together, discussed the order of the task to be completed, looked directly at ASV to see how these could be accomplished (e.g., with a split screen) and discussed language support.

Afterwards I raised their awareness of the importance of collaboration for taskwork. Following Mercer (1995), we considered possible rules for working together, discussed them and agreed on our own set of class rules, which I wrote directly into a Microsoft Word document (Figure 28). The children listened well to each other’s comments, and I observed the relaxed atmosphere of the class.

One week after this introduction, Ms Marple and I booted up the laptops, logged into AS and provided the online dictionary in another tab. After a short summary of the task demands by me, every dyad collected a laptop and set off to create their digital story. Ms Marple and I observed the children and helped them with the task and the software. During the afternoon break I watched all the videos and gave every dyad some short written feedback (step 4 of the teaching speaking cycle, 2.4.3). I noted excellence and things to improve. After the break I went to every dyad and made sure the children understood and responded to my feedback while again,
Ms Marple and I supported the children with their taskwork which lasted from two to four PM including a ten-minute break.

At home I downloaded all the videos and saved them on a USB stick. Another week later, I visited Ms Marple’s class, where the children awaited me excitedly and we watched their presentations and celebrated their achievement: the pupils sat on the floor in front of the screen while Ms Marple showed them one video after the other. They watched the other videos spellbound, laughing and giggling. After each video, many volunteers gave feedback to the producers in standard German and English: things they liked, things they could improve next time, and sometimes they also had a question. At the end, they even reflected on the task, the task demands, and their learning such as the choice within the task, the different requirements the task offered, how much they gained from the collaboration, and multimodal choices made. In this sequence I was a silent observer and sat at a pupil’s desk.

Throughout the year I introduced the tasks in the same way, Ms Marple and I set up the computers, we assisted the children with the taskwork, I gave them written interim-feedback, and visited the class to celebrate their success.

In these reflection/feedback sessions the children’s learning in terms of language learning and ICT knowledge became apparent and raised questions of assessment and marking. However, as the children had unequal opportunities in their dyad, and in some tasks the speech of the individual required more or less skills and knowledge (e.g., a reporter interviewing a professional), Ms Marple and I refrained from assessing the tasks.

These reflection/feedback sessions, my prior watching/listening to the audio-/video-recordings of the taskwork, and their general reflection on their use of multimodality generated the need to analyse the children’s audience design (3.13) as Bell argues ‘[S]tylistic or intraspeaker variation derives from and mirrors interspeaker variation. Style is essentially speakers’ response to their audience.’ (1984, p. 145). Similar to Macleroy et al. (2021), telling a good digital story was the main aim which made the pupils give their best in learning English. The children’s understanding of storytelling grew during the year from general enjoyment of taking on a different role to making more deliberate choices about the multimodal affordances: they incorporated multimodality (photos/icons, soundtracks, and pitch/intonation), drew on common knowledge (e.g., characters of the textbook and others), and carefully chose animals, attractions/stalls or jobs/holiday destinations (5.3).
Whilst all the children created videos in dyads, due to the small number of voluntary participants, spacing at school, availability of recording devices, and I as a single researcher transcribing the taskwork, I opted for four participants, i.e., two dyads (3.4). These two dyads worked in selected group rooms, in which they were simultaneously audio- and video-recorded (3.5). I decided to draw on both video- and audio-recording for the following reasons:

- video-recording allowed me to make sense of gestures, miming etc. as part of translanguaging for meaning-making (2.6)
- audio-recording allowed me to understand their speech more clearly because the voice recorder was on the desk and the video camera further away
- video- and audio-recording ‘has the capacity for completeness of analysis and comprehensiveness of material’ (Cohen et al., 2007, p. 407)
- having two recording devices meant I had a back-up in case one had failed

Whereas I video-/audio recorded the observation of tasks (3.5), I only used a voice recorder to audio-record the interviews (3.6). This was less intrusive (Cohen et al., 2007) and enabled me to return to the recording and check the wording (Nunan, 2004b). I further elaborate ethical decisions below (3.15).

Because of the lockdown and six weeks of homeschooling during the data collection period 2019/2020 from 16 March to 10 May 2020, I had to change my initial research plans (3.8). I considered comparing DST lessons to a regular English lesson which I observed with an observation table just before the lockdown (3.9). These insights were valuable as they showed the class activities, the children’s engagement in the class and their interaction with each other, as well as their individual work. During the lockdown, I asked all the nineteen children of Ms Marple’s class to create an ASV talking about their day at home (Appendix 14). The children or their caregivers e-mailed the link of their video to me, and I gave them individual feedback on their digital story by e-mail. In addition, I was interested in all the children’s experience with DST and compiled an online questionnaire. Ms Marple e-mailed my cover letter with the link to the questionnaire (Appendix 5) to the parents along with the weekly homework. Eighteen out of nineteen (18/19) children answered the questionnaire (3.10). Through classroom observation, homeschool task, and the online questionnaire during the lockdown, I was able to achieve further triangulation of methods and data (3.14).
3.4 Participants

In Switzerland, we teach the same class for two or three years in a row, in canton Zug we usually teach either Year 1/2, 3/4, or 5/6. I taught a Year 4 class when I did my pilot study and as speaking tasks would have overburdened Year 3 total beginners, I sought out a Year 4 class for my main study. I contacted the teachers at our school and others who showed interest in my study. Many also taught Year 3 or had commitments that did not allow participation. Finally, Ms Marple, her self-chosen pseudonym, agreed to participate and so my main study took place in her Year 4 class of ten-year-olds in a progressive state school in a small town in central Switzerland. The school is located in a wealthy urban catchment area. Ms Marple, the class/English teacher, was thirty years old and in her eighth year of teaching. She is an experienced teacher and holds a higher qualification in English than the minimum Common European Framework of References for Languages C1 level required for teaching English in Swiss primary schools.

Her class consisted of nineteen children, ten boys and nine girls. All children were fluent in (Swiss) German, whilst at home three children spoke English, two French, two Spanish, one Italian, one Hungarian, and one Russian. Eight pupils of this multilingual class gave their consent to participate in the study. Ms Marple identified four children whose linguistic ability allows for broader generalisability and representation. This meant excluding outliers such as pupils with learning disabilities or fluent English speakers, though it would be interesting and desirable to conduct future research with wider mixes of students. All the four participants’ L1 is Swiss German. They grow up monolingually and live close to each other. Here I present the four participants of Ms Marple’s class with their self-chosen pseudonyms drawing on my pen-portraits and Ms Marple’s description:

Tina is a very good and conscientious pupil. She is hardworking, able to work independently and with concentration, and takes on responsibility for her work.

Fritzli, her partner, is imaginative, inventive, and attentive in areas where he considers himself expert. But sometimes he is a dreamer, unstructured and unfocused.

Momo has a good feeling for languages, but his performance depends on the day. He sometimes has problems understanding a task. He and his partner
Hansli are neighbours and good friends, and often spend their free time together.

Hansli is affable and easy to talk to. His affinity for languages is not marked. He can get nervous and distracted easily, and sometimes has problems with self-regulation.

3.5 Observation of tasks

I opted against asking the children to keep reflexive journals or written accounts of the process as they would have been too strenuous and time consuming for the participants, and not reveal their interaction, collaboration, and construction in situ which is what I was most interested in and, of course, young children have been found to be unreliable self-reporters due to their desire to please their interlocutor (Nunan, 2011; Cohen et al., 2007).

I opted for observation because of its insightfulness into situations (Cohen et al., 2007) and its holistic view of language use and L2 learning in a social context (Nunan, 2004b) with collaboration, translanguaging, collective construction of knowledge, and needs and expectations of the tasks. This provided sufficient data to answer my RQs and I chose a qualitative research approach as offering a better fit with the naturalistic observation methods I was engaging in (McDonough and McDonough, 1997). The natural setting of a classroom facilitates the researcher to observe the dynamics of collaboration and gather specific evidence of development over time (Cohen et al., 2007). This sociocultural and social constructivist view on contextualised learning and collaborative meaning-making is compatible with my paradigm, ecological constructivism (3.1).

Naturalistic observation can represent classroom behaviour (McDonough and McDonough, 1997), but is morally value-laden (Cohen et al., 2007). The observer as an additional person or the camera in the classroom can distort classroom behaviour (Wragg, 2011; McDonough and McDonough, 1997). To mitigate the effects of intrusion and potential distortion of power relations (Wragg, 2011), I embedded myself in the class as far as possible as outlined above (3.3): we worked on the ground rules for talk (2.7) together, I prepared the children for the tasks, assisted them during the taskwork, and we watched their AS videos together. The children were used to several teachers working in the class and as a member of staff for eight years, they were used to seeing me at school and in the playground,
which made me just one more among them. Hopefully, this degree of familiarity helped make my observer-as-participant role less obtrusive and more naturalistic (Cohen et al., 2007).

Cohen et al. (2007) identify several potential drawbacks of qualitative live-observations: subjectivity, selectiveness of perception, and time-limits of the researcher to observe the required performance as critical events ‘tell a small but significant part of a larger story’ (Wragg, 2011, p. 70). These critical events are difficult to collect, and as I wanted to observe two dyads, I chose to video-/audio-record the lessons. To minimise the potential impact of the power relationship, which cannot be underestimated (Wragg, 2011), I encouraged the children to examine the camera and look at the voice recorder, which both dyads did during each of the four tasks. This familiarity made them relaxed about their use.

During the academic year 2019/20 the tasks took place on four Monday afternoons from two to four PM with a ten-minute break, which makes about fourteen hours of recording. These recordings enabled me to revisit the raw data and find underlying patterns. In order to ensure my perceptions of the sessions were as immediate as possible to the actual event, I made notes in my reflexive journal that same evening and made sure I reviewed, watched and listened to the recordings, and started to work on the transcriptions (3.7) during the same week. I revisited the recordings several times before and while I analysed the transcripts thematically (3.11).

I was also able to make pedagogical use of my observations. I shared a transcript from one of the sessions with two of the participating pupils, Hansli and Momo, at an informal encounter in the playground. The boys were impressed with their own performance and started a competition with the other dyad as to which of them could produce more words than the other in the course of the afternoon. The transcript of audio-/video recordings of the tasks, then, became a motivating force for them to extend their own language use and inspire others to do likewise. This unplanned move made me realise that sharing transcripts with them could be motivating, and accords with my wish to conduct research with young children rather than on them (Mortari and Harcourt, 2012; Pascal and Bertram, 2012; Waller and Bitou, 2011; Flewitt, 2005).

Supplementary methods can help confirm the findings of observation, improve reliability (Cohen et al., 2007), and give deeper insights. In response, I decided to employ interviews.
3.6 Interviews

Interviews can be used flexibly for data collection. I decided against structured interviews as their pre-determined inquiry schedule would have restricted answers and elaborations and risked seeming like an interrogation, which would not be a child-appropriate method as they would appear somewhat intimidatory and would not sit well with my participant status or my paradigm of ecological constructivism. Unstructured interviews are exploratory, and accordingly also unsuitable (Cohen et al., 2007). As a result, I selected semi-structured interviews which let me explore the insights from my initial data analysis. While the children and teachers could influence the interview with their answers, I could draw flexibly on the list of topics (Appendix 3) I wanted to raise.

I was aware of difficulties and tried to solve them (Cohen et al., 2007; Nunan, 2004b):

- **time allowance**: be as succinct as possible
- **asymmetrical relationship**: listen carefully, show empathy, nod, checking understanding
- **piloting**: I improved my interview by including reflections from my piloting the previous year (e.g., allowing thinking time before the next question to give the participants time to add something)
- **recording**: audio-recording was less intrusive than video-recording
- **language**: instead of using technical terms, I used everyday language or drew on the data of audio-/video-recordings of the task. Furthermore, while Standard German is the language of instruction, we spoke Swiss German, our L1, which indicated a less formal relationship and so helped reduce distance between myself and the children/teachers.

While I interviewed the teachers individually, I talked to the four children in their respective dyad as group interviews are favourable for children (Cohen et al., 2007). This less intimidating format promoted interaction, and, thus, gave them a voice while more sensitive personal concerns were more difficult to address. Their comments revealed aspects of their interpersonal relationship beyond the classroom tasks. Despite my concerns about the limits of their attention span, the two dyads saw the interview as a game, as another opportunity to compete with
each other to see which pair could say the most. They were more talkative than I had anticipated, and each interview lasted about forty minutes instead of the expected thirty minutes.

During the interview with the participants in June 2020 in their familiar tutor group-room, I again checked that they were still happy for me to record the interview, informed them about the purpose of the interview, confidentiality, and how the data would be used and stored, and their ability to withdraw. I had a checklist of topics I planned to cover (Appendix 3) and started with easy questions to set a relaxed atmosphere asking them about their motivation to participate and explored further issues. I ticked the topics off the list as the discussion progressed, which enabled me to cover everything while being flexible with the flow of discussion and open to their suggestions. At the end I thanked the children for their valuable insights. I applied the same procedure to the interviews with teachers. The one with Ms Marple, the Year 4 teacher, took place in her classroom in June 2020, and also lasted about forty minutes.

Originally, I had planned to assess the children’s language gains and compare them to children with similar characteristics from the parallel class. However, because of six weeks of home-schooling during the COVID-19 lockdown I had to improvise (3.8) and opted instead for a classroom observation in Ms Marple’s class, a student questionnaire and an interview with Ms Maloney (Year 5 teacher) to verify the insights I had gained applying the other methods. The interview with her took place in the local library (her suggestion) in September 2020 and lasted about thirty minutes. I invited her and Ms Marple to check the transcript, which they both declined.

I listened to the interviews before transcribing them. I applied the codes from my reflexive thematic analysis (TA) (3.11) of task observation (3.5), my classroom observation (3.9), and findings from the questionnaire (3.10) to the transcript of the interviews and added the data to the themes of my reflexive TA.

### 3.7 Transcription

My task observations and interviews generated about one thousand minutes of audio-/video-recording, offering rich insights into the work and thinking of my participants. However, recordings are difficult to analyse (Wragg, 2011). To make analysis feasible, I opted for transcribing them.
Such transcripts are a reduction of the original interaction that is essential for the research process (Davidson, 2010) and are interpretations of communication, separated from the time and context they appeared (Jenks, 2011).

All situated research, particularly with young participants, involves some levels of compromise. Jenks (2011), Davidson (2009), and Cohen et al. (2007) argue that transcripts are a reflection of the underlying research theory and determine representation and the attention to detail. Transcripts are tailored to meet the limitations of data analysis available to the researcher, and in response, also reflect the position of the researcher in the research process.

I analysed my data using reflexive TA (3.11), of which the first phase is transcribing. Transcripts for reflexive TA do not need to be overly detailed, but suitable and purposeful for the analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2006). I kept the centrality of transcripts for my research in mind and the fact that a transcript should reflect an honest portrayal of the talk (Mercer, 2004). The decisions I made about the level of transcription needed to serve the research questions, the analysis, and the claims based on the investigation.

For the purpose of my research, my focus on analysing the transcript data was to find evidence of student collaboration, particularly reflected in their developing use of English, and evidence of translanguaging being used to support these.

Before I started transcribing the observation of collaborative DST, I watched the video-recordings of the two dyads, Tina and Fritzli, and Hansli and Momo, and noted critical incidents in my reflexive journal. Having gained a big picture, I began transcribing. I watched the video to fully perceive and understand the situation, which is part of my paradigm of ecological constructivism (3.1.2), and added the observations of happenings, gestures, miming, and action in brackets next to the spoken word as the data loss of intonation, visuals, and gestures cannot be ignored (Cohen et al., 2007). Because the camera was positioned in order to capture both children and the laptop, it was sometimes difficult to understand exactly what the children were saying as they had their backs to the camera (which also served to protect their anonymity). I then listened to the voice track of the voice recorder which was laying on their desk close to the laptop and caught their voice more clearly. I also decided to write down the timing of both the video- and audio-recording on the first line of every new page of the transcript (e.g., Figure 15). This allowed me to easily access the video-/audio-recording during the process of analysis.
I transcribed all the data myself. To improve reliability I listened to the audio-/video-recordings multiple times (Steinar, 2011) as I am responsible for guaranteeing a truthful approach and quality. I transcribed and coded the speech in the language it was spoken. In the part of Switzerland where I conducted my research, we speak Swiss German, Alemannic dialects. Swiss German is mainly spoken while Standard German is used for writing and reading, or as the language of instruction at school. Siebenhaar and Voegeli (1988) assert that the differences between the two are mainly in sound or different uses of words rather than syntax, although there are some differences, for example, the past simple/perfect is not found in Swiss German. Nevertheless, everyday occurrences can be expressed in Swiss German (Schmid, n.d.). For transcribing the sounds of Swiss German, I mainly followed the method proposed by Zimmermann (2019), an influential Swiss German proof-reader. I wrote phonemically (e.g., vill with the stress on the letter l), but if in doubt, I stuck to the suggestion of Schmid (n.d.) to stay close to the standard version for readability (e.g., wieder with the difference between wieder (again) and wider (against) in Standard German). Throughout this thesis I present talk in Swiss German in italics, Standard German in bold, and English in normal print.

The transcript includes standard punctuation to 'represent the grammatical organisation of the speech as interpreted by the researcher' (Mercer, 2004, p. 147). I added explanations where relevant, inaudible speech, and nonverbal behaviour, such as gestures, facial expressions, actions, and laughter in parentheses. This helped me represent at least some of the salient non-verbal features (Jenks, 2011). An asterisk indicates a non-standard formation, and the English translation is on the right:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fritzli</th>
<th>I’m the fox. *I go with the spider to the animal party.</th>
<th>(recording) I’m the fox. *I go with the spider to the animal party.</th>
<th>(they listen to the recording)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>Yeah. OK. Next. Wämmer mal Text mache?</td>
<td>Yeah. OK. Next. Shall we have text?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My denaturalised transcription includes ‘uhms’, ‘errs’, and false starts (Davidson, 2009). Following Mercer (2004), I indicated overlaps or simultaneous utterances with square brackets […]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hansli</th>
<th>Uhm, uhm, [the].</th>
<th>Uhm, uhm, [the].</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Momo</td>
<td>[OK]. Fox.</td>
<td>[OK]. Fox.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Throughout my thesis the transcripts of task observation are depicted as above. To keep them distinct, transcripts of ASV videos are indented and depicted without gridlines:

Tina
Hi, let’s talk about the fair. Shall we go there together on Sunday?
Fritzli
Oh, yes, that’s a good idea.

Interviews are shown without gridlines with the English translation on the right:

AL
Wägerum so…?
Ms Marple
Ja, es esch eifach e gueti Stimmig
ond sie möched eifach ihri Sache.
Ond, ja, sie wänds guet mache.

Why so…?
Well, there is a good atmosphere and they just do what they need to do. And yes, they want to do it well.

Having outlined the qualitative methods of observation of the tasks and semistructured interviews, and how I transcribed them, we now turn to the impact of COVID-19 on my research and the decision to include a classroom observation and a questionnaire.

3.8 COVID-19 impact on my research

The COVID-19 pandemic coincided with my data collection, and the Swiss state school closure from 16 March to 10 May 2020 had a significant impact on my research plan, data, and methodology. For this reason, I made the following changes to my initial planning:

When the closure was looming and the continuation of my data collection uncertain, I reflected on the validity of observing a real classroom situation (3.9) to compare the observation to the provisional findings of the insights from the three collaborative tasks and have a basis for future interviews (3.6). In February 2020 I asked Ms Marple if I could observe an English class, which I did on 09 March 2020, one week prior to the lockdown.

My introduction to the fourth task was planned for 16 March 2020, the first day of the lockdown. As it was no longer possible to do it with the whole class, I contacted the parents of my participants to see if they would be willing for the activity pairs to meet in one of their homes or supervised by me at school. Understandably, they decided against this and so I had to rethink my research. When the duration of the lockdown was extended several times and thus the return to school uncertain, in consultation with Ms Marple, I wrote an individual differentiated ASV home-school
task (Appendix 14), in which the children created a presentation about their new daily routines under lockdown. In addition to complementing the dyad presentation data with evidence from their individual task done at home, this improvised adaptation proved to have further unforeseen advantages. The children shared and discussed their videos when they came back to school on 11 May 2020, and this helped facilitate their return. In addition, this individual task allowed me to keep in touch with the children as I gave them individual feedback by e-mail. This single home-school task also allowed me to gain insights into differences in the children’s experience of working collaboratively and alone.

Together with the home-school task, Ms Marple sent the link to my online questionnaire (3.10) to the parents. I opted for this method to gain first insights into the children’s attitudes towards the tasks, the software, and compare collaborative and single tasks. This in turn informed my topics for the interviews (3.6).

Initially I had planned to use pre- and post-tests to assess language gains of my four participants and compare them with similar children from the parallel class. Despite the higher socioeconomic level of the school, learning and support during the lockdown differed markedly as argued by Huber et al. (2020) and verified by my participants. As a result, I decided against post-tests, asked the children in the questionnaire to evaluate their language gains, and verified these insights in the interviews with my participants and Ms Marple, the Year 4 teacher. After the children had moved on to Year 5 and had a new class/English teacher, Ms Maloney (self-chosen pseudonym), I interviewed her about her perception of the pupils’ level of English compared to others. Ms Maloney is a very dedicated teacher, was twenty-seven years old, and in her fifth year of teaching.

3.9 Classroom observation

Wragg (2011) claims that pupil observation can be insightful regarding the effect of teaching on the learners and their reaction to teaching. However, the method needs to be purposeful. I kept this in mind when planning the classroom observation one week prior to the lockdown: I dismissed audio-/video-recording which would have been too obtrusive (McDonough and McDonough, 1997) for both students and the teacher. To support my goal of data triangulation, I designed an observation chart with categories that corresponded with my research aims (Nunan, 2004b), my codes (Appendix 6) and my initial themes (Figure 20) which I had derived from my deductive and inductive analysis of three end-of-unit tasks.
Cohen et al. (2007) argue that predefined categories need to be exclusive and distinct. I converted my defined categories into an observation table that made it possible to record information systematically. Cohen et al. (2007) warn that the number of these distinct measures must be feasible, and Wragg (2011) adds consideration of the time sampling: too short a period can be exhausting for the researcher, too long a period can result in too many occurrences. He suggests marking a box only once during the allotted time period. I followed his advice and piloted my chart using extant videos until I became proficient, and only then in my colleague’s classroom. Based on my experience, I changed the time slot that counted as one observation from fifteen to thirty seconds to make it feasible and after several adjustments to the layout, I settled on Figure 14 as a manageable format that enabled me to capture the data I was most interested in efficiently. In the chart, the first section identifies the language use, where ‘T’ stands for teacher and ‘Ps’ for pupils, ‘E’, ‘G’, ‘CH’, and ‘Gconstr’ mean English, German, Swiss German, and German construction, i.e., German sentence structure, respectively. The second section looks at the classwork, where ‘I’ indicates individual children speaking and ‘O’ everyone speaking. The third section considers the four skills, and the last section codes identified by my reflexive TA: language support provided, ZPD/IDZ, pupil’s self-correction, teenage language/swearwords/slang, and fun with language. I added a line at the top to indicate activities in the lesson (e.g., chant, description of picture one). This helped me refer to the different stages and allocate the categories to a sequence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1.30</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2.30</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3.30</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4.30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gconstr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whole class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>write</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>read</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>listen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lang supp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZPD/IDZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps self-correction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teenage lang swearwords</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fun with language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14: Classroom observation table
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The data of such a structured observation table can be converted into numerical data, to indicate how often it occurred during a lesson. I also noted any particular events involving my four participants at the bottom of the column. These allowed me to compare their classroom behaviour to their collaborative work during the tasks. Wragg argues that the combination of both quantitative counting of single occurrences and qualitative notes can be more insightful as pupils ‘can play different roles during lessons’ (2011, p. 5).

Wragg (2011) also points out that the presence of the researcher can impact the classroom situation. As an insider-researcher, teacher at the school, and assistant during the end-of-unit tasks (3.3/3.5), I had become familiar to the class. This insider-researcher role became apparent as soon as Ms Marple changed from classwork to individual work: the children used me as a resource and asked me for help. This did not impede the completion of my observation schedule, though.

A single classroom observation of one hour can only give insights into an isolated event. As mentioned, the lesson had two distinct parts. First, the children described paintings in pairs, and talked about their favourite painting. In the second part, Ms Marple conducted an oral summative assessment with dyads in a group room while the other children worked in their activity book or practised lexis using a computer program. I used my observation schedule to keep a tally of events in each part of the lesson and from this generated a set of numerical data (Appendix 4).

Additional notes about incidents in the first part and my four participants enabled me to ‘look behind and beneath the mere frequencies’ (Wragg, 2011, p. 8). I gained a deeper understanding about my four participants, their working style and motivation in class, and in English.

### 3.10 Questionnaire

As argued above (3.8), the duration of the Swiss COVID-19 lockdown/home-schooling was extended several times in spring 2020 which made the return to school uncertain. I had initially planned to compare the language gains of my four participants with four children from the parallel class who did not do any tasks. Because of unequal opportunities, disruption to schooling and learning during the six weeks of home-schooling during the lockdown (Huber et al., 2020), I decided to alter my research methodology. As online or telephone interviews with 19 children would have been too intrusive in these uncertain times, and too time-consuming, I
opted for a questionnaire which enabled me to obtain information about the children’s views on the task work.

Nunan (2004b) emphasises the importance of clarity of questionnaire objectives. In choosing a questionnaire, I intended to gain a general idea of the children’s attitudes and opinions about the various tasks, the software, collaboration, and sharing of the videos. This in turn informed the interviews (3.6), which were validity checks (Cohen et al., 2007) and facilitated data triangulation (3.14).

Dörnyei (2003) asserts that quantitative questionnaires can measure facts, behaviours or habits, and attitudes. Closed questions present possible responses to gain statistical frequencies (Cohen et al., 2007). These are simple to compare and analyse (Nunan, 2004b). However qualitative, open-ended questions may generate more insightful information. Dörnyei (2003) claims that whilst some theoreticians argue against the use of qualitative and exploratory questionnaires as superficial, a few open-ended questions can lead to insights of new issues. A semi-structured questionnaire can become a robust tool with the inclusion of closed questions and space for comments (Cohen et al., 2007). A logical structure and sequence are important.

Cohen et al.’s (2007) suggestion to use a flowchart helped me generate topics of focus and put them in a logical order. The wording of questions is crucial for primary children who can struggle with reading in their L1: I used short and simple sentences in Standard German, accessible unambiguous language, familiar emoticons (smileys), and refrained from inserting technical terms (Dörnyei, 2003). I altered the wording according to the feedback of the pilot activity which I describe below. I restricted the quantitative items to binary, multiple choice, and rating scale questions. These formats were familiar to the children for giving informal feedback during class. Cohen et al. (2007) argues against uneven numbers in Likert scales because people tend to prefer avoiding the appearance of holding an extreme position and so are likely to opt for a middle value if available. Dörnyei (2003), on the other hand, asserts that few people choose a middle value and relative proportions are not affected; this influenced my choice, and proved true in my questionnaire.

Piloting a questionnaire is vital (Cohen et al., 2007; Nunan, 2004b; Dörnyei, 2003). Dörnyei (2003) recommends a pilot with people similar to the target group. Constrained by lockdown, I was able to recruit five pupils from my own Year 5 class,
who had experience of using ASV, a group of children I supervised in school as their parents were unable to school them at home, and a primary-aged neighbour. I sent the questionnaire as a Microsoft Word document with tick-boxes and dropdown-menus to ensure practicality, clarity, reliability, and content validity. After this piloting, and feedback from teaching colleagues, I simplified the wording, added information to the questions to make the questionnaire more accessible, and shortened the introduction as its length was discouraging for the children. Then I transferred the data onto the online questionnaire Jisc (Jisc, 2021) because Jisc assures security of data. Furthermore, an online questionnaire was more convenient than sending documents back and forth by e-mail, and to simplify everything even more, I generated a short link to send home.

The questionnaire (Appendix 5) was live during the last two weeks of home-schooling. Ms Marple added my cover letter (Appendix 5) with the short link to her weekly workplan and sent it to the parents, so all the parents knew about my questionnaire. Some parents helped the children fill it out and even added their own comments to the open questions. The return rate was 94.7%, i.e., only one child out of nineteen did not respond.

The Jisc software is used to analyse numerical data on multi-item scales. It enabled me to have the raw data/percentages or convert the data into bar or pie charts. For reporting I had to decide which categories made sense to collapse: I added the items above the middle category and the middle category with the lower category because most answers were positive.

Open-ended items need interpretation by the researcher and condensing of the answers into meaningful categories (Dörnyei, 2003). I drew on reflexive TA too and merged similar answers to match them to a code.

Whilst questionnaires can give fast insights into the surface topic, they do not allow for the exploration of complex relationships (Dörnyei, 2003); my questionnaire data were further used to inform the interviews with the participants and the teachers (3.6). It was also a means of data triangulation (3.14).
3.11 Reflexive thematic analysis

Apart from the quantitative answers from the questionnaire and observation sheet, I analysed the qualitative data from the transcripts of the task observations, interviews, and the questionnaire with reflexive thematic analysis (TA).

3.11.1 Justification for adopting reflexive TA

Braun and Clarke (2006) argue that reflexive TA is a flexible and accessible method to analyse various datasets, such as collaboration, or interviews, which enables the identification, analysis, and description of patterns within datasets. By analysing a large data set, data can be arranged to identify commonalities and differences, describe and construe meaning, summarise key insights to generate accessible outcomes, or uncover unforeseen knowledge. This process involves researcher reflection, which is the reason Braun and Clarke have recently refined the name from TA to reflexive TA to highlight ‘the researcher’s subjectivity as analytic resource, and their reflexive engagement with theory, data and interpretation’ (2020, p. 3, emphasis in the original).

I selected reflexive TA because of its accessibility and flexibility for gaining a holistic picture across my data. It allowed me to reflexively connect with the data to generate knowledge and interpret it (Braun and Clarke, 2020; Braun and Clarke, 2019). I rejected statistical methods of quantitative research because they would not fit with my paradigm or my RQs. Furthermore, with systematic coding of observations that measures only frequencies of words or patterns, the richness of the talk is lost, and the focus of even sociocultural discourse analysis which looks at ‘episodes of talk in social context' (Mercer, 2004, p. 141) would only be applicable to the observation of the tasks and partly answer my RQs.

3.11.2 Opportunities and challenges

In reflexive TA the congruence between theory, methods and RQs is important (Braun and Clarke, 2006) for reflexive involvement with the data during the analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2019) to identify patterns of importance or interest within the dataset which answer the RQs (Maguire and Delahunty, 2017). Reflexive TA works with ecological constructivism as it embraces constructionist collaborative meaning-making and sociocultural contexts. Furthermore, reflexive TA enables the researcher to analyse different data sets individually. This can be done deductively, guided by theory, or inductively, by identifying themes in the data (Braun and Clarke, 2006). I used both methods. However, interview questions or RQs should not be
mistaken for themes (Clarke and Braun, 2013). Other fallacies are superficial or inconclusive analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2006). Further challenges are: distrust about the validity, researchers’ dependence on their own assessment, wariness of its flexibility, and lack of rigour (Clarke and Braun, 2013). Fereday and Muir-Cochrane (2006) warn about rigour and adequacy. For rigour, the focus needs to be on the importance of coherence, clarity of theory and research approach, and interpreting the data according to its meaning for the participants. For adequacy, the narrative of the findings and the sample needs to be intelligible and consistent.

To prevent inconsistency and fallacy, I followed Braun and Clarke’s (2006, p. 96) checklist and ensured the following:

- **transcripts**: suitable and detailed enough
- **codes**: equal weighting of data, accurate, comprehensive, and extensive coding process with comparison and probing of themes throughout the dataset to get themes that ‘are internally coherent, consistent, and distinctive’ (Braun and Clarke, 2006, p. 96). While coding reliability TA approaches rely on a fixed codebook from the beginning which makes agreement among multiple researchers possible, in qualitative reflexive TA knowledge is generated through the researcher’s active meaning-making of the subjective situation (Braun and Clarke, 2020).
- **analysis**: full analysis and interpretation of the data which demonstrates the accordance of data and analysis with quotations that support the claims, and elaborates the research neatly
- **overall**: each of the six phases (3.11.3) had enough attention
- **report**: accurate explanation of reflexive TA theory and analysis by a researcher who was clearly engaged in the study, coherence between approach and investigation, narrative and concepts relate logically to epistemology

### 3.11.3 Description of my approach to reflexive TA

I followed Braun and Clarke’s (2020; 2006) six-step guidance because of its rigorous approach to reflexive TA. It starts with the raw data, allowing a holistic and situated analysis. I illustrate the procedure and how I applied the steps.
Phase 1 is getting familiar with the data (Maguire and Delahunt, 2017; Braun and Clarke, 2006). I reflected on the four task afternoons, watched the video-recordings, listened to the audio-recordings, took initial notes, compared them to my reflexive journal, and then started transcribing as described above (3.7). Transcribing, as outlined, is generating meaning and a first act of interpretation (Braun and Clarke, 2006).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T</th>
<th>OK, du seisch: „Can we go to the popcorn stand? (V: 1:31:02; A:1:31:15) Ord denn säg ech: ‘Oh, no. I have not, it’s not...’ Wie seit mer däm, it’s not... fein.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>I don’t like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>I don’t like popcorn. OK. (gets ready to record) OK, du seischs. (presses the record button) (the pop-up window appears again and asks to allow the microphone, T presses the relevant buttons.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Oh! Wenn du ‘nicht erlauben’ drücksch, denn gahts ned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>OK, chumm. OK, lah mech drucke. Lah, tue du trucke. Du seisch: “Can we go to the popcorn stand?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Achtung. (presses the record button) Can we go to the popcorn stand?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Oh, no, I don’t like popcorn. Jetzt (presses the play button, they listen to the recording)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 15: Section of data transcript of audio-/video-recording of a task

In accordance with Maguire and Delahunt (2017) and Braun and Clarke (2006; 2020) in phase 2 I generated initial codes. The coding was done in the language of the transcript and I only translated the extracts contextually for presentation in my thesis, a favoured approach to retain the original language for as long as possible (Cormier, 2018). Coding is itself a form of analysis, as it entails attaching labels to the observations and arranging the data into meaningful units (Braun and Clarke, 2006). I started theoretically with deductive coding, an explicit approach, and selected my codes according to the theory and existing studies (Braun and Clarke, 2020), as deductive analysis begins with knowing the theory (Twining et al., 2017). My prior immersion in the literature helped me generate the deductive codes (Figure 16). However, these need to be clear, consistent, and defined for validity (Cohen et al., 2007) before analysing the data (Fereday and Muir-Cochrane, 2006). In my pilot study I noticed that two codes (‘use of general language support’, ‘English’) needed to be clearly defined and added the definitions to my codebook (Appendix 6). Before and while coding the (next) data, I checked the codebook as ensuring agreement and consistency of the same meaning across the data improves reliability (Cohen et al., 2007; Ryan and Bernard, 2003). I opted for manual coding rather than using software such as NVivo because of the manageable amount of data and highlighted relevant sections of the transcript using a colour-coding system (Figure 16).
Figure 16: Deductive codes

Inductive codes (Figure 17) emerged while coding deductively. This inductive approach allowed me to immerse myself in the data, identify and code all patterns that were of potential or obvious relevance to my research questions (Braun and Clarke, 2006), and pick out critical moments and incidents (Fereday and Muir-Cochrane, 2006). While some codes had an immediate connection to the research questions, others were generated driven entirely by the data. As with deductive codes, defining inductive codes improves reliability for consistent application (Cohen et al., 2007). These in turn were added to the codebook along with their definition (Appendix 6).

Figure 17: Inductive codes
I used coloured crayons to highlight the deductive episodes and a pencil to add the inductive codes in all printed transcripts (Figure 18).

Figure 18: Analysis of data of audio-/video-recording of the task

I then collated the codes identified from the transcripts into a Microsoft Word document using the 'headings' tool to map a code onto a heading, which made it easy to search for their occurrence throughout the data. An extract could appear in several places if it showed more than one phenomenon under investigation, as suggested by Braun and Clarke (2006). Afterwards I attached some initial analysis and thoughts (Figure 19) and went back and forth and added further thoughts to the respective collated codes. My insights were the basis for further investigations in the pre-COVID-19 classroom observation, the questionnaire, and the interviews (Wragg, 2011). These were coded too, and the codes added to the document.
Phase 3 is the generation of initial themes from the coding by allocating the collated codes to themes. This is a ‘creative and active process’ (Braun and Clarke, 2020, p. 16) in which the researcher plays an important role in conceptualising and generating themes which are indicative of their significance to the data and to the RQs (Maguire and Delahunt, 2017). Finding it advantageous to represent them visually, I wrote the insights of the coding onto slips of paper, compared them, checked which ones I could merge, organised them into themes and matched them to the RQs (Figure 20). Furthermore, I compared my findings of the types of talk with my KWIC analysis (3.12).
Figure 20: Identification of themes

Developing and reviewing the themes is done in phase 4. This involved going back to the data set and checking if the themes occur in all of them (internal homogeneity) and if they were valid within the data (external heterogeneity) (Braun and Clarke, 2006). For this reflexive practice I examined the occurrence of the themes in the transcripts of the tasks and interviews, investigated whether they matched the questionnaire and KWIC, and compared them against my classroom observations. I then looked for coherence with the RQs (Figure 21).
In phase 5, it is important to look for 'a central concept' (Braun and Clarke, 2020, p. 13) of the theme. I refined and defined the themes and related them to the RQs (Figure 22). In doing so, it is important to determine the essence of the theme, subthemes, and how they interact (Maguire and Delahunt, 2017). As I organised my report according to the RQs, I allocated the themes to the RQs, defined what they included, and named them. This was the preparation for phase 6, writing the thesis.
3.12 Key words in context

To support my qualitative data analysis for collaboration, I also searched for key words in context (KWIC), a quantitative and confirmatory search for words (Guest et al., 2014) or patterns of language anchored in context (Mercer, 2000).

KWIC are ‘key linguistic features’ (Mercer et al., 1999, p. 104) that afford insights into people’s talk (Ryan and Bernard, 2003). Key words can be found easily (Guest et al., 2014) by use of concordancing software to identify and list all occurrences of particular strings in a text along with their surrounding context. Only the analysis of the context determines the value of the KWIC found. As a result, it is important to manually check any occurrence (Mercer, 2000).

To verify and quantify the deductive analysis of exploratory talk, I translated the six key terms identified by Mercer et al. (1999) into Swiss German and searched for them across the transcripts of the four tasks in my Microsoft Word documents. I manually examined the KWIC identified in my Microsoft Word search and their surrounding words with the definition of exploratory talk (2.7/Appendix 6) and only counted the key words that fit the definition. As the length of the data of audio-/video
recordings of the task is different, for comparison reasons I converted the numbers of their occurrence per ten thousand words (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KWIC total number</th>
<th>1st task September 2019</th>
<th>2nd task November 2019</th>
<th>3rd task January 2020</th>
<th>4th task May 2020 (after the COVID-19 lockdown)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>number of words in the data</td>
<td>15,822</td>
<td>22,397</td>
<td>22,291</td>
<td>18,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will (because)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ich/dank/glau/b/find (I think)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>du (you) in questions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wersum/wieso (why)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wie (how)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was (what)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KWIC occurrence per 10,000 words in the data</th>
<th>1st task September 2019</th>
<th>2nd task November 2019</th>
<th>3rd task January 2020</th>
<th>4th task May 2020 (after the COVID-19 lockdown)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>will (because)</td>
<td>3.160</td>
<td>7.560</td>
<td>9.420</td>
<td>4.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ich/dank/glau/b/find (I think)</td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td>3.125</td>
<td>7.177</td>
<td>11.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>du (you) in questions</td>
<td>5.056</td>
<td>4.464</td>
<td>5.383</td>
<td>14.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wersum/wieso (why)</td>
<td>3.792</td>
<td>5.004</td>
<td>6.972</td>
<td>8.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wie (how)</td>
<td>3.792</td>
<td>8.036</td>
<td>13.458</td>
<td>12.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was (what)</td>
<td>12.640</td>
<td>9.378</td>
<td>23.776</td>
<td>19.515</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: KWIC analysis

**3.13 Analysis of audience design**

Audience design is a sociolinguistic theory that shows how speakers adapt their language to their audience needs, expectations, and reactions (Bell, 1984). This analysis came into play as the analysis of the video-/audio-recordings of the children working on their tasks and the feedback sessions revealed the need to demonstrate the children’s means and development of audience design throughout the year, as they actively designed their videos to accommodate them to their peers and teacher, and responded to their reactions (Sargeant and Tagg, 2014; Bell, 1984). For my ASV context, audience design comprises language, paralanguage, and multimodal technology.

Bell demonstrates that speakers adapt their speaking according to the reactions of the audience as ‘the interrelation of interspeaker variation, intraspeaker variation, and linguistic evaluation is crucial evidence on the derivation and nature of style shift’ (1984, p. 150). This response can lead to an accommodation to the audience to enhance understanding, identification and bonding (Sargeant and Tagg, 2014).
Furthermore, social interaction can generate the construction of identity (Lee, 2014; Page, 2014) that results in self-presentation. This identity can be purposefully constructed for an audience or for the individual himself/herself.

Audience design or identity construction can be achieved through, for example, choice of music styles, behaviour, narrative, wordplay (Deumert, 2014), or by drawing on linguistic choices (Lee, 2014). These can include vocal ranges, context (Seargeant and Tagg, 2014), or emphasis (Vásquez, 2014), and in digital spaces by drawing on multimodality (Deumert, 2014), orthography (Lee, 2014), font, layout, and emoticons (Leppänen et al., 2014). These multimodal resources can replace mime and gesture, and support understanding in a mainly informal digital community (Seargeant and Tagg, 2014). While the message of these resources has to match the meaning (Page, 2014), they can be creatively mixed and modified which can empower identity and foster agency, or limit the message as being incomprehensible to an unintended audience (Leppänen et al., 2014). This can be achieved by choosing a specific utterance, reference, or language in a multilingual group.

Alignment and creating a socioculturally meaningful product can strengthen the bond to a group and can be culturally meaningful (Leppänen et al., 2014). Vásquez suggests that referring to popular characters or using insider knowledge is a plea for group membership and can build identity at the same time. Humour plays an important role too: it is performed by people ‘who do not take themselves too seriously’ (2014, p. 83), with puns, jokes, or by funny multimodal arrangements (Deumert, 2014).

Watching, listening to, and transcribing the video/audio-recordings of collaborative task work prior to the feedback session, made me aware of deliberate choices or changes in language and multimodality, and analysing the transcripts of the task-observations revealed the children’s wordplay for the respective task/video. Keeping in mind the feedback they received such as ‘cool photo’ (Figure 34) while comparing and analysing the video series, allowed me to see their development in audience design during the year.

3.14 Triangulation

As this chapter has shown, I have applied different methods and drawn on different data. That is to say, I have aimed for triangulation. This can enhance credibility and
trustworthiness (Twining et al., 2017). Patton (1999) asserts that different methods can uncover different features and employing different methods to collect and analyse data are advantageous. Qualitative and quantitative methods can be used complementarily to reveal different findings or evaluate consistency which can improve reliability. Based on this, triangulation of data provides quality control of the information gathered by comparing the data and checking the truthfulness and consistency of it.

To enhance credibility and trustworthiness, I have drawn on the following analytic processes of triangulation:

- **data triangulation**: using different data from different participants or in different settings or at different times (Santiago-Delefosse et al., 2016)
- **method triangulation**: using multiple methods to collect data (Santiago-Delefosse et al., 2016; O’Brien et al., 2014; Kuper et al., 2008)

As a single researcher I collected and analysed the data myself and did not apply investigator triangulation (Costley et al., 2013; Elliott et al., 1999). Furthermore, I did not make use of participant checking, i.e., giving participants the opportunity to comment on transcripts and emerging findings (Santiago-Delefosse et al., 2016; O’Brien et al., 2014; Tong et al., 2007; Elliott et al., 1999) because the children would have been overwhelmed with the data, and the teachers declined my offer for them to read and check the transcripts or my work.

### 3.15 Ethics

In my research with children, I focused on their needs, ensuring their well-being, and seeing them as competent and knowledgeable participants.

Having decided that the innovative aspects of DST in English as L2 were worthy of research, and that my methodology and methods were appropriate for my research questions and for children, it then remained necessary to justify carrying out the study with my participants. My understanding of the ethical issues involved in conducting research with young children (rather than on them) has been formed particularly by the ideas of Mortari and Harcourt (2012), Pascal and Bertram (2012), Waller and Bitou (2011), and Flewitt (2005). These and my further reading (e.g., BERA, 2018) informed my application to the Open University’s Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC/3292/Lustenberger) (Appendix 7).
While I conducted the pilot study in my English class, the search for a participating class for the main study took some time. Despite the feeling of obligation to participate (Costley et al., 2013; Flewitt, 2005), colleagues initially declined mainly citing workload. Eventually, Ms Marple, her elective pseudonym, agreed under the condition I did all the administration and teaching of the tasks, and the work with ASV and the laptops. Having gained her agreement, I sought ethical approval at the Open University. After this was granted, I informed the school’s Senior Leadership team about the main study to gain their permission.

In August 2019, I introduced my research to Ms Marple’s class and the control group, which was the parallel class, as I had initially intended to compare language gains with pre-/post-tests. I handed out an information sheet (Appendix 8) and a letter of assent/consent for the children and their caregivers (Appendix 9) as both needed to agree (Hammersley, 2015). Some parents declined participation because they rejected having any data stored and kept online, even if it is in a secure location in Switzerland, others objected to data involving their child being collected, and others were opposed to their children’s image being captured in photos or videos. I accepted these parents’ wishes and adhered to them.

Having selected similar participants of both classes (3.4), I explained the selection process to the children. I took care to negotiate ongoing consent, established a dialogic relationship with the participants and their classmates, and responded sensitively to their reactions (Flewitt, 2005) by taking the time to talk to them and assisting them. My participants were interested in the recording equipment, which I encouraged them to investigate so that they became familiar with it and it became less of a negatively distracting factor in the observation period. The camera did not ‘disappear’ as is sometimes claimed in accounts of this type of research. On the contrary, in each session they checked the focus of the video camera, examined the voice recorder settings, and even asked me to adjust the camera’s positioning if they had accidentally moved it. It seemed to me that their conscious engagement with the equipment empowered them and our relationship, and improved my documentation (Waller and Bitou, 2011). This observation is supported by reflexive comments in my research journal.

Given the importance of open dialogic communication (Flewitt, 2005), I continuously told my participants what I did with the recordings, and showed them data of audio/video-recordings of the tasks, parts of which they read. This information of my intentions and progress of my sensitive approach (Costley et al., 2013) animated
the two dyads to have a competition as to which of them could produce more words than the other in the course of the afternoon as mentioned earlier (3.5). I witnessed it on the recordings, they told me and wanted to know the number of words that had been used. Furthermore, informal talks during the lessons or in the playground allowed me to learn from and about them and made them part of the research process (Flewitt, 2005). This rapport enabled collaboration, and joint construction (Waller and Bitou, 2011), and my focus on the children working in their context, a sociocultural view (Hammersley, 2015), is in line with my paradigm of ecological constructivism (3.1).

Flewitt, (2005) also inspired me to have the participants choose their own pseudonyms, which they enjoyed a lot. I negotiated their choice throughout the study as I wanted to ensure as much anonymity and confidentiality as possible which is difficult in a case study approach (Richards, 2011; Burton, 2000) (3.2.3). Lomax (2015) even argues its impossibility but suggests protecting identification while telling their story. Hence, for dissemination I avoided information that would identify them and changed all the personal data in the transcripts and videos (Boase and Humphreys, 2018; Flewitt, 2005). Furthermore, I kept them informed about my findings and presentations.

Regarding data, all hard copies collected have been kept in a locked drawer in my home and the other data on a password-protected memory stick and uploaded on a Swiss cloud which operates under Swiss law. I will keep them until the project is completed and only anonymised data will be stored for further research, so confidentiality is guaranteed (HREC/3292/Lustenberger).

Being used to several teachers in the class, the children embraced me as another teacher at the school and assistant for the ASV projects. The first task and the introduction of another task on open days enabled the parents to see my work. This was helpful for me during the Swiss COVID-19 state school closure from 16 March to 10 May 2020 when at the beginning of the Swiss lockdown, two guardians of my four participants declined video-/audio-recording at home or at school because of risk of contagion, which I understood and respected (Flewitt, 2005). Offering continuous negotiation (Lomax, 2015), I valued the wellbeing of my participants higher than my self-interest (Murray, 1992) and was sensitive to making demands at a time when people were anxious about the COVID-19 virus and the lockdown. My ongoing ethical approval proved valuable (Mortari and Harcourt, 2012) and all
but one parent of the whole class supported my request to fill out a questionnaire in April/May 2020.

While outsider research might be more objective, as an insider I knew the rules and regulations of the canton and the school. According to Costley et al. (2013) my insider knowledge was valuable, especially within a sociocultural approach, but I sought for other perspectives from the participants and the teachers. Interviewing colleagues can be a delicate issue. Based on this, I appreciated Ms Marple’s initial sceptical stance towards the research project and asked her about it in the interview which I elaborate on below (5.1). In my journal I reflected on my insider relationship throughout the research process, which helped me mitigate subjectivity, though subjectivity is inevitably prevalent in qualitative research as the researcher interprets the data and tells the story (Costley et al., 2013), and intended in reflexive TA as ‘the reflexive, conceptual bases for knowledge generation processes and practices’ (Braun and Clarke, 2019, p. 591). According to Cohen et al. (2007) my researcher-researched relationship was more one of equality than distance – the characteristics of insider research. This can be powerful for bringing about change in the setting (6.4).

3.16 Conclusion

This chapter discussed my holistic view of the research context with ecological constructivism (3.1) as my research paradigm, and sought to capture the relationship of individual and collaborative thought processes in their respective environment (Lam and Kramsch, 2003). I justified my case study design (3.2), my research design (3.3), selection of participants (3.4), and choice of data collection methods and analysis which were observation of my four participants creating four digital stories (3.5), one semi-structured interview with the children in their dyads and the teachers individually (3.6), and the transcription of this data (3.7). I then considered the implications of the Swiss COVID-19 lockdown (3.8) on my methodology for selecting additional methods: a single classroom observation (3.9), and a pupil questionnaire (3.10). I described my data analysis of reflexive TA (3.11), key words in context (3.12), audience design (3.13), and outlined triangulation of method and data (3.14). Finally, I examined ethical issues (3.15). The next chapter illustrates my findings in relation to my three RQs (2.2).
Chapter 4 Findings

In this chapter I address my research questions (2.2) and present the main findings from the analysis of:

- transcripts of my audio-/video-recordings of two Swiss Year 4 dyads aged ten, Tina and Fritzli, and Hansli and Momo creatively completing four speaking tasks in English as L2 classes using online software during the academic year 2019/20
- a classroom observation of an English lesson prior to the Swiss COVID-19 lockdown
- answers to a questionnaire during the COVID-19 lockdown with all the nineteen children of the class (return rate: 18/19)
- transcripts of audio-recordings of one interview per dyad
- a transcript of an audio-recording of one interview with the Year 4 class/English teacher, Ms Marple
- a transcript of an audio-recording of one interview with the Year 5 class/English teacher, Ms Maloney

I have organised the results in line with the RQs describing and discussing the findings of opportunities and challenges in oral L2 DST (4.1), effects of DST on oracy (4.2), and the support of L1 in oral L2 DST (4.3). I illustrate the findings drawing on the data mentioned above. The results are evident across the data from all four end-of-unit tasks, but for the ease of presentation I answer each RQ in turn drawing on samples from data of audio-/video-recording of the task from a single (but different) end-of-unit task each time. I summarise the task before answering the RQ.

Note on identification of the languages in the transcripts:

- English (normal print)
- Swiss German (in italics with the English translation on the right)
- Standard German (in bold with the English translation on the right)
- collaborative ASV tasks are in a table
- interviews without gridlines
- ASV recordings without gridlines and indented
4.1 RQ1: What are the opportunities and challenges in teaching oral DST?

4.1.1 Can oral DST promote oracy? If so, how can it be used to do so effectively?

I answer RQ1.1 drawing on the data of the audio-/video-recording of the unit 1 task, conducted in November 2019. In this unit, the children learnt the names of attractions/stalls and things commonly found at a fun-fair (Figure 23). These were prominent throughout the unit and related to the CLIL topic on the five senses. For the task, the children had to suggest and justify going to two attractions/stalls, which their partner had to decline giving a reason, and then they had to agree on a third option (Appendix 10).

![Five sensational senses](image)

Figure 23: Unit 1: Five sensational senses (Arnet-Clark and Stampfli-Vienny, 2010, pp. 2-3), reproduced with permission

4.1.1.1 Structure of the task
The task sheets contained the aims, helped the children plan the task and assign roles, provided a model skeleton dialogue, a list of useful words and chunks, and
the KWIC (Appendix 10-Appendix 14). They enabled several levels of differentiation by:

- **quantity**: number of slides, longer/shorter texts
- **quality**: amount of language support to integrate
- **level**: core, additional, and extended aims (Kanton Zug, 2011)
- **open-end**: level of variation by the task, and ASV

This framework (Appendix 10) enabled the pupils to complete the task successfully. Moreover, the task also allowed them the creative flexibility to include their own ideas. Both dyads took advantage of the structure and adaptability as this example of Tina shows (**Swiss German**, **Standard German**, English):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tina</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Also, ech fröge</strong>: ‘Hey, let’s talk about the fair.’ <strong>Da chasch du luege.</strong> ‘Shall we go there together on Sunday? Oh, yes, that’s a great idea. <em>Who should we go to?’</em>*</td>
<td><strong>Ja, und denn tüemmer so afa diskutiere.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| OK, I’m going to ask, ‘Hey, let’s talk about the fair.’ **Look here.** ‘Shall we go there together on Sunday? Oh, yes, that’s a great idea. *Who should we go to?’ Yes, and then we’re going to start our discussion. |

To start, Tina followed the model structure they had been given and set the basis for the choice of attractions/stalls and ways of justifying their choice. They were able to draw on their own language resources flexibly or use the language support offered, which proved a successful option, and together with the flexible task design and framework, they had both structure and adaptability (Goh and Burns, 2012). The ASV software supported their learning: as it limits the recording time to a maximum of thirty seconds, the children could only record short dialogues. On the other hand, they quickly had a sense of accomplishment, which kept them engrossed in the activity.

I designed the end-of-unit tasks to revise the content from the unit and provide opportunities for further practice in using the lexis and structures, which are the building blocks of YL TBL (Cameron, 2001). This empowered the children to recycle the language acquired during English classes, language they were familiar with, and they could demonstrate their knowledge of the L2. The additional language support on the task sheet enabled them to stretch themselves, add variety, and personalise the video. This mixture of drawing on their prior knowledge and offering extended language support proved effective and made language learning more than just
teaching lexis and structures, as I illustrate in section 4.1.2.3. Furthermore, it was motivating for the children.

4.1.1.2 Motivation

The studies included in my literature review (2.1.1), most of them short-term, mention the motivating factors of children’s activities with ICT (Kirsch and Bes Izuel, 2019; Dausend, 2017; Sun et al., 2017; Pellerin, 2014). In my research the motivation persisted throughout the year as the children took ownership of the product. Working on the tasks on laptops, both dyads became absorbed in their work. They even forgot to take the afternoon break. On one occasion, Momo and Hansli were so focused on their project that they only noticed it must have been time for play time when they realised it was silent on the corridor:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hansli</th>
<th>(stands up and looks through the glass window in the door)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Momo</td>
<td>Hey, es esch scho, es esch scho… Hey, it’s already, it’s already…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansli</td>
<td>Füf ab.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Momo</td>
<td>Äbe. Wärs ned schlauer, wemmer würded gah?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansli</td>
<td>Ja, stimmt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Momo</td>
<td>Chumm, mer gönd.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite being told to leave for play time or tidy up at the end of the lessons, they continued working. They added final touches, selected another music track, altered the layout, and even recorded an extra slide. In contrast, at the end of the observed lesson, when the children worked in their English activity book and did English vocabulary drills on a computer, they started tidying up as soon as the lesson ended. In the interview, Momo and Hansli reflected that the project was something special that gave them a reason to speak English, and that they enjoyed working on the laptop. So, their motivation was evident both explicitly from what they said, and implicitly from their behaviour:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AL</th>
<th>Was esch eigentlech öichi Motivation gsi, da mitzmache?</th>
<th>What actually motivated you to join in?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Momo</td>
<td>Ech find…</td>
<td>I find…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansli</td>
<td>Ja, ech ha chönne Änglisch rede.</td>
<td>Yes, I could speak English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Momo</td>
<td>Das esch be mer ä so gsi ond denn han ech guet [gfunde…]</td>
<td>That was the same for me and then I liked the fact…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansli</td>
<td>[Ech has] lustig [gfunde…]</td>
<td>I found it fun…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Momo</td>
<td>[…wills halt] öppis Speziells [esch].</td>
<td>…that it was something special.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansli</td>
<td>[…mit em Laptop] schaffe.</td>
<td>…working on the laptop.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Not only was the motivation of the participants very high, but the children in general liked the ASV tasks at school as Figure 24 shows. More than 83% (15/18) of the children enjoyed the work. When asked to give reasons for their enjoyment they said they liked selecting the images and working together best. In their dyad they could autonomously design their own video within the task requirements.

Figure 24: How did you like the work with ASV at school?

The children also took responsibility for their own learning. They worked autonomously on their presentations, drew on the support provided, but also chose their own way of expression within the task frame. For example, Fritzli and Tina simplified the structure given (I would like to…/Why don’t we…/We could…/I suggest that…) (Appendix 10) to match their needs and make the talk manageable.

By drawing on individualised expressions, they took ownership of their own product:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tina</th>
<th>Ond de säged mer nachher: “Oh, yes, we go on the hotdog stand. It’s so, it’s so… I love, it’s my favourite food, hotdogs.’ OK, säged mer da: ‘Can we go to?’ Ond de seisch du: ‘Oh, no, it’s so sticky.’ OK?</th>
<th>And then we say, “Oh, yes, we go on the hotdog stand. It’s so, it’s so… I love, it’s my favourite food, hotdogs.’ OK, say here, ‘Can we go to (inaudible, must be candyfloss)?’ And then you say, ‘Oh, no, it’s so sticky.’ OK?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fritzli</td>
<td>Nei, ech säge eifach: ‘Oh, no, it’s so sweet.’</td>
<td>No, I’ll just say, ‘Oh, no, it’s so sweet.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>[Nei.] sticky, das esch luschtig. sticky.</td>
<td>No, sticky, that’s funny. (laughs) sticky.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fritzli</td>
<td>Stick-y.</td>
<td>Stick-y. (plays with the word, laughs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this extract, Fritzli played with the word *sticky*. He experimented with the pitch, elongated, and shortened the vowel sound, and finally said it exaggeratedly. This playfulness with the language in L1 and L2 appeared in both dyads as the control of language was handed over to the children and it motivated them to produce a better presentation, whilst there was little room for this kind of playfulness in guided classroom instruction.

4.1.1.3 **Audience**

The above-mentioned flexibility of the task sheet facilitated individualised learning. The software (1.5) empowered the children to focus on the product, but also to build this playfulness with language into their presentation, which they tailored to their audience. As seen above, Fritzli rejected going to the candyfloss stand, and they decided to go to the hot dog stand together. In order to achieve an effective ending, on the last slides of their video they spoke the text together, and Tina took the audience straight to the hotdog stand by pretending to munch a hotdog and simultaneously expressing with her intonation how delicious it was:

Tina and Fritzli  
**Come on, let’s go to the hotdog stand.**

Tina  
**Mmh, mmh, yummy, hotdogs. Mmh.**

Hansli and Momo also tailored their videos to the audience. Momo reflected on their audience design in the interview:

Momo  
**Ond mier händ au gwüsst, wie s Programm gaht. Ond mier händs denn au mit vill Müeh luschtig chönne mache.**  

And we also knew how to work with the software. And that meant we could put a lot of effort into making it funny.
Momo and Hansli, who are good friends, always injected some humour into their presentations. Seeing themselves as ‘big boys’, they had themselves refusing to go on the rollercoaster saying they would get sick on it – which is not true – and opted for the merry-go-round – for which they are too old – but jokingly justified their choice because the merry-go-round has such cool music:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Momo</th>
<th>Tüemer so öppis merry-go-round.</th>
<th>Let’s do something merry-go-round.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hansli</td>
<td>(slaps his left hand on his forehead)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Momo</td>
<td>De lached sech alli, weisch, wie esch das doof.</td>
<td>Then everyone will (die) laughing, you know, that’s so daft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansli</td>
<td>Die send eifach alli voll obe.</td>
<td>They’re all from above. (commenting on pictures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Momo</td>
<td>De lached sie sech weisch wie voll tot. Wette.</td>
<td>They’ll totally die laughing. Wanna bet?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansli</td>
<td>(laughs) (inaudible)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Momo</td>
<td>Weisch, mier bem merry-go-round. Ja, weisch wie luschtig.</td>
<td>You know, us two going on the merry-go-round. That’s so funny.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These examples show that their autonomy fostered a sense of ownership of the task and product and enabled them to demonstrate their awareness of an intended audience, something difficult to achieve for YL L2 in free speaking classes, and not witnessed by the Year 5 teacher, Ms Maloney. By having an audience, in this case their classmates and their teacher, the children were motivated to perform well. As a result, they set their aims high and rehearsed the dialogue until it lived up to their
expectations. By repeatedly rehearsing the talk for the recording, they practised lexis and structures without noticing. What otherwise might have been a dry drill became a dynamic performance. Putting the focus on language, skills, and strategies (step four of the teaching speaking cycle (Figure 9) by Goh and Burns (2012)), allowed me to give feedback during the break and the children were then able to improve their recording afterwards. I elaborate on this further below (4.1.2.3).

4.1.2 What kind of prior knowledge is required to negotiate meaning during DST speaking tasks with presentation software? How can this prior knowledge be built and fostered?

The section above illustrated that prior knowledge of the material the task is based on, language, and ICT are decisive. I discuss the findings for RQ 1.2 regarding the requirement, building and fostering of prior knowledge by drawing on the data of the audio-/video-recording of the unit 5 task (Appendix 13). This was the last unit studied, following the return from the COVID-19 lockdown from 16 March to 10 May 2020. In anticipation of the summer holidays, the CLIL-unit revolved around travelling (Figure 26). The children learnt the lexis of means of transport, the relevant prepositions, and places to go. Hence, in the task, they asked each other about their (imaginary) holiday plans which was sad given the fact that travelling was severely restricted because of COVID-19, which they commented on themselves during the task.
Task requirements

The flexibility of the task, its structure and approach with the software again fostered individualised learning and the creation of an individualised product by embedding language learning in a situated context (Lafford, 2009), congruent to my paradigm ecological constructivism. The task also posed challenges and involved the pupils in negotiation processes. Because of COVID-19 and restricted travelling, Tina and Fritzli were unsure about their choice of destination. As their initial search for pictures of the Alpli (a place on the local Mount Zug) on ASV was unsuccessful, they reverted to the places they had researched during COVID-19 home-schooling. Momo and Hansli were also indecisive. Momo commented during the task:

| Momo       | Mmh, but, das ist irgendwie dumm, weil es gibt jetzt gar keine so holiday wegen Coronazeit. | Mmh, but, it seems a bit stupid, because there aren’t any holidays because of coronavirus. |

Finally, Hansli decided to go on a safari in Africa because they would find cool pictures for their presentation, a choice that points to their audience design (4.1.1.3/5.3). As Momo had forgotten that the task instructions ask each child to talk
about their holiday plans, he spontaneously opted for the Iguazu Falls in South America. In previous tasks the dyads had sometimes planned the whole task at the beginning and altered the speaking underway. Sometimes they had planned the task along the way, especially if they had forgotten their task sheet or the task did not necessarily require making preparatory notes.

Their flexibility might have also derived from the fact that they could hardly remember the basic information of my introduction which happened a week prior to the task when I introduced the aims, the task, and the language support. The amount of information proved overwhelming and too strenuous for their attention span, and resulted in their rather spontaneous planning and disregard of the actual aims as Momo confirmed in the interview:

**AL** No einisch zo de Task zrugg, uhm, ech ha die i Grund-Zuesatz- ond Zündstoff iteilt. Esch das hilfrich gsi?

**Momo** Mier händ das gar nöd gmerkt. Back to the task, uhm, I divided them into core, additional, and extended aims. Was that helpful?

Momo’s comment is in accordance with the class teacher’s attitude: the aims seem rather incidental, not a mainstay in her teaching:

**Ms Marple** Ja, also mier tüend eifach, uhm... eifach d Lernziel abgäh jewils vo Ferie zu Ferie. Uhm, ja, ech weiss ned, öb sech, d Chind sech jetzt extrem a däm orientiered. Also, ech be mängisch, ech ha s Gefühl, sie möched eifach.

**Ms Marple** Yes, we just hand out the learning aims for the term. Uhm, yes, I don’t know if the children really use them for orientation. I am, I have the feeling they just get on with it.

The cantonal guidance put a big emphasis on the pupils knowing what the learning aims are for every unit. Teachers are expected to distribute them at the beginning of a unit and the children reflect on their achievement at the end of a unit.

Nevertheless, successful collaboration was ensured through the children reaching a common understanding. Their negotiation of the outcome was guided by the internal dynamic of their friendship rather than the external expectation on the task sheet. They all live close to each other and get on well. Hansli and Momo mentioned in the interview that they were best friends and often played together. For them, reaching a common understanding seemed important for their work together. Tina reflected that the task required them to work as a dyad, but they naturally found it
easier to work together anyway. This is in accordance with results of the class questionnaire (Figure 27) comparing working collaboratively on the ASV activity in school with working individually on ASV at home during the COVID-19 lockdown: Nearly half of the class (44.4% or 8/18) preferred collaboration while 27.8% (5/18) enjoyed working alone and another 27.8% (5/18) were undecided. They reasoned that collaboration was more fun and easier as they could help each other while it was easier to concentrate at home because of the quiet surrounding.

Figure 27: Preference of ASV work

4.1.2.2 Collaboration during the tasks
According to Mercer (1995) the joint agreeing on a set of ground rules makes effective on-task collaboration more likely and this principle was an integral part of my research. We set aside time to discuss them at the start of the academic year and the children readily produced an agreed set which I put together with them on a poster (Figure 28). Their rules accord with the ones by Mercer (e.g., Fernández et al., 2015; Mercer et al., 1999).
Although the children officially knew the rules, they initially did not have the tools to operate collaboratively as the application of the rules was not practised and the poster with the collated rules did not make it on to the wall. Hence, I explicitly taught them the language that would indicate they were doing so and added the key words that would be useful for successful negotiation and whose use would indicate exploratory talk and effective collaboration to the task sheets. Originally, Mercer et al. (1999) identified these KWIC to indicate the presence of exploratory talk by examining changes from pre- to post-intervention-tests. I had decided against including quantitative pre- and post-tests in my design for pragmatic reasons, but my qualitative analysis of the data of audio-/video-recordings of the tasks revealed improvement in reasoning from one task to the next apart from the post-COVID-19 task. The quantitative analysis (Table 2) as discussed in 3.12 confirms and specifies these qualitative findings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KWIC occurrence per 10,000 words in the data</th>
<th>1st task September 2019</th>
<th>2nd task November 2019</th>
<th>3rd task January 2020</th>
<th>4th task May 2020 (after the COVID-19 lockdown)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>will (because)</td>
<td>3.160</td>
<td>7.590</td>
<td>9.420</td>
<td>4.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>echt dank/glaub/find (I think)</td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td>3.125</td>
<td>7.177</td>
<td>11.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>du (you) in questions</td>
<td>5.056</td>
<td>4.464</td>
<td>5.383</td>
<td>14.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wem/wes (why)</td>
<td>3.792</td>
<td>5.804</td>
<td>8.972</td>
<td>8.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wie (how)</td>
<td>3.792</td>
<td>8.036</td>
<td>13.458</td>
<td>12.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was (what)</td>
<td>12.640</td>
<td>9.378</td>
<td>23.776</td>
<td>19.515</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: KWIC occurrence per ten thousand words of data from recordings of the tasks

The children’s talk changed considerably with the focus on justifying their reasons. Over this period, they posed significantly more questions using a question word,
which in turn fostered further expansion on their own reasoning. Their use of *because* tripled, and *I think* increased tenfold. This accords with Mercer's (1995) findings that explicit teaching of how to ‘do’ effective talk and providing opportunities to practise the language associated with negotiated reasoning around a meaningful task, improves productive collaboration.

By contrast, in the post-COVID-19 task, the use of question words and *because* decreased while the children were focused on the person (*I/you*). Noticeable is the direct use of *you* in questions which nearly tripled after the lockdown suggesting they were exhibiting great interest in their partner’s opinion and they listened more carefully to each other. This marked increase of *you* coincides with Hansli’s remark during the interview that the thing he liked best about school after the lockdown was seeing his friends, which is in agreement with literature stating that the children missed their peers during home-schooling (BKD, 2020; Huber et al., 2020), while all four mentioned that their motivation for school had decreased. This situation persisted with the return to school after the summer holidays. In response, Ms Maloney, their Year 5 teacher, mentioned that because she had witnessed the division of labour in the pair-/groupwork and the children’s ignorance of each other’s remarks in general, she made collaboration a focus in German lessons to strengthen effective cooperation in all subjects.

4.1.2.3 **Language use**

The flexibility of the tasks (4.1.1) enabled the children to take ownership of their work as they could draw on their prior knowledge, but also use the structure and *chunking* examples provided in the support materials I had created. The language support consisted of *chunks*, formulaic expressions, and sentence starters. Both dyads elaborated in the interview that they had made little use of the language support:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AL</th>
<th>Fritzli</th>
<th>Tina</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What I wrote, so sentences you could use, or did you use your sentences?</td>
<td>We have ours</td>
<td>Yes, we picked bits and pieces from the sentences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Was ech gschiibe ha, so Sätz won ihr hend chönne bruche, oder hånd ihr öich Sätz bruucht?</em></td>
<td><em>Mier hånd [üsi...]</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ja,</em> mier hånd also so einzelni Sache us de Sätz no echli usepickt.*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The audio-/video-recording data suggests that the task design made them rely on the language support to guide them through the task as they had to ask each other where they went to and how they went there:
Ms Marple appreciated the language support, a perceived shortcoming of the textbook:

Ms Marple Uhm… Ja. Ond was ech lässig finde, isch de Language Support, ech ha s Gfühl, vo däm hends rächt chönne profitiere. Ech ha s Gfühl, das fällt mängisch au im Young World wie eso echli konkreti Sätz was chönnd sie überhaupt säge. Oder ja, eso echli de Language Support. Eifach, was chammer i welne Situatione säge. Hani s Gfühl, händs au rächt profitiert vo dem.

Yes, and what I really liked is the language support, I think they took advantage of it. I think, this is also lacking in Young World, concrete sentences they could use. Or yes, language support. Just what you could say in which situations. I think, they benefited a lot from it.

This data suggests the importance of language support for teaching and learning. The children’s prior knowledge of the L2 paired with the language support provided became a meaningful tool to express their needs and even emotions in an L2 and personalise their presentation. Not only was the oral proficiency important, but also the written one – in both languages. The children looked up words or listened to the pronunciation using online dictionaries. In addition, they had to make sure their spelling was correct when searching for a photo. Looking for a photo of the sea, they typed in the homophone ‘see’ and ended up with pictures of seeing:

Ms Marple Mees isch eigentlech i jedem sin, jedem sine. Jede Lieblingsort vo Meer. S – E – E, falls es nonig weisch. Esch eigentlech… Was, send die tumm?

Sea is the one of everyone. The favourite place of everyone. S – E – E, if you still don’t get it. Is just… What? Are they stupid?

Yes, and probably if they’ve seen the sea.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Momo</th>
<th>Jetzt tuesch zerscht da mal stah ond frage: ‘What do you do?’</th>
<th>Now you have to ask, ‘What do you do?’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hansli</td>
<td>I go to Africa, bro.</td>
<td>I go to Africa, bro.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansli</td>
<td>Yes, I go per- by Lamborghini Veneno. Ja, ech säge: ‘I go by, per, per…’</td>
<td>Yes, I go per- by Lamborghini Veneno. Yes, I’ll say, ‘I go by, per, per…’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Momo</td>
<td>Nei, by.</td>
<td>No, by.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansli</td>
<td>I go by Lamborghini Veneno.</td>
<td>I go by Lamborghini Veneno.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I was able to correct any major oral or written errors through my feedback, in line with step four of the teaching speaking cycle by Goh and Burns (2012)/Figure 9. The children read my written feedback and I made sure that I explained it to each dyad. While the pupils were sometimes reluctant to rerecord a slide because it meant additional work, the class teacher appreciated the feedback as it improved the recording.

Figure 29: Fritzli and Tina collaborating

4.1.2.4 ICT

In the questionnaire, 83.3% of the children (15/18) said that ASV was (very) easy to use (Figure 30). The reason for this stems from the fact that ASV has a clear and accessible interface with conventional icons, which makes the software easy to understand and use. This simplicity allowed the children to figure out features if needed as Momo confirmed during the interview:

Momo  Ja, eifach d Erklärig am Afang ond nachhär gfindt mer eigentlech fascht alles sälber use. Also so s Grundzüg, wie gaht mer e Foti go hole…

Yes, just an explanation at the beginning, and then it’s quite easy to find out things. Just the basics, how to get a photo…
The children integrated their general knowledge of how to work on a computer, and gradually what they had learnt during the year, e.g., the use of the laptop pen, the tablet mode, checking the battery status, and touch typing. At the beginning, they needed a lot of support after initial problems with the built-in microphone, and the weak Wi-Fi also caused problems. However, these were speedily resolved.

More challenging was the rooming, as they needed a quiet space to do the recording, and small group rooms were scarce. More than two groups in one room or on the corridor caused background noise and impacted on the quality of the recording. Ms Marple suggested she would do the tasks in groups, i.e., one group works on ASV tasks in the corridor and in the group rooms, while the others complete English activities in the classroom. This shows that a shift to incorporating ICT in lessons is likely to involve a shift in classroom organisation and pedagogy, something teachers may be reluctant to try or lack the resourcing (staff and rooming) to do. Teachers may need to be persuaded that the potential benefits outweigh the challenges.

4.2 RQ2: What is the effect of task-based speaking practice on pupil’s overall speaking proficiency in DST applying the teaching speaking cycle?

Originally, I intended to compare the oracy of the four participants with four children from the parallel class by applying pre-/post-tests using Lingualevel, an independent
Swiss tool to evaluate foreign language competences. For reasons outlined earlier, COVID-19 made this inappropriate. In their research about challenges in education during coronavirus, Huber et al. (2020) report a student-reported median of twenty hours per week of academic work (all grades), whilst teaching staff estimated that pupils only worked about eleven to thirteen hours per week at home as compared with the twenty to twenty-nine hours primary children would normally spend in school and on homework. Moreover, the quality and amount of home-schooling varied, and learners’ diligence and opportunities differed, the latter confirmed by BKD (2020). As a result, I had to base my findings on the children’s responses in the questionnaire, answers in the interviews with participants, the class teacher, and the Year 5 teacher.

In the questionnaire 77.8% of the children (14/18) mentioned that the online tasks had improved their English (Figure 31). The other four children may have perceived little or no change in their spoken English as they are either native or fluent speakers or have an English-speaking friendship group:

![Figure 31: Has working with ASV tasks improved your English?](image)

These 14 children also identified the areas of improvement (Figure 32) and mentioned that their general self-confidence was boosted. Apart from improvements in speaking, six pupils felt more at ease working with the computer, and one person mentioned feeling more comfortable in English. Furthermore, the tasks developed their English through this self-confidence and improvement of vocabulary:
Ms Maloney, the Year 5 teacher, emphasised the growth in the children’s self-confidence in English and was impressed by their good pronunciation. She compared their motivation and enthusiasm to their performance in French lessons and qualified her statement about English with the familiarity of the subject which made them less inhibited. She ascribed this familiarity to the multinational make-up of the locale, and the English music the children listen to:

Ms Maloney  
Es esch öppis ihne Vertrauts, öppis wo sie sech wohlfühlked. Ech fend d Ussprach amigs sehr guet. Das hed aber vielleicht au demit z tue, dass die Chind da sehr vill Musig losted, also änglishi Musig. Ech fend, üsi, also Zug esch em Änglishche scho echli zueto, amig. Mer ghörts zom Teil im Bus inne.

It’s something they’re familiar with, something they feel comfortable with. I find their pronunciation very good. But this might perhaps be to do with them listening to an awful lot of music, music in English, I mean. I find English is very common in Zug. Sometimes you’ll hear it on the bus.

The dyads also felt that they had made progress in English. In the interview they mentioned speaking primarily and pronunciation which they put down to the re-recording process, but they also reported a boost in motivation for English as a subject generally. This is positive reinforcement: motivation of task performance (4.1.1.2) proved advantageous for motivation in the subject overall:

AL  
Was hed sech verbesseret dank dene Tasks? How did you improve your English by performing the tasks?

Hansli  
Eifach s normale Rede, Änglish rede. Just speaking, speaking English.

Figure 32: How ASV improved your English
Momo: Ond secher au d Motivation hed sech secher ä echli verbesseret. 
And motivation really improved, for sure.

Hansli: Ja, lieber Änglisch. 
Yes, I like English better.

Momo: Ja, s Änglisch rede au. Ond halt d Ussprach. Dass mer sech au Müeh git. 
Yes, speaking English too. Pronunciation. You put effort into it.

AL: Uhm, dur die Tasks send ehr, send ehr besser worde im Änglisch? 
Have you improved your English by performing the tasks?

Tina: Ech wörd scho säge. 
I'd say so.

Fritzli: S Änglisch wird halt immer schwieriger ond es git meh Vocis ond so. 
English is getting increasingly harder and there is more vocabulary and so on.

Tina: Mer hed ja so Sache chönne ufnäh ond de hed mers so richtig müesse säge. Ond mer hed au vill Nöis dezu glemt. Also ech find, s Änglisch esch so rächt verbesseret. 
We could record things, and we had to get it right. And we've learnt a lot of new things. Well, I think, my English has really improved.

Their class teacher confirmed this boost in motivation. She said, the children had fun, and the online work resembled a game. They were relaxed, just spoke with ease, which in turn increased their self-confidence. This all happened unnoticed while working. Since games are motivating, this again provided positive reinforcement. Ms Marple also noticed the usefulness of the language support for general conversations. The chunks, which are close to real-life situations, might prove helpful for future conversations (2.3.3/4.1.2.3). Finally, working on the computer not only progressed their language competences by dint of the repeated recording, but also their ICT knowledge, and so this further embedded MIT into other subjects, a cornerstone of Curriculum 21.

Ms Maloney mentioned the children’s high level of commitment in English in Year 5. She complimented their staying in English during English tasks or activities especially compared to French where they often switched to their L1, which occurs for total beginners, and their asking for a follow-up activity in English lessons instead of idling once they had finished the assigned task. Furthermore, she was impressed by their lexicon:

Ms Maloney: Mhm. Ech finde, im Wortschatz, fend ech, hend sie sehr, also sehr vill wenn ech jetzt halt vergliche zo minere letschte Klass. 
I think their vocabulary is much bigger compared to my last class.
In conclusion, the children and the class teacher confirmed that they had enjoyed the tasks and felt that online tasks could improve oracy. The Year 5 teacher was positively surprised by the children’s self-confidence in speaking English, their motivation, their lexicon, and pronunciation.

4.3 RQ3: Can the use of L1 support the development of L2 oracy in task-based oral DST?

To answer RQ3, I draw on examples of the audio-/video-recording of the task of unit 2 undertaken in January 2020. The children learnt the names of shops and places in town, the people who work there and the jobs they do. My end-of-unit task was based on the introduction of unit 2 (Figure 33): a reporter interviewing someone about their job. These pages were an integral part later too. In the task, one child took the role of the reporter asking questions, the other the person answering them (Appendix 11).

![Figure 33: Unit 2: A town like mine (Arnet-Clark and Stampfli-Vienny, 2010, pp. 10-11), reproduced with permission](image)

4.3.1 Collaboration

Working in a dyad, effective collaboration was the key to success, and translanguaging can support this by making the task more comprehensible (García
and Li, 2013). In the interview, Tina assured me that collaboration was cool and made work easier, and Hansli claimed that they would not have managed to do a task if they had not been allowed to speak (Swiss) German:

Hansli  *Ja, alles uf Änglisch hetted mer ned*  Yes, we’d have never managed gschafft.

Translanguaging enabled the pupils to discuss the task and ICT, organise the work, prepare for recording, clarify words, and evaluate their recording. Hansli and Momo embedded their interview into a TV talk show format. They adapted the language support and their linguistic resources to their story:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hansli</th>
<th><em>Ech sage: ‘Hello policeman. [I'm]'</em></th>
<th><em>I say, ‘Hello policeman. I'm'</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Momo</td>
<td><em>[Nei,] du muesch zerscht säge, lueg do.</em> Reporter: ‘Hello, I'm now in the’</td>
<td><em>No, Look here what you have to say first. (points to the worksheet)</em> Reporter, ‘Hello, I'm now in the’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hansli</th>
<th><em>Ja, OK. I'm now here in the police station.</em></th>
<th><em>Yes, OK. I'm now here in the police station.</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Momo</td>
<td><em>OK, guet. Good Mrs Mr… name…</em></td>
<td><em>OK, fine. Good Mrs Mr… name…</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hansli</th>
<th><em>Was esch din name?</em></th>
<th><em>What is your name?</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Momo</td>
<td><em>Mr Greg. Was esch din name? The policeman’s name?</em></td>
<td><em>Mr Greg. What is your name? The policeman’s name?</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hansli</th>
<th><em>Hello, I’m now in the… police station.</em></th>
<th><em>Hello, I’m now in the… police station.</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Momo</td>
<td><em>Hello, I’m now in the… police station.</em></td>
<td><em>Hello, I’m now in the… police station.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Hansli  |  *Uhm. And I’m talking to the… police officer. Los.*  |  *Uhm. And I’m talking to the… police officer. Go.*  |

Drawing on language as a tool for mediation (Lafford, 2009), the children took ownership of the task-based DST and the affordances of the software. They were excited about their story and passionate to have it correct, which made them rerecord the talk until it met their expectation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Momo</th>
<th><em>Das esch schlächt.</em></th>
<th><em>That’s bad.</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hansli</td>
<td><em>Voll Kacke.</em></td>
<td><em>Completely crap.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Momo</td>
<td><em>Söll echs säge?</em></td>
<td><em>Shall I say it?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansli</td>
<td><em>Mr Greg interviewed a job in the town.</em></td>
<td><em>(shakes his head) (presses the record button)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *Mr Greg interviewed a job in the town.*  *(presses the play button) (the end is cut again, angry noise)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Momo</th>
<th><em>Söll echs säge?</em></th>
<th><em>Shall I say it?</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hansli</td>
<td><em>Mr Greg interviewed a job in the town.</em></td>
<td><em>(presses the record button)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *Mr Greg interviewed a job in the town.*  *(presses the play button)*
Yeah.

(presses the play button)

Yeah.

Ms Marple summed it up by saying that translanguaging empowered them to express their emotions which helped the children identify themselves with the tasks.

Translanguaging also facilitated exploratory talk and drawing on the IDZ, which entails constructing shared knowledge and comprehension through language use drawing on communication resources (Mercer, 1995). In the next example, Tina wanted to answer the question ‘What do you do?’, but this did not fit with the reporter’s subsequent comment, which was his appraisal of having a long day. Fritzli argued against the proposed wording for the recording and persuaded Tina employing exploratory talk and IDZ:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fritzli</td>
<td>Nei, aber das passt ned, [lueg.]</td>
<td>No, but that doesn’t fit, look.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>[Obe.]</td>
<td>Above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fritzli</td>
<td>[Zu däm.]</td>
<td>To this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>Säg</td>
<td>Say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fritzli</td>
<td>Das passt ned zu däm. Will plötzlech seit nachhär de Reporter: 'Uhm, that’s a long day.' Ond so Züg. Das esch unlogisch.</td>
<td>That doesn’t fit here. Because afterwards the reporter says, ‘Uhm, that’s a long day.’ And such things. That’s illogical.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hansli and Momo talked about the job of a policeman who looks out for people. Engaging in exploratory talk and working within their IDZ, the boys discussed the meaning, which would have been impossible without translanguaging at this stage of their learning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hansli</th>
<th>Ond nachher verzellsch halt, ‘<em>I’m go to the streets and look up, look…’</em></th>
<th>And afterwards you just say, ‘<em>I’m go to the streets and look up, look…’</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Momo</td>
<td>Look to the right.</td>
<td>Look to the right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansli</td>
<td>Nei, ‘Look to all of ready’, oder irgendwas so Ähnlechs. Esch guet?</td>
<td>No. ‘Look to all of ready’, or just something similar. OK?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Momo</td>
<td>Nei, ech frag dech mal was zum Rächte…</td>
<td>No, I ask you what take care…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansli</td>
<td>Hä? Wie zum Rächte?</td>
<td>Huh? What to the right?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Momo</td>
<td>Also, dass alles guet laufu.</td>
<td>That everything is OK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansli</td>
<td>Aha. Ebe, du.</td>
<td>Ah, just, you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Momo</td>
<td>To the right.</td>
<td>To the right. (they both laugh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansli</td>
<td>Nei, das esch rächt.</td>
<td>No, that’s right.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Translanguaging also entails interspersing English words in their Swiss German talk. As the tasks and ASV were in English, both dyads drew on this technique which was convenient for them. Tina and Fritzli needed a new slide – a fullscreen this time – and a photo of a wound:

| Tina          | What? Möched mer en wound, nei, möched mer en fullscreen. | What? Let’s make a wound, no, let’s make a fullscreen. |

In the interview, Tina justified her interspersing English words given the task was in English and they had to record it in English afterwards. Having the aims and lexis of the task in mind, translanguaging made reaching a consensus easier and the collaboration more straightforward. She understood that being able to draw on all her communicative resources meant the end result would be better and more easily achieved than if they had limited them.

### 4.3.2 Preparation for recording

Preparation for recording was a key stage. The dyads drafted the dialogue drawing on the language support and their prior knowledge. Tina and Fritzli looked up the language support on the task sheet (4.1.2.3) which consisted of possible sentences and questions for the reporter that were put together and possible answers for the professional which were below in a new paragraph (Appendix 11). They collaboratively composed an ending for their presentation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tina</th>
<th>Ond jetzt, ond jetzt seisch du, seisch du: ‘Thank you for the in...’ Uhmm,</th>
<th>And now, and now you say, you say, ‘Thank you for the in...’ Uhmm,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fritzli</td>
<td>The information.</td>
<td>The information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>OK, ja. Eis, zwei. Ond, ond was säg ech?</td>
<td>OK, yes. One, two. (counts to start the recording) And, and what shall I say?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>OK.</td>
<td>OK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fritzli</td>
<td>Goodbye. Säg: ‘Goodbye.’ Uhmm, was muess ech säge?</td>
<td>Goodbye. Say, ‘Goodbye.’ Uhmm, what do I have to say?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>Du seisch: ‘Thank you for the information.’</td>
<td>You say, ‘Thank you for the information.’ (presses the record button)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The recording was in English. But selecting resources, reaching agreement on, and analysing the text of the dialogue usually took place in L1. Tina reflected that it was much easier and faster to ask the partner about linguistic resources or computer
issues in Swiss German. In addition, drawing on their L1 also enabled them to simplify the text and adapt it to their abilities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tina</th>
<th>Fritzli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ech wörd säge: ‘Good morning, my name is…’</td>
<td>I’d say, ‘Good morning, my name is…’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Das fend ech no en gueti Idee. Fändsch das au no cool?</td>
<td>I think that’s a good idea. Do you think that’s cool too?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>Was soll ech säge?</td>
<td>What shall I say?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fritzli</td>
<td>Hello. Can I cask you some question, questions about your job?</td>
<td>Hello. Can I cask [ask] you some question, questions about your job?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translanguaging supported the integration of knowledge (Li, 2018; Li and García, 2016), and their L1 supported their meaning-making to gain ownership and perform for an audience (4.1.1.3/5.3), which both boys confirmed in the interview. Momo clarified that they wanted to do the best tasks and make the audience laugh. They also drew on affordances of the software and selected suitable tracks and layouts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hansli</th>
<th>Momo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nei, en Momänt, mier chönds eso mache. Ond denne… Welli Farb nämed mer?</td>
<td>Wart, wart, ech wett emal luege, ob mer da unde au öppis anders [cha gfinde.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No, one moment, we can do it like that. (fullscreen) And then… Which colour shall we use?</td>
<td>Wait, wait. I’d like to see if we can find something else (another layout) down here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansli</td>
<td>[Det heds] anderi Schrifte.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Momo</td>
<td>Tüemer das emal luege. Los! Mach! Es gaht ja nöd. Scheisse. Esch huere blöd.</td>
<td>Let’s use this one. Go! (has pressed onto another layout, but it takes a long time to appear on the screen) It doesn’t work. Bugger. It’s stupid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, let’s take the one up here. That’s cooler.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansli</td>
<td>Ja, ebe. Nehmed mer das do obe. Das esch cooler.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Momo</td>
<td>Ebe.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansli</td>
<td>Welli Farb?</td>
<td>Which colour?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Momo</td>
<td>Lueged mer zerscht mal. Nei, die nöd. Die hämmer scho s letztsch Mal.</td>
<td>Let’s have a look. No, not this one. We used that one last time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansli</td>
<td>Die? Ech find die oder die esch cool.</td>
<td>This one? I think this one or this one is cool.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3.3 Appraisal of recording

Having recorded a slide, the children evaluated it. Sometimes they moved on because they were satisfied with their performance. Sometimes they just rerecorded it without elaboration because they knew that it was bad, and they had to correct it. Sometimes they reviewed the slide and improved the recording as described above (4.3.1), or they made adjustments such as reducing the volume of the music to make their speech more audible:
During and at the end of the lesson, they also watched the whole presentation and assessed their work:

They were proud of their achievement on the introductory slide, *Welcome to Mr. Greg’s show*, particularly Momo’s realistic imitation of a broadcaster as he copied the intro to a TV talk show which I discuss below (5.3.3). In the extract, the boys metacognitively reflected on their voice, commented on various parts of their presentation which made them extremely proud of their achievement. Moreover, Momo repeated/mouthed difficult parts, which they had collaboratively achieved.

### 4.4 Conclusion

In this chapter I have presented my findings in relation to the RQs (2.2) and illustrated them with quotes from the transcripts (3.7) of audio- and video-recorded ASV lessons (3.5), interviews (3.6), answers from the questionnaire (3.10) and observation notes (3.9). The following central points emerged:

**RQ1: opportunities and challenges in YL L2 DST (4.1)**

- The flexibility of the task sheet and the structure of the task facilitates creativity and adaptability through the revision of meaningful content and aims for individualised and personalised language practice. Therefore,
language learning is more than just teaching lexis and grammatical structures.

- Both language support and an explicit feedback enables the children to stretch their prior knowledge.
- The children were motivated throughout the year, they worked autonomously, took ownership of the task, and designed their video with their audience in mind.
- Explicit teaching of aims and ground rules for collaboration/KWIC can support purposefulness.
- The simplicity of the ASV software allowed the pupils to focus on its creative use.

**RQ2: effect of task-based DST on improvements in oracy (4.2)**

- The children of Ms Marple’s class and my four participants especially perceived an improvement in their English in terms of self-confidence, lexis, pronunciation, and ICT, which boosted their general motivation for English. Confidence and positive motivation have been shown to be key features of the *good language learner* (Gardner, 1968).
- Their teachers confirmed the children’s perception. However, whilst COVID-19 restrictions rendered the planned quantitative measures of improvement impractical, it is clear that the children’s and teachers’ evaluations suggest that this was indeed the case, but any future study might usefully include such data.

**RQ3: support of L1 in L2 DST (4.3)**

- The children’s level of English was insufficient to stay in their L2 the whole time, and, by their own judgement, would have led to a less satisfactory end-product.
- The children drew on their L1 to compose their speech and analyse it. Discussing the meaning of and arguing for lexis or sentences, they were engaged in *exploratory talk* and worked within their IDZ.
- Translanguaging facilitates effective collaboration, identification with the task, and expression of their emotions.

In the next chapter I discuss my key findings and relate them to the literature.
Chapter 5 Discussion

The purpose of this chapter is to describe and discuss my research findings and relate them to the existing literature. The main aim of my research was to explore oral DST in the YL L2 classroom:

- to examine opportunities and challenges
- to explore L2 learning and oral proficiency
- to investigate the support of the L1 use in developing L2 oracy

My small-scale case study was positioned in ecological constructivism with a holistic view on interaction and processes (Hoven and Palalas, 2011) which foster socialisation into a bound community (Lam and Kramsch, 2003). I analysed the data with reflexive TA, for which researcher subjectivity and interpretation is important (Braun and Clarke, 2020). Hence, the results of my research are placed and contextualised within my subjectivity, my focus, and my understanding.

I identified four key findings which I see as main insights in relation to my RQs and which I illustrate here:

1. Motivational aspects (5.1) are affective and creative indicators which empowered the children and made them gain ownership over their learning.
2. The task design (5.2) was responsible for this. By embedding ICT into differentiated L2 real-life tasks, the children exploited the multimodal affordances and felt agency for their learning.
3. This spurred their audience design (5.3) in which they tailored their video to their audience to make it socially meaningful and culturally appropriate.
4. Translanguaging (5.4), drawing on all resources for meaning-making, supported collaboration, justification, and learning.

5.1 Motivation

My main research took place in the academic year 2019/20, the year of implementation of Curriculum 21 in canton Zug and integration of MIT into other subjects. For this purpose, five brand-new laptops per class were provided as a tool for teachers and learners to explore, which we did throughout my yearlong research from September 2019 to the end of May 2020. My research indicates that the ‘novelty-effect’ posited by most short-term studies of digital storytelling with young learners in the L2 classroom (e.g., Dausend, 2017; Sun et al., 2017) is open to
question. Long-term motivation in DST results from having a real audience and increased commitment as a result of using ICT is mentioned by Kirsch and her colleague (Kirsch and Bes Izuel, 2019; Kirsch, 2018/2016), however, it remains unclear how intensely they worked with the same group of children, who were also some years younger than my participants. The motivation of my participants to engage with ASV tasks remained on a high level. In addition to the data discussed above, there were also affective indicators that would support this. For example, I noticed their radiant eyes, cheering when they entered the classroom, or by the way they would stop me in the playground to talk to me about the tasks. The online class-questionnaire during the Swiss COVID-19 lockdown from 16 March to 10 May 2020 allowed me to verify my observations, and semi-structured interviews with the four participants and Ms Marple, the class teacher, shed further light on the children’s collaboration. The children were highly engaged during the three tasks prior to the lockdown and thoroughly enjoyed the creativity of the last collaborative ASV task at the end of May. Despite their generally low levels of motivation at that time because of boredom due to the revision of home-school subject matter and the strict COVID-19 rules and constraints, the children produced solid presentations about travelling, even though actual travel was restricted because of coronavirus. This seemed to make the task even more appealing and inspiring as they could travel anywhere through their imagination. I am confident that with the right infrastructure in place, long-term motivation in DST can be maintained. In the next paragraphs I discuss my reasons for this.

An affective design can boost motivation and increase L2 learning (Kukulska-Hulme and Viberg, 2018; Legutke et al., 2009). Ms Marple confirmed that the autonomous ASV tasks had a game-like effect. Games, relevant to children, involve them and support their learning (Nunan, 2011). The students in the study perceived the collaborative and playful DST as light-hearted, which positively impacted their motivation. Kirsch (2016) argues that storytelling cultivates language and cultural learning and involves cognitive and emotional components. Such a powerful combination was motivational, facilitated the identification with the real-world tasks which ensured meaningful L2 learning (Lafford, 2009) and spurred creativity. This creative use of L2 is in contrast to common L2 teaching approaches in primary schools where children are often exposed to a diet of drills and choral chanting due to the lack of innovative pedagogy (Legutke et al., 2009).
My tasks represent an innovative practice as the children freely rehearsed the text (often repeatedly) before recording. Then they would choose to edit and re-edit the language until the recording lived up to their expectations. Not only did they try to improve the language (Pellerin, 2014), but it provided incidental language practice for which they took ownership and they had a clear aim: their high motivation derived from the fact that they had a real audience – their classmates and teacher. My results show that providing a meaningful context and affective practice can result in higher L2 learning than mere drill practice (Ziegler, 2016). My intervention revealed that the real-world tasks permitted meaningful language learning (Lafford, 2009).

Furthermore, shy or introvert children can hide in class repetition or choral drills, and their language learning may pass unnoticed by the teacher. Yet they must speak up in normal class situations, which can be stressful for them. Collaborative ASV tasks allow them to practise the spoken text in a safe environment. Trying out new language before using it ‘live’ can improve the willingness to take risks (Ziegler, 2016). Affective aspects such as motivation, commitment, pleasure and encouragement in collaboration can reduce tension and embarrassment (Kukulska-Hulme and Viberg, 2018; Ziegler, 2016). Consequently, an empowering practice that can heighten their self-confidence and self-esteem, as evidenced in the questionnaire and interviews and by Chong and Reinders (2020), might encourage shyer children to feel more confident about speaking in class (Anderson et al., 2018). My DST tasks could add to this important aspect of L2 pedagogy.

ASV tasks can also motivate learners because they can personalise their learning. My participants’ empowerment derived from their engagement with each other, the task, and the software: they collaboratively accomplished a storytelling task, negotiated the content, the text, the choice of pictures/icons, the layout, and the music. This enabled greater personalisation of the story and their control over their own learning (Legutke et al., 2009). They searched online for words they needed or listened to the pronunciation if they were unsure. Consequently, they acquired lexis that was relevant to them which in turn was motivational. Both dyads, for example, drew on me as a resource: Momo once asked me if it was correct to say much time. Assuming he meant this as in not much time I said yes. Throughout the lesson, they metacognitively commented on this chunk, and the next week Momo greeted me saying, ‘Much time’, indicating how significant this personal engagement with language was to him. (Having watched the video-recording of the collaborative taskwork, I gave him a written note pointing out the correct grammar rule which I
also explained to him and Hansli.) The data suggests that DST tasks motivated the children because of the individualised learning context and their creation of a personalised presentation. This multimodal collaborative process was engaging: their progress was readily visible to them, and they were proud of their final product. A good outcome can enhance pupils’ performance and motivation (Kukulska-Hulme and Viberg, 2018).

Collaboration enabled the children to control their personal learning metacognitively as they analysed and assessed their spoken text or presentation (Kirsch and Bes Izuel, 2019). This deepened their language knowledge as what has been learnt in negotiation processes (other-regulation) can be applied individually (self-regulation) later (Vygotsky, 1978). A positive experience of successful collaboration (evidenced by both the presence of exploratory talk and a well-received end-product, the presentation) can be motivating, support their learning and the awareness of the learning process metacognitively. Collaborative planning and analysis of the speech raised their language awareness (Kirsch and Bes Izuel, 2019). There is a further discussion of the correlation of collaboration, translanguaging, and use of language below (5.4.3).

A third point of personalisation was the learners’ repeated use of meaningful language. Ms Marple commented in the interview that the lexis and structures of the tasks were child-oriented, which according to Gardner (1968) boosts speaking. Furthermore, these chunks could be applied to a different situation later. This improved their self-confidence, as confirmed by the children in the questionnaire and interviews.

Personalisation was also a feature of the single COVID-19 task conducted at home because the children chose what content to share about their home-schooling experience. Their videos gave an insight into their life at home which made it possible for them to reconnect after the lockdown. While some of them enjoyed the freedom to decide and work individually, nearly half of all children preferred the collaborative tasks at school which is in line with Hwang et al.’s study of Year 6 learners who ‘showed more interest in interactive storytelling process’ (2016, p. 230). Collaborative DST fostered the learners’ creativity, and stretched them mentally through social interaction as claimed by Blake and Scanlon (2013). Their collaborative planning had an impact on the complexity and accuracy of the language they produced, something Ziegler (2016) had observed too. Teachers should take account of these different preferences when planning tasks.
The motivational effect was not only seen in the children. Initially, Ms Marple had only reluctantly agreed to participate in my research because she was concerned it would involve a lot of extra work, including learning how to use new software. She feared that the project would mean she had insufficient time to get through the English syllabus. Having witnessed the children’s motivation during the first task, their eagerness to work on the laptop, and the personalised presentations, she became enthusiastic. Half-way through the project she asked me to write DST tasks for Year 3 because she had now become keen to introduce ASV projects and integrate MIT into English so as to exploit the full potential of DST. ICT can be beneficial in L2 teaching, but primary teachers find the embedding of MIT into other subjects challenging (1.2), and Toohey et al. (2012) argue that typically L2 teachers lack access to ICT, support, teaching time, professional development, and administrative assistance. I address these in my recommendations (6.2). In addition, for DST to be truly motivating for all, a good task setting is imperative.

5.2 Task

The first version of our coursebook Young World does not feature a TBL approach. Using appropriate software, TBL can be integrated in L2 learning to ensure differentiation. Language support, repetition, and interim-feedback can improve oracy.

5.2.1 Embedding ICT

Curriculum 21 is vague about how to incorporate MIT into English lessons, referring only to the comparison of paper and online dictionaries, writing with a word processor, encountering people from English speaking countries, and describing English cultural events (e.g., by watching a YouTube video) (D-EDK, 2018a). The content of the further qualification module for teachers to teach the subject MIT is on programming and robotics mainly. In response, teachers need to find ways to integrate MIT into subjects, which they find difficult anyway (1.2). As most primary teachers teach most subjects, linking MIT to the L1, German, or Humanities is more obvious than to an L2. Hence my research showed an innovative pedagogy in which MIT and English can be combined for appropriate TBL according to Cameron's (2001) definition (2.3.2.2), as technology can connect social and educational expectations and activate desired learning performance. Software can enhance communication and interaction (Kukulska-Hulme and Viberg, 2018), promote creativity, and according to Blake and Scanlon (2013) online environments can
enable new ways of learning. This is especially true for DST for YL who acquire and practise their L2 and gain new ICT knowledge at the same time (Macleroy et al., 2021).

I decided to use ASV as it is a free software that works without prior installation and has been shown to be user-friendly with adults (Arispe and Burston, 2017; Schenker and Kraemer, 2017). I decided to try it out with YL as the interface is straightforward, the program is flexible to use and would promote personalisation. Having control of the layout of the slides, photos, icons, text, theme, and music (Figure 2) would both challenge and enable the children to work collaboratively to find the best solution for their presentation. Subsequent questionnaires and interviews with my participants confirmed this: 83.3% of the children (15/18) said that the software was easy to use and Momo outlined that my short introduction at the beginning was sufficient to work with the software because it is quite self-explanatory.

The multimodal affordances allowed the children to heighten their awareness of the ASV potential and tailor their presentation to their needs (Fuchs et al., 2012), which makes learning interesting and personally meaningful (Kukulska-Hulme and Traxler, 2019). The simplicity of ASV enabled them to focus collaboratively on the task demands and the language use to design a presentation. They became agents who worked autonomously for an audience. Having a real audience raised their motivation and commitment, which I discuss below (5.3). My research indicates that a multimodal software package can be used to support autonomy, engagement, and motivation in long-term DST activities. The simplicity of ASV (Chung and Wang, 2020) made it easy for the children to focus on the language, which is in accordance with Kirsch's (2016) findings.

**5.2.2 Differentiation**

The tasks (Appendix 10/Appendix 11/Appendix 12/Appendix 13/Appendix 14) were based on the competences of *Curriculum 21* (2.4.2), the mandated textbook (Figure 23/Figure 26/Figure 33), recycled the main lexis and structures taught and had clear aims for language learning (Cameron, 2001). Drawing on resources the children were familiar with made the tasks engaging and fostered collaboration and creativity, which I noticed in the audio-/video-recordings, and which my participants confirmed in the interviews.

The children approached the work differently: sometimes they drafted the whole video at the beginning, sometimes they planned slide by slide. This is in conformity
with Dausend (2017). However, I noticed that the task sheet influenced the children’s planning. The more structured task sheet of the fairground activity (Figure 34) required them to fill in a table of three stalls/attractoins they wanted to visit. They first discussed the order of the stalls and reasons for declining and agreeing. The other three tasks did not include such a guided preliminary activity and in these cases, they simply discussed and drafted the text as they went along.

![Unit 1 Five sensational senses](image)

This has practical implications for how a task is set up. Teachers might choose to structure a task very tightly if needs be, which might be a good idea for the first task, so the children can get used to it, but they can also build in flexibility where appropriate. When the boys had free rein finding a photo for the second stall, for example, Momo suggested they agree to go on the merry-go-round so as to make fun of themselves and entertain the audience as mentioned above (4.1.1.3). They had to operate within the constraint of finding appropriate pictures but then had the freedom to make creative use of their choice.

The children in my pilot study were used to referring to the differentiated learning aims, followed them and the instructions on the task sheet, but the children in my main study ignored the aims. This probably stemmed from Ms Marple’s different practice: she placed less emphasis on sharing and monitoring learning aims with
the children. In this particular instance, she had emailed the aims home during the holidays to ensure the parents know what is taught at school. Since the aims were not presented to the children in class, the topic learnt was more important than the aims. For my DST tasks, they apparently just worked out what they thought they had to do. This shows the need for teachers to be explicit about the learning aims: first when designing a task and then explaining them transparently to the children, as a mandated textbook can lead to both teachers and students simply working mechanically through the activities and finding out what the children have learnt afterwards (Wiggins and McTighe, 1998). Furthermore, the explicit approach recommended by Goh and Burns (2012) and Mercer (1995) can enable greater support to be given to the children.

Providing interim-feedback as part of the teaching speaking cycle (Goh and Burns, 2012) can assist learning too. To my knowledge, no previous YL L2 DST research has addressed this explicitly. My feedback was based on the ecological requirements of the learning aims, and tailored to the children’s product (Lafford, 2009). It was a written note to which the children sometimes reacted reluctantly as it usually meant rerecording a slide, so my oral explanation in both languages supported the metatalk of my writing and enabled clarification (García and Li, 2013) resulting in an improved video. My findings show the importance of transparent explicit teaching: if the children understand the reasons for the teacher’s actions and can see their benefit, they are more willing to accept their own agency in learning, implement the feedback, and so improve their final product.

The guidance on the task sheet and the user-friendliness of the software encouraged the dyads to work autonomously which empowered them to create the content collaboratively (Kukulska-Hulme and Viberg, 2018; Benson, 2013). The open tasks provided choice, which the children perceived as a game (5.1). They slipped into another role due to the role-play format of the task, they altered their identity and acted as a different person. The choice of software and options within the task made personalisation of their presentation possible. Having to design a presentation for an audience seemed to add a spur to their creativity (Lee et al., 2015), which I discuss below (5.3).

5.2.3 Speaking
Exhibiting linguistic creativity is difficult for beginner language learners as they cannot draw on a large lexicon or a rich variety of grammatical structures for that
matter. Based on this, to master speaking, language support tailored to the learners and the activity is crucial (Legutke et al., 2009). To my knowledge, apart from Hwang et al. (2016) who provided lexis and content and Sun et al.'s (2017) sentence starters, there is not much research on the role of language support in L2 DST pedagogy in primary education. In my pilot study the pupils referred to the language support on the task sheets frequently, which we jointly evaluated. In response to their input and my observations, I then adapted it for the main study.

The participants in my main study reported that they did not draw on the language support, but the task design evidently led them to employ it unawares, as we had practised the sentence starters or information needed beforehand. This means that the language support reduced the cognitive load (Chen and Chang, 2017). Furthermore, they looked up words or checked pronunciation online. Ms Marple’s comment that both the task and language used were meaningful for the children can be ascribed to the fact that the tasks were designed close to real-life situations and thus helpful for future conversations. This shows the relevance of oral DST tasks for L2 learning: they can become a valid tool to foster (L2) learning as language learning is more than just acquiring lexis and structures, but DST tasks can engage the children emotionally. Moreover, the teaching speaking cycle allowed for flexibility and autonomy as well as for additional guidance to be given. Where the children needed more guidance, more individual coaching whilst on-task, I was able to instruct them during the lesson in addition to the feedback provided during the break (stage 4 in the teaching speaking cycle/Figure 9), which further supported their understanding. Toohey et al. (2012) noticed teachers’ difficulty in balancing scaffolding and autonomy which resonates with Goh and Burns's claim that speaking is done rather than practised, i.e., teachers do not explicitly teach ‘the skills and strategy and the language’ (2012, p. 2) that enables learners to develop speaking, which is especially true with guided speaking practice in the YL L2 classroom (Pinter, 2017; Legutke et al., 2009). In line with ecological constructivism (3.1.2), these diverse requirements of real-world L2 language use in a situated context and criteria-based feedback fostered learning (Lafford, 2009).

This flexibility of general and individual language support and scaffolding, the repetition of chunks/structures, and their heightened motivation raised the participants’ self-confidence and made them proud of their presentations. This combination allowed them to individually improve their oracy, as indicated by the results of the questionnaire and interviews. The comparison of results from post-
tests I had originally planned would have given further indication to what extent and in what way my participants and the children from the control group have improved their oracy during a year. But because of COVID-19 and unequal home-schooling conditions (Huber et al., 2020), the comparison of results would have invalidated the results of achievement. As a consequence, I had to rely on statements from pupils and teachers. I reflect on these limitations below (6.3). Nevertheless, this differentiated DST task design allowed all children to have a sense of accomplishment and to express their creativity while keeping their audience in mind.

5.3 Audience/recipient design

Audience design is the speaker's selection of language to accommodate the addressee (e.g., Rogers et al., 2013; Horton and Gerrig, 2005; Bell, 1984). However, for my research I included multimodal affordances as part of 'language'. I defined audience design as the choice of language, paralanguage, and multimodal technology tailored to a specific audience. Both context and affordances of the software (Seargeant and Tagg, 2014) influenced the results within the setting (Lee, 2014) as I show by Hansli and Momo's development of the presentations, translanguaging by Tina and Fritzli, and some reflections on the audience. While the videos clearly reveal the children's audience design, Ms Maloney mentioned it was uncommon to see such considerations appear in the work of even her Year 5 L2 class.

The motivational aspects discussed above also derived from the choices the children had within ASV and the task. Multimodality as a designing tool can heighten students' perception of how they can use the software to cater to their needs (Fuchs et al., 2012). Whilst there has been some research on audience design amongst adults using social media (Seargeant and Tagg, 2014; Blokpoel et al., 2012; Newman-Norlund et al., 2009), children writing (Durán, 2017), and teenagers' literacy-based DST (Anderson et al., n.d.; Toohey et al., 2012), its role in young children and oral DST, particularly in the foreign language classroom, is, as far as I am aware, as yet unexplored.

In my study, Momo mentioned the motivational aspect of audience design. The children knew their peers, shared their perspective, and adjusted their presentation to match their preferences (Blokpoel et al., 2012). Similar to Lee's (2014) observation on social media, they constructed their identity as peers, but also as to how they wanted to be perceived by their peers. Their sense and performance of
identity and elaboration of design features grew stronger during the year, exemplified by Momo and Hansli’s work, which I also witnessed in the other dyad.

**5.3.1 First task**

According to Hansli, their willingness to repeat the recording until it was perfect was increased because of their awareness that they were creating for a particular audience, as was also found to be a motivational factor in Kirsch and Bes Izuel’s (2019) research. This shaped the children’s reflection and criticality towards the recording. Their self-monitoring, as argued in Levelt’s model (Figure 7), was heightened, and the collaborative interplay with the task and the laptop, and reconsiderations of the recording made them agents of their autonomous learning (Larsen–Freeman, 2019; Anderson et al., 2018; Jones and Healing, 2010).

In September 2019, Hansli and Momo managed to finish their first task in time but had an empty slide at the end of their video. Instead of deleting it and returning to the classroom they stayed and worked on the empty slide to add in Figure 35. They decided against including a photo of other animals as part of this animal-themed task (Appendix 12) and instead chose a smiley and inserted a funny picture to entertain their peers. To create a special effect and mark the ending of the presentation, they agreed that both should speak together, and sign off with goodbye. Hansli and Momo’s plan proved successful: the children laughed and commented on the slide. Accordingly, the boys met their needs (Rogers et al., 2013) which proved motivating for the next task; as Seargeant and Tagg (2014) argue, action and reaction can sharpen a speaker’s sense of identity.

Figure 35: First task


5.3.2 Second task

Positive and negative feedback can both be useful to learners in helping them make adjustments (Durán, 2017). The feedback reinforced Hansli and Momo’s efforts to be more creative and humorous. They added linguistic resources to address the audience further (Page, 2014). When deciding where to go on the fairground, the boys liked rollercoasters and the word deathride (Figure 23) made them even more appealing, while they thought the merry-go-round was boring for younger children and, therefore, it would be decidedly ‘uncool’ to go on a ride designed for much younger children. However, Momo eventually rejected going on the deathride and instead suggested going on the merry-go-round for its comic effect. Momo declared in the interview, that their intention was to amuse the audience and do the best task. The boys related their intention and humour to their peers who as parts of the same social group would be able to judge the joke and the pictures correctly (Page, 2014). However, when watching all the videos in class the following Monday, Momo and Hansli nervously awaited their peers’ reactions and were relieved, when they laughed.

Hansli  Can we go to the deathride? It’s so fast and fun.
Momo    Oh, no. *On the deathride I’m get sick. Can we go to the merry-go-round? It’s so slow and I don’t get sick.
Hansli  Yes, that’s a good idea. *I like the music from the merry-go-round. Let’s meet at the fair in Baar on Sunday morning.
Momo    Cool, I’ll be there.

This extract from their video shows evidence of contextualisation (Page, 2014), situatedness, common culture, and understanding (Sargeant and Tagg, 2014) as the boys referred to a fair that had taken place in a nearby town the previous weekend. They made the presentation close to real-life, demonstrating the ‘interconnectedness of psychological, social and environmental processes’ (Lam and Kramsch, 2003, p. 144) and agency of L2 learning.

They also tried out different layout options and agreed not to reveal the ‘secret’ of doing the novelty layout. Moreover, they designed another funny last slide (Figure 36) drawing on the multimodal affordances of the software to use a visual rather than linguistic resource in order to create a positive effect on the audience (Durán, 2017). The technology and task enabled them to develop their own brand, a further indicator of their increasing ownership of the task and tool.
5.3.3 Third task

The third task involved a reporter interviewing someone about their job. Instead of just reproducing the interview, Hansli and Momo embedded it in a talk show. For this reason, their first slide consisted of a dark TV on which they superimposed the words *WELCOME TO MR. GREG’S SHOW* in front of a purple illuminated wall (Figure 37). Voicing the text, Momo imitated the intro of a TV talk show. The boys were aware of this special effect as in the interview Momo referred to the ‘silly title’ and Hansli assumed that their peers would laugh, indicating their sense of humour (Anderson and Macleroy, 2017): they adapted their presentation to conventions, and anticipated the reaction of the audience (Durán, 2017).
By selecting Mr Greg (who was interviewing Inspector Crusoe), the boys were drawing on shared sociocultural knowledge with their peers (Leppänen et al., 2014) and reusing it in imaginative ways (Toohey et al., 2012): Mr Greg is a famous cartoon character on Cartoon Network and Inspector Crusoe is a reference to Inspector Clouseau of the Pink Panther movies. Drawing on common cultural knowledge is recognising shared interests (Toohey et al., 2012; Horton and Gerrig, 2005), represents a bid for inclusion, and is often paired with humour (Vásquez, 2014). By de-/recontextualising the characters, the boys became agents of their identity (Toohey et al., 2012), and slipping into another role was fun and helped them overcome the anxiety of performing in another language.

In this video they played with multimodality and language to entertain their peers (Figure 38). As in a TV show they used the first slide for both the intro and outro to increase the recognition effect.
5.3.4 Fourth task

In the final video, Hansli and Momo continued their efforts to entertain their target audience by selecting holiday destinations, and by incorporating impressive photos (4.1.2.1). The CLIL-topic was travelling and means of transport. Before school and during the breaks all the boys played the popular Top Trumps game with cars, a card game involving high-end vehicles. Top Trumps inspired Hansli and Momo to select expensive cars and a private jet (Figure 39) for inclusion in their presentation. They tailored their video to their audience, drawing on their shared knowledge and interests (Schmader and Horton, 2019).
As beforehand, they personalised the layout. This shows that the children took ownership and were proud of their cultural product, and their videos were meaningful for them and their audience.

**5.3.5 Multiple languages**

The children’s L1 impacted their identity and their audience design too (Chalmers, 2019). While the video was in English, many children kept their final slide in their L1. Fritzli and Tina said *Tschüsiii* (Figure 40), meaning *cheers* to their audience. In Switzerland, in contrast to Germany, *tschüs* is only used informally, if someone is on a first-name basis. *Tschüsi* is even more informal, effectively a term of endearment. The multiple i’s, the exclamation marks and Tina’s soft voice to address their peers are all socially meaningful and culturally appropriate to their context (Leppänen et al., 2014). Applying translanguaging (2.6) they violated the monolingual construct of the video and also the usual imperative to use standard German in class work.
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Figure 40: Last slide of unit 1 by Tina and Fritzli

**5.3.6 Home-schooling/COVID-19 task**

The idea behind setting video-making tasks during the COVID-19 lockdown was to keep the children engaged and connected with each other and school. Apart from talking about their daily routine, most learners commented on COVID-19 or home-schooling in their videos and uploaded personal photos. Many parents supported them with the technology, construction of the text, and recording or uploading of photos. This reflects the socioeconomic background of the children having parents
who are very interested in education and have the means to support them with necessary resources. However, contrary to Sun et al.'s (2017) participants who widely shared the link to their homework, only four out of eighteen children forwarded the link to their presentation to family or friends, and only three children gave me permission to upload the video-link to the password-protected Padlet website, a digital pinboard. After checking with the parents, one party refused to do so as some parents declined participation because of the potential online audience: they feared that unknown people (Bell, 1984) could watch their child’s video or even forward the link. This cannot be ruled out in an online context and I respected their wish.

5.4 Translanguaging

Translanguaging was a meaningful approach for collaborative tasks. I adopted a broad definition of translanguaging (2.6) as a holistic theory of meaning-making employing all resources available such as languages, gestures, media, artefacts etc. (Lin and He, 2017; García and Li, 2013). Translanguaging in this sense emerged spontaneously through collaboration with a task and ICT (Cenoz, 2017). I draw on this ecological perspective of translanguaging seeing language as a tool of mediation (Lafford, 2009) and share insights into translanguaging in L2 classes. This is an innovative aspect of my research as most research on translanguaging has focused on minority languages.

5.4.1 Policy

The policy in Curriculum 21 is premised on the use of L2 in L2 classes to increase language learning (D-EDK, 2018b). In response, I tried to follow this policy in my pilot study. Every child received a laminated sheet with general language support for working with ASV, and we practised the language support repeatedly. The children reluctantly took the sheet along to the taskwork and put it aside. Focusing on the task, they naturally used Swiss German, their L1. This shows that groupwork changed the language routines as the children flexibly used languages to build up knowledge (García, 2009). Being in their second year of L2 instruction, their L2 knowledge is restricted (García and Li, 2013) and the language support on the laminated sheet proved ineffective for successful collaboration.

In my main study I encouraged the children to give reasons justifying their suggestions during their presentation-writing task. Inevitably, they translangugaged, as was evident from the data of audio-/video-recordings of their lessons. The
children organised the task, planned, and evaluated the speech in both languages. This helped the children manage the cognitive task demands and the language (García and Li, 2013). The negotiation processes opened up opportunities and developed their identity (Cenoz, 2019) because the children were able to express themselves verbally and emotionally (García and Li, 2013). As a result, the children perceived their agency by creating a presentation of which they had ownership. This in turn fostered autonomy.

Hansli commented that using L2 only would have been too difficult – confirming the statement by García and Li (2013) above, and Pinter (2017) and Cameron’s (2001) consideration of L1 use in YL CLIL and TBL classes (2.3.1.6/2.3.2.4). Their L1 served as a tool for collaborative meaning-making, and managing the work, and even improved their use of both languages, and their learning achievement (Chalmers, 2019) in terms of collaborative and individual learning. As a result, the children’s repertoire was expanded by collaboratively drawing on their individual linguistic resources, the affordances of the software, and the requirements of the DST task.

In a beginner class, the teacher’s constant use of L2 and children’s response in L1 can be considered translanguaging (García and Li, 2013). This is what Ms Marple did: she stuck to English while the children answered in English or tried to. For more complex problems the pupils switched to Standard German – the language of instruction in general classes. My findings show that Year 4 children can control their language use and form their identity by switching languages when addressing different people (Lee, 2014). The addressee determines the language, and they can switch accordingly (Bell, 1984). This is in agreement with Fallas Escobar (2019) who asserts that if monolingual practice is the rule, the children tend to translanguage less.

### 5.4.2 Code-switching

When searching for photos, discussing the layout or something about the unit in Swiss German, my participants interspersed English words:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hansli</th>
<th>*Nei, mier gönd ja uf de deathrider.</th>
<th>*No, we’re going on the deathrider. (slaps his forehead three times)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Momo</td>
<td>*Am Schluss gömmer uf de merry-go-round.</td>
<td>*At the end we’re going on the merry-go-round.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Momo</td>
<td>*Nei.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The boys’ smooth switch from one language to the other requires competences in both languages. This shift was done effortlessly and naturally, with intention and purpose (Jaspers, 2018; Palmer et al., 2014). Code-switching is regarded as a speaking style, but reasons for its usage have so far been unclear (Poeste et al., 2019) while my results provide some insights: as the Swiss German lexicon serves to speak about traditional topics, for modern usage, words of Standard German and English have been adopted (Schmid, n.d.). Based on this, unconscious code-switching is frequently applied in Swiss German. Used to interspersing English words in their everyday language, my participants did so during the tasks too. They confirmed the convenience of code-switching in the interviews: English words from the unit or the software were quickly and easily inserted into their Swiss German, which simplified collaboration. Despite this linguistic ease and creativity (García and Li, 2013), code-switching has been maligned and stigmatised. However, as shown it is common and socially significant (Palmer et al., 2014; García and Li, 2013) to maintain communication (Dörnyei, 1995). This is a new understanding for primary Swiss English language methodology, and has the potential to influence pedagogy.

5.4.3 Collaboration

Translanguaging as defined above is more than mere code-switching, and is encouraged in CLIL and TBL for problem-solving in the YL classroom (Pinter, 2017; Cameron, 2001). It is a dynamic use of multimodal language resources (Lin and He, 2017). This multifaceted approach helped the children control their personal learning and develop individual metacognitive strategies while being engrossed in the task (Lamb, 2011).

Rules for collaboration can support metacognition (Mercer, 1996), so the class collaborated on generating a set of ground rules for talk, which I collected and printed out. As this poster (Figure 28) did not ultimately make it on to the classroom wall, I provided the KWIC on the task sheets and encouraged the children to use them. As seen in both qualitative and quantitative results (4.1.2.2), the participants’ use of exploratory talk and the KWIC improved during the first three tasks, while they still used cumulative and disputational talk. So my results build on prior results in L1 classes (e.g., Mercer et al., 1999), but show that providing KWIC can enable better communication in an L2 environment too.
However, in the last unit after the lockdown the children used less exploratory talk and KWIC apart from I/you while they were still motivated to do the ASV task. These findings and my data contribute to a clearer understanding of the impact of COVID-19 as home-schooling caused inequality of learning in terms of parental support, time, and space for learning and technological resources (Huber et al., 2020). After the lockdown on 11 May 2020, catching up on the missed learning and bans on outings or special events impacted the children’s motivation and learning. These insights should be considered when teaching in a difficult situation such as during and after a lockdown. Online learning involves more than just a change of setting; the relationships that obtain in the classroom and that influence learning do not automatically persist in the online environment. Furthermore, children need sequences that stretch them in the subject matter and personally in terms of autonomy and agency. If established and practised beforehand, the rules for collaboration could have been a cornerstone and guidance, fostered ownership and empowered my participants in this difficult time. While the effectiveness of collaboration in DST supported by translanguaging has been demonstrated in prior research (Kirsch, 2018), results regarding the types of talk are contradictory: Kirsch (2016) argues that DST promotes exploratory talk, but Kirsch and Bes Izuel suggest that the talk in collaborative DST ‘was mainly ‘cumulative’, although there was evidence of ‘exploratory talk’” (2019, p. 215).

Nevertheless, despite the application of the rules for collaboration, KWIC can facilitate the IDZ (4.1.2.1), i.e., gaining new knowledge through collaboration (Mercer, 2000). This practice is socioculturally mediated through artifacts and language (Lantolf and Thorne, 2006). These allowed my participants to draw on peer-scaffolding to plan the task collaboratively and imaginatively (Stavrou et al., 2021), or to justify their linguistic choices in both languages, also known as other-regulation. Their collaborative language use was embedded in the particular context and situation (Lafford, 2009) in which they assisted each other in accomplishing the task by drawing on each other’s expertise and used each other as a resource, which enabled co-construction in L1 and L2 (García and Li, 2013).

Such negotiation processes facilitated internalisation, which is self-regulation. As outlined above (4.3.3), the boys discussed the chunk ‘much time’ and Momo checked it with me. His control over the newly acquired chunk (Ziegler, 2016) made him perceive his agency as he repeated the sentence whenever they listened to the recording. This practice supported internalisation processes and enabled him to use
it jokingly as a greeting in the next lesson. As a result, my study suggests the use of KWIC supported students in their IDZ and collaboration (other-regulation) which fostered individual learning (self-regulation).

5.5 Conclusion

In this chapter I have described and discussed the findings of my study. I identified four key findings relating to: improvements in motivation; the importance of task design; awareness of audience design; and the benefits of translanguaging.

Firstly, I have highlighted the motivational aspects (5.1) of oral game-like tasks facilitated by technology which verify findings of previous DST studies with children (Chong and Reinders, 2020; Kirsch and Bes Izuel, 2019; Kirsch, 2018; Dausend, 2017; Sun et al., 2017; Hwang et al., 2016; Kirsch, 2016; Pellerin, 2014; Hur and Suh, 2012). Some of my results build on this existing evidence, but they give deeper insights into reasons for: identifying how collaboration is valuable; how DST can be enhanced through translanguaging and explicit teaching of how to make it work; the impact of exploratory talk; the children’s deliberate audience design; and how personalisation can be motivating (Bower, 2019). Learning then becomes more significant and powerful than mere working with a textbook. DST with language support can develop linguistic skills, and increase the quality and time of speaking (Ziegler, 2016).

Secondly, having a real audience (5.3), real objectives and real-life tasks (5.2) are cornerstones of digital teaching and learning (Tour, 2020). My study confirms Tour’s (2020) ecological insights and demonstrates that combining user-friendly software with a differentiated task that recycles the language and structures taught whilst including some elements of choice (Cameron, 2001) can be advantageous. As a result, oral DST can stretch MIT and English pedagogy as oral learning opportunities are challenging in primary (Dausend, 2017), especially when simultaneously attempting to embed MIT in English classes. My findings show the importance of an appropriate and creative problem-solving task-design along with language support that fosters child-oriented language (Blake and Scanlon, 2013). Together with teacher scaffolding, this can reduce cognitive load (Chen and Chang, 2017).

Research has shown that children have a sense of who ‘the reader’ of their writing is and can distinguish between writing for an adult and a child (Durán, 2017; Toohey et al., 2012), but to my knowledge, little is currently known about their awareness of
audience design in oral L2 DST by children (5.3). My data indicated that children can anticipate the needs of their listeners/viewers and adapt their presentation accordingly. My participants manipulated paralanguage, selected visuals, chose graphic resources (Seargeant and Tagg, 2014), and mobilised cultural resources to entertain their peers and teacher. This ability to address a defined audience is a crucial factor for success in life as much as in the classroom. Whilst Fukumura (2015) claims that the motivation for audience design is still unclear, I have been able to give examples of its motivation and development.

While previous research on oral L2 DST has stressed the benefits of translanguaging (5.4) for meaning-making and use of exploratory talk (Kirsch and Bes Izuel, 2019), other- and self-regulation as self-reflection (Pellerin, 2014), and that L1 use can heighten self-esteem and achievement in writing (Toohey et al., 2012), my results demonstrated that:

- children naturally and purposefully translanguage and code-switch, even if the policy and mandated practice proscribe it
- translanguaging can improve collaborative and individual meaning-making and thus develop individual learning
- translanguaging can empower the children to become agents in the creation of their products and help them tailor them to their immediate audience
- task-based DST combines linguistic resources with the affordances of the software and the task which enables the children to increase their (language) learning

Furthermore, joint and individual learning was supported by collaboration (Mercer, 2000). I have discussed the children’s use of KWIC which positively influenced their reasoning, behaviour, and performance. This led to a final product which the children were very proud of.

In the last chapter I first summarise my research and my key findings. I then discuss implications and limitations of my research, demonstrate outcomes, give recommendations for future research, and finally reflect on my research journey.
Chapter 6 Conclusions and recommendations

The purpose of this last chapter is to examine the fulfilment of the research objectives posed in Chapter 2 (2.2). These aimed to: identify opportunities and challenges in digital storytelling (DST) in a young learner (YL) foreign language (L2) classroom in Switzerland; investigate impacts on oracy; and examine the role of the first language (L1) in this process. Whilst I have illustrated my findings (Chapter 4) and discussed them previously (Chapter 5), I here conclude the research and findings (6.1). I then mention implications (6.2) before I acknowledge limitations of my research (6.3). I further demonstrate impacts my research has had to date (6.4) which leads to the need for future research (6.5). I end this thesis with a personal reflection (6.6).

6.1 Research conclusion and findings

The aim of this enquiry was to investigate how YL L2 beginners of English engage with collaborative oral task-based DST to improve their oracy. Whereas task-based learning (TBL) has been widely researched, TBL supported with Information and Communication Technology (ICT) is a more recent phenomenon, and a recent phenomenon that is still in need of a more clearly articulated pedagogic approach (Chong and Reinders, 2020). Hence, my digital tasks were designed to provide differentiation, scaffolding, and interaction, and relate to the learners' experiences.

The Swiss Curriculum 21 for English is predicated on the children using the target language principally (D-EDK, 2018b), but the reality is quite different, particularly in the early stages, due to the learners' limited L2 resources. Because research on translanguaging among YL in DST in the L2 classroom is very limited, I decided to embrace it and encourage its use in my study.

Previous DST research in the YL L2 classroom has identified its positive impact on children's motivation, highlighting such features as its promotion of creativity and the stimulus of having a real audience, but evidence of development in the L2 has been vague: general improvements in skills in collaborative DST (Kirsch and Bes Izuel, 2019), and accuracy and fluency in individual DST (Sun et al., 2017).

I intended to address these gaps in the literature with my small-scale case study approach, and my paradigm ecological constructivism helped me examine language, language learning, interaction, and inherent processes holistically (Hoven and Palalas, 2011). I drew on multiple methods such as participant observation,
semi-structured interviews with the participants and their teachers, a classroom observation prior to the Swiss COVID-19 lockdown, and a questionnaire during the lockdown with all the children from the class to examine the problem from different angles. Reflexive thematic analysis (TA) enabled me to identify, analyse, and describe the patterns within these datasets (Clarke and Braun, 2013) and generate the following findings:

6.1.1 Opportunities and challenges in teaching oral DST

6.1.1.1 Promotion of oracy in DST and its efficacy

What was impressive throughout the data was the children’s high level of commitment to collaborative DST in L2. This stems from six points identified:

1. Handing the learning over to the children, they took ownership for their learning and were immersed in the task.

2. The use of the software Adobe Spark Video (ASV) was stimulating and motivating because results were quickly visible to the children in the video.

3. Adapting the task to the children’s needs, knowledge, and intentions, enabled the children to experience and exercise agency, which was reinforced by the reactions of their peers and their teacher, Ms Marple, when watching the videos.

4. The pupils had a clear audience for their video. In response, they were motivated to produce correct English, which required rehearsing their lines, and multiple repetitions until the recording met their expectations. These repetitions were more motivational and meaningful than mere drills/hidden drills as chants, games etc. which still prevail in the YL L2 classroom (Pinter, 2017; Legutke et al., 2009).

5. The children clearly tailored their video to their particular audience, which was a creative process drawing on the flexible software ASV, personalising the task, and flavouring the video with their humour. Their awareness of audience design developed during the year. To date, there has been little research that focuses on the role of audience design in YL L2 oral DST, where it is mentioned but not discussed (Kirsch and Bes Izuel, 2019; Kirsch, 2016), and described in teenage literacy-based DST (Toohey et al., 2012) and YL individual writing (Durán, 2017).
6. This all was an empowering experience that impacted the children’s motivation and further English learning, which experience suggests can drop in their second year of learning.

My approach to the TBL design proved decisive in promoting this positive student engagement. Their collaborative work was enabled by the design of the end-of-unit tasks and the language support materials provided which offered a meaningful revision of the lexis and structures they had previously learnt. This was particularly promising because the task involved using child-oriented lexis and structures and was related to the children’s world. Moreover, the tasks enabled differentiation, which led to personalised and individualised learning, and learner autonomy. To create these end-of-unit tasks, I used a backward design model (Figure 11). Theorising task design for DST is new and proved successful by:

- relating the task to the curriculum
- relating the task to the children’s needs and lives
- keeping the affordances of the software and language support in mind

6.1.1.2 Required prior knowledge and building and fostering of prior knowledge

End-of-unit tasks allowed the children to draw on language they had learnt previously, and additional language support offered on the task sheet and within the teaching speaking cycle (Figure 9) assisted the teaching approach. This framework by Goh and Burns (2012) to support speaking holistically has not previously been reported on in research on oral DST with YL. The children followed a structured and guided approach with interim feedback which made iterative improvement in their work possible. This framework was beneficial because oracy in the L2 classroom is often treated as a given rather than explicitly taught (Goh and Burns, 2012), and much less theorised.

Reflexive TA of the audio-/video-recordings of my four participants engaging in their tasks, their interview answers, and answers from the online questionnaire with the class revealed the ease of the use of the software used which inspired my participants to be creative and tailor their presentations to their audience. This shows that using software that is user-friendly enables the children to focus on content rather than technology.
The COVID-19 lockdown impacted my data collection of collaborative DST but fortuitously allowed me to make a comparison to individual work by setting a home-school task (5.3.6). I discovered that most children preferred collaboration as it spurs their creativity and sense of audience design and helps them construct and structure the talk more successfully than on their own. This can inform DST practice more widely.

6.1.2 Effect on pupil’s speaking proficiency
Audio- and video-recordings of the dyads revealed the children’s multiple recordings and metacognitive processes of evaluation which led to progress in speaking proficiency, especially pronunciation, as observed by my four participants and their teachers. The children perceived the task as a motivational game and had fun. Moreover, in the questionnaire with all the children, they mentioned they had experienced progress in self-confidence and ICT skills. While the former is important for oracy in general, the latter shows that the subject Media and Information Technology (MIT) can be meaningfully embedded in other subjects, an expectation of the recently implemented Swiss Curriculum 21.

6.1.3 Use of L1 in L2 classes and collaboration
My findings that the children drew on their L1 for negotiation processes, such as organisation and preparation of the task, clarification of words, and judgement of the quality of the speech they produced, reflect Kirsch (2018) and Dausend's (2017) insights. My findings suggest that, counter to prevailing Swiss policy and practice on the use of the target language in the L2 classroom, promoting the use of translanguaging enabled the pupils to engage in task-based DST, expand their linguistic resources, tailor the story to their audience, and spice it up with humour. This allowed the children to express their emotions, crucial in the YL classroom (Nunan, 2011), which gave them a true voice in the process, which the reflexive TA of the data of video-/audio-recordings of tasks and the analysis of the children’s digital stories revealed.

Translanguaging also reinforced collaboration within these negotiation processes in my YL L2 classroom: it supported meaning-making and reasoning. Creating the conditions for effective collaboration in the L2 classroom has been given little consideration, but it is clear from work on oracy in L1 contexts (e.g., Mercer, 1996) that talk benefits from being explicitly taught and practised if it is to be effective and of value for the children. I demonstrated that even supplying a list of key words in
context (KWIC) can support children if the rules for collaborative talk have not been explicitly incorporated into classroom practice.

This holistic view of languages was embedded in my paradigm ecological constructivism (3.1.2), and the case study approach (3.2) and my methodology (3.3) provided the basis for the emergence of rich data. Reflexive TA (3.11) enabled me to code and analyse the children’s use of L1.

In summary, YL oral L2 DST can strengthen L2 learning:

- by employing real-life tasks which are differentiated, tailored to the children’s needs, and recycle meaningful lexis and structures
- by providing language support
- by teaching oracy explicitly and giving the learners feedback (Goh and Burns, 2012)
- as a motivational approach which is engaging, also long-term
- by having a clear audience
- by supporting children’s collaboration explicitly (Mercer, 1995)
- by integrating MIT into oral L2 learning
- by encouraging translanguaging for L2 learning

6.2 Implications

These findings have implications for my immediate Swiss context and policy, but also for YL oral L2 DST, and L2 teaching and learning theory in general, while the wider community of English language methodology, primary teachers, and language teachers in general will be able to infer and determine the transferability to their context. In addition, publishers, especially of YL resources, might be inspired to find more imaginative ways for fostering freer speaking.

The study shows that task-based YL oral L2 DST can change the often prevalent behaviourist methodology of mere drills and choral practice (Legutke et al., 2009) often disguised as chants, rhymes and songs (Pinter, 2017). My work demonstrates that repetition does not necessarily imply dry and meaningless drills but can become creative recycling of lexis and structures which can lead to positive outcomes and real learning. Learning happens because of learner activity and engagement which
is spurred by the motivation of creating a personalised digital story for a real audience. This implies that task-based DST embedded in the curriculum promotes more meaningful and realistic communication and freer speech that could be valuable for learners to show what they can do. As demonstrated, DST improved self-confidence in English which could encourage shyer children to become more outgoing and participate more often in class.

Learning also happens through the interplay of linguistic resources with the affordances of the software and the DST task (Lafford, 2009). This enabled the children to expand their repertoire and become not just performers of someone else’s script, but co-creating actors improvising around a given theme. This implies the need to recognise the powerful approach of collaborative oral task-based DST for L2 pedagogy, which should be incorporated into Initial Teacher Education (ITE), but also into continuing professional development.

These insights are also significant for publishers whose textbooks are often seen as the base for teaching. This implies that they should integrate realistic and meaningful communicative tasks (or even DST tasks), for which they also provide language support. It would be desirable if they suggested DST in their teacher’s book and refer to DST literacy.

Especially when children have learnt the language and structures, they perceive their language growth in task-based oral DST. The approachability of my problem-solving tasks demonstrates the value of the *backward design* with clear and differentiated learning aims and language support which promotes personalised and individualised learning. This implies that my DST task design (Figure 11) can add to the theory of L2 teaching and learning as Chong and Reinders (2020) claim the urgency for an efficient theoretical concept of technology-mediated TBL that enables the design of powerful pedagogical DST tasks with the potential to improve language learning.

This is crucial in my immediate context as tasks are a core element of *Curriculum 21* (Krieg and Hess, 2017) and form the basis of our methodological approach (Kanton Zug, 2011). Their absence from the first edition of our textbook *Young World* and only one task per unit in the revised version is a shortcoming. This implies that my task design could serve as a model for teachers, especially those who are already familiar with the cantonal *support cycle* (Figure 10) and would provide them with a basis for planning further tasks and activities to enrich the teaching and
learning in their classrooms. This would equally apply to similar contexts apart from my own, and quite likely be applied in other content areas too. For example, it is not difficult to imagine teachers of Humanities or Science bringing their subject to life through the power of DST.

Along with the task design, my study highlights the need for language support and scaffolding in teaching speaking, another shortcoming of the mandated textbook, and thus often neglected by teachers. While the children used the lexis learnt, they also drew on the language support which helped them express themselves. This implies the need for methodology lecturers in ITE to raise the awareness of support in their sessions, and for teachers in their continuing professional development to reflect on additional and language needs and assist their learners. Furthermore, it is recommended that publishers offer guidelines and suggestions for scaffolding and language support.

My research also illustrates that talk requires support and practice. Speaking cannot just be done, and is more than mere pronunciation, but a holistic concept of skills, communication strategies, and language and discourse that needs to be improved (Goh and Burns, 2012). This can be aided by the theory of the teaching speaking cycle (Figure 9) which comprehensively supports learners with its holistic framework of teaching skills, strategies, and language to promote speaking. The cycle would also underpin the TBL approach. This implies that publishers should consider speaking more holistically in their textbooks, with which the teaching speaking cycle can help. It would also be beneficial if the framework were to become more popular in English language methodology as a model that can enable teaching speaking more thoughtfully, more holistically, and allow for improved speaking outcomes. In contrast to the TBL framework, it supports learners from the start with a clear focus on the activity, explicit teaching of required needs, and the formative iterative feedback helps them improve their work.

This should be accompanied by meaningful and transparent explicit learning aims being used to guide teaching and learning so that learners are not left performing isolated language tasks in a vacuum or having to work out for themselves what the larger purpose of an activity might be. This implies the need for teachers to be clear about their learning aims first when designing a task and then explaining them transparently to the children.
Not only is oracy important for DST, but suitable software is crucial too. My results confirm the user-friendliness of the multifaceted ASV software (Chung and Wang, 2020; van Arnhem, 2017). Its simple interface enabled the children to focus on the task and their speaking, and its adaptability spurred their creativity and audience design. This implies the convenience of a simple, versatile program that can also be used for cross-curricular work, or explored in many other subjects as Adobe Spark (AS) also offers other opportunities with AS Page and Post (Forta and Burns, 2018).

Incorporating ICT involves a shift in classroom organisation and pedagogy. Teachers might be hesitant to try it out or would need more resources. As seen above, the rooming was a challenge because the children needed a quiet space to concentrate and do the recording, and small group rooms are scarce. More than two dyads in one room or on the corridor caused background noise and impacted on the quality of the recording. This implies an issue with resourcing both in terms of physical space and staffing. Either more group rooms are needed, or while one half of the class works on DST, the other half works silently or on another task in the classroom. Based on this, teachers need to see the many advantages to overcome these challenges.

My research suggests a more relaxed use of the L1 in line with Kirsch (2018) and Dausend’s (2017) findings about YL use of L1 in DST, and illustrates that YL L2 beginners need to be allowed to draw on their L1 to collaboratively solve an L2 task (5.4.1) as recommended by Cameron (2001), and Pinter (2017) for Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). But although there is growing awareness of translanguaging worldwide, the policy of the Swiss Curriculum 21 is to use the target language principally as the language of instruction to ensure ‘maximum input and a rich linguistic environment in order to learn a foreign language’ (D-EDK, 2018a, p. 5, translated by the author). That means that an L2 should be learnt like an L1, and as little German spoken as possible in order to maximise the use of English, while my research demonstrates that more is often needed to enable understanding, construction, and meaning-making. Using the L1 is regarded as a necessary evil, but I would say it is a necessary good. Whilst language mediation, which means summarising content from L2 in L1, is allowed in Curriculum 21, translanguaging offers a more holistic view of communication. This implies the necessity for reconsidering the ‘[n]ational discourses constructing languages as autonomous bounded systems’ (Anderson et al., 2018, p. 197) of the target language-based policy. Since translanguaging is an unfamiliar concept in Switzerland (Krompáč,
there is a need to make it more widely-known. My research may raise the awareness of translanguaging and code-switching in Switzerland and its manifold advantages for learning. This would represent a new approach for Swiss primary English language methodology lecturers and has the potential to influence pedagogy significantly.

I also demonstrated that translanguaging can support task demands and language learning in DST to develop identity, agency, ownership, and autonomy (4.3.2). These are important characteristics in learning which let the learners experience success. This implies the need for acknowledging the use of L1 in YL DST and in L2 teaching generally as a means of support and to enable the development of language and personality.

My results reveal that translanguaging enabled collaboration, learning in general, and language learning specifically through meaning-making and expression of emotions in oral task-based DST in L2. This implies that translanguaging is a powerful approach in the YL L2 classroom and should be recognised as an important method, which fosters holistic learning in terms of interdisciplinary competences such as collaboration, but also improvement in language learning and ICT knowledge. Consequently, the potential of translanguaging in the L2 classroom should be more widely acknowledged.

Moreover, collaboration and interthinking processes play an important role in my research. I would make two recommendations. Firstly, in DST the children’s co-construction of their stories and peer-scaffolding spurred their creativity, and interthinking processes made them explore the best options for their video and speech. Even though the agreed ground rules did not play an important role in the class, the KWIC identified by Mercer et al. (1999) enabled the children to collaborate well. This implies the importance of metacognitive processes in collaboration. The children know these required rules implicitly, but are more likely to apply them with explicit instruction and guidance (Mercer, 1995). Whereas initial teacher guidance after collaborative agreement on the rules is imperative, Vrikki et al. (2019) argues that learners who have adopted the rules are able to apply them without being constantly reminded. Whilst these metacognitive processes are valuable in general, such an implemented routine could be especially beneficial in difficult times, such as a pandemic, to foster togetherness and collaboration as research findings of dialogic teaching and learning demonstrate ‘higher learning outcomes and more positive attitudes to schooling’ (Hardman, 2019, p. 1).
Secondly, as learning in general is based on language (2.4.1), interthinking processes can strengthen the learner’s entire communicative repertoire (L1 and L2) and affect further learning through intrathinking processes. In addition, interthinking processes which enable peer- and self-reasoning lend themselves well to develop interdisciplinary competences, a core element of Curriculum 21. However, ideas such as Mercer’s (1995) on the explicit teaching of ground rules to enable effective collaborative talk are little known in Switzerland. This implies the requirement to make them known to policy makers and offer teacher training and professional development to raise teachers’ awareness of the importance of interthinking processes for effective collaborative work and providing support for the children’s learning.

Finally, my research revealed three potential impacts in relation to embedding MIT across the curriculum. Firstly, it showed how MIT might be successfully embedded in English/L2 classes. As Curriculum 21 was written from 2010-2014 (Geschäftsstelle der deutschsprachigen EDK-Regionen, 2010) when desktop computers were not yet widely available in Swiss primary classrooms, the curriculum document refers only to examples of how MIT might be embedded in the L2 classroom such as the use of an online translation tool, the use of word-processing, and virtual and real encounters of people and artifacts of the English culture (D-EDK, 2018a), but even today, technology-enhanced TBL is a young division of L2 research (Chong and Reinders, 2020). This implies that my research could help advance theory that could lead to further developments in technology-based YL L2 TBL.

Secondly, according to the feedback of the MIT further qualification course I took part in, the integration of MIT into other subjects seems to be challenging for primary teachers, which can slow down the development of innovative approaches (Kukulska-Hulme, 2021). As ‘technology integration is still very much an ongoing effort’ (Mourlam et al., 2020, p. 9) and German the primary teachers’ L1, and they often teach all or most subjects, finding an implementation for MIT in German or Humanities might be more obvious than in an L2. This implies the need to make innovative work more accessible. I have shown that the AS software offers easy and multiple uses. My task sheets provide ready-to-use material which can be adapted to a particular class and their needs or (together with my task design) serve as a template for how similar activities could be modified to other content areas to develop the specific language skills they required, but which are rarely consciously
taught. In L2 classes, these game-like tasks can counteract the general tendency of children’s loss of initial motivation for the subject in their second year of instruction.

Thirdly, the two facts above express the need to train student teachers to embed MIT into L2 classes as the integration of technology in L2 teaching can be fruitful. This implies that English language methodology lecturers should routinely include the use of digital devices in ITE and that practising teachers would also benefit from continuing professional development in this area.

6.3 Limitations of the research

My research setting was my school, which made me an insider researcher as discussed above (3.3/3.9/3.13/3.15). This role facilitated me in building rapport more easily with the children and the teachers. Particularly advantageous was the fact that the children were used to having different teachers for different subjects in Ms Marple’s class because introducing the tasks and helping the children during classwork made me one among others: I adopted a role as a participant during the classwork. In addition, teaching at the same school means that we had shared experiences and contexts, and shared knowledge about requirements, cantonal rules, and regulations. However, expectations from my practice both at primary school and the Pädagogische Hochschule Zug (PH Zug)/ITE college of Zug influenced my view and at times I had to define my role as an insider as insider researchers often need to define their roles (Cohen et al., 2007). For example, our headmaster attached great importance to discussing and reflecting on learning aims with the children which I did when introducing the task, but I noticed the children’s boredom because they were not used to doing this. While I assumed that they were more interested in the task than the aims, an outsider might have investigated this point earlier and addressed it questioning practices or policies that I took for granted and thus uncovered slightly different findings.

My small-scale qualitative case study gives specific ecological insights into holistic language practices, learning in interaction (Hoven and Palalas, 2011), and language improvements (Nunan, 2004b), which are true for my specific community. But these insights have limitations in terms of generalisation to other communities (3.2.2), because the inferences cannot be generalised ‘beyond the empirical evidence’ (Bassey, 1999, p, 6). However, this is not the aim of my case study. Because of its subjective and particular insights (Cohen et al., 2007), it rather seeks for naturalistic generalisation of the reader drawing conclusions from the case study (Bassey,
1999), or analytic generalisation, i.e., developing a theory to assist other researcher’s comprehension of similar cases, aspects or circumstances (Cohen et al., 2007).

Within this case study approach, the participant demographics are not typical and should be borne in mind. Firstly, my participants were of only one class in a wealthy urban catchment area with fluent and native English speakers in the class. Their higher socioeconomic background means their parents have the means to support them, and fluent and native speakers might impact language learning in terms of motivation as native speakers can stimulate learning if children aim to become equal to them or discourage learning if the (personal) standard is set too high. Secondly, participation was voluntary, and both the parents and the children had to give consent. Some parents did not allow any audio-/video-recording, and children who were insecure would not want to be audio-/video-recorded and interviewed. Thirdly, Ms Marple excluded outliers such as fluent speakers or children with special needs. Lastly, my four participants from above socioeconomic standard spoke Swiss German only, which is, according to Hutterli et al. (2014), not a representative group within multilingual Switzerland.

Turning to the data collection methods, the observation of the tasks generated rich data and deep insights into naturalistic learning during the lessons which took place in a small, dedicated room suitable for group-work. Even though the children were separated in a group room, audio- and video-recorded, and aware of the recording as they looked through the camera and checked the voice recorder each time, they behaved naturally which was reflected in their relaxed use of informal language during the sessions. Although this meant the children were separated from their classmates and might have been uncomfortable in this unfamiliar setting, the decision to do this was justified as it would have otherwise been impossible to make recordings of sufficient quality, let alone to transcribe them later: creating optimal conditions for the children to work in also facilitated the research process. This lesson was brought home to me when, following the return post-COVID-19-lockdown, one of the group rooms became unavailable and I had to decamp to the only available room, a storage room which was open to another room where another session was taking place.

The COVID-19 lockdown from 16 March to 10 May 2020 impacted my data collection. A single home-school task replaced a collaborative task which was the best I could make of the unfortunate situation. However, for some parents and
children the situation (Huber et al., 2020) and the individual task proved stressful. Some children worked on their parents’ computer, others had problems accessing AS online, and one child even created a story that was longer than six minutes. Even though, it was good to stay in contact with the children, and for Ms Marple to catch up after the lockdown, in retrospect, I should have set a voluntary task because the time was very demanding on the parents.

The three collaborative observations prior to the COVID-19 lockdown elicited rich data and made it possible for me to react to the situation and change my methodology. Firstly, I added a classroom observation to check the validity of my initial findings. This was very insightful about the children’s work and language use. However, if I had started earlier linking the initial findings to the research questions (RQs), this would have helped me closely tailor my observation table to the RQs.

Secondly, an observation earlier in the academic year might have revealed other insights than my class observation in the week prior to the lockdown. Then strict hygiene rules were already imposed on the children. These had an impact on the class dynamics and lesson in terms of greeting, interaction, and social distancing.

Thirdly, during the lockdown, I implemented an online questionnaire to seek all the children’s view about oral DST, which I further explored in the interviews at the end of the research. While the questionnaire was particularly insightful about the children’s experience and their self-assessment on improvement on oracy, I had to compromise three things: Firstly, it was evident from the answers that comments came not just from the children, but adults also added comments to the questionnaire. They suggested including more categories. This taught me the importance of being more inclusive in the categories of respondent included.

Secondly, one child, who had been very positive and enthusiastic about DST in the collaborative school setting before and after the lockdown, was very negative in his report in the questionnaire. I noticed that his home-school video was much longer and, based on my knowledge of his home background, surmised that he may have been under some parental pressure to exceed the task demands set, which may account for the difference in his response. Equally, of course, there may also have been entirely other reasons for his change of heart. This taught me the importance of contextualisation and avoidance of assumptions when interpreting data.

Thirdly, in the questionnaire I often asked the children to give reasons for their answer. Open-ended questions were very tiring (Dörnyei, 2003) for the children,
especially in as difficult a situation as a lockdown. This taught me the importance of ensuring the questionnaire design is tailored to the participants and not just my research questions.

Lastly, because of inequalities arising from six weeks of home-schooling during the COVID-19 lockdown (Huber et al., 2020) especially so close to the end of the academic year (beginning of July), measuring and comparing language gains with children from an experimental group, post-tests would not have been valid anymore. Consequently, I had to rely on the teachers’ expertise and self-evaluation of the participants in the questionnaire and interviews. Despite asking regarding improvement in various ways and using different wording, being my participants and colleagues, their self-reported evaluation could have been biased to please me. They might have been more critical to an outsider-researcher. In addition, this self-reported data could not provide finely-detailed data on improvements across a range of specific areas such as fluency, structures, lexis, strategies, in which the children improved.

Regarding interviews, in a future interview I would change the first question to the children: I asked them about their motivation for participating in the study, which was insightful for me, but which they could hardly remember as they had made this decision ten months before. I would now start by asking a potentially more resonant question about their experiences in creating videos which would be a springboard for further investigation.

During the year and during the interviews, I showed transcripts of audio-/video-recordings of the tasks to the children and Ms Marple to improve internal validity. This decision to share was in line with my role as an insider researcher. Both teachers declined to cross-check the interview transcripts and I decided against asking the children to do this as it would have been too demanding for them. However, after the lockdown the children asked about the results of the questionnaire and I showed the class some results. Even though, they were positive throughout, these answers might have impacted the participants’ responses to the subsequent interviews. In retrospect, I would share preliminary insights only after the interview or visit the class once more, although this would not have been possible in the short-term in this instance because of COVID-19 restrictions.

My paradigm, methodology, analysis, and insider research call for addressing subjectivity. It is critical in constructivist research because of the personal
involvement of the participants, as in qualitative research the ‘subjectivity of respondents, their opinions, attitudes and perspectives contribute to a degree of bias’ (Cohen et al., 2007, p. 133). Furthermore, in reflexive TA, researcher reflexivity and subjectivity are essential for interpreting the data (Braun and Clarke, 2019). Reflexive TA does not seek for coding reliability as outlined above (3.11), and as a single researcher my report is shaped by my person and personality (Reiss, 2005). I addressed subjectivity by quoting the participants, and through validity checks: consistency in the interviews, in transcriptions, coding and analysis of the data, and then triangulation of the data. My reflexive journal assisted reducing subjectivity by enabling me to reflect critically on the process, the methods, and events. Looking back, my daily notes I took during the COVID-19 lockdown proved helpful for processing incidents, decisions, and actions, and in any future research I would consider taking notes more regularly.

Lastly, I refer to the limitations of my context for which my findings are specific not least because of my paradigm, ecological constructivism (3.1). However, I have tried to improve reliability by faithfully explaining my data collection, analysis, triangulation of the methods, and findings (Cohen et al., 2007; Robinson, 1994) in order to make the findings transparent, particularly for Swiss primary English teachers, Swiss primary L2 methodology lecturers, and other L2 teachers (of YL) who can draw conclusions and assess transferability to their or another setting. Furthermore, by relating the findings to the literature, I generated theoretical and practical findings that have implications for theory and practice (6.2). In addition, my enquiry has already had some practical outputs.

**6.4 Outcomes of my research to date**

My research has led to various outputs:

- I published an article about my pilot study in *Babylonia*, the Swiss peer-reviewed language education journal (Lustenberger, 2019).

- I teach digital media sessions at the PH Zug to fourth semester English language methodology students. My research has enabled me to share my own deepened theoretical awareness with the students, provide an innovative approach to implementing the *Curriculum 21* reforms, and open new insights for them to pursue.
• I have embedded the use of ASV tasks into teaching oral work sessions to first semester students at the PH Zug.

• My professional development workshops based on the integration of MIT into L2 teaching reflect my research and give the teachers other valuable alternatives to develop new skills. I provide them with models from my L2 classroom and help them create suitable tasks to integrate MIT into their L2 lessons.

• During the lockdown I was invited to give online workshops to sixth semester students at another ITE college in Switzerland on L2 primary oral DST.

• I was invited to present provisional results of my research to a committee at the PH Zug in October 2020. A presentation at the PH Zug to a wider audience is planned as soon as COVID-19 restrictions allow.

• I was invited to present my study to the Swiss foreign language methodology association ADLES in January 2021.

• I was invited to present my research and AS to advisors of local ICT authority in February 2021. I showed them opportunities for using AS in English lessons and its potential application across the curriculum. We collated further ideas and made them available for sharing on an interactive website.

• Following a presentation to the local School Improvement Officer on Mercer’s types of talk, which fit well with developmental work here on interdisciplinary competencies, we are now seeking ways to share my research more widely with primary colleagues.

• During the Swiss COVID-19 lockdown in 2020, I produced an instruction manual for teachers on the use of ASV, which raised interest in the Swiss exchange organisation Movetia for which I wrote instruction manuals for AS Post and Page too.

• Following this, I was invited to present AS for the Swiss exchange program Movetia in September 2021. I demonstrated the use of the software and suggested opportunities to use it with the class for digital exchanges.

• As the COVID-19 lockdown made it difficult for teachers to teach new vocabulary to their students, I created a series of AS videos for Years 3 and 4, which introduced the vocabulary the children needed to complete the
relevant units at home. A list of these videos was uploaded to a dedicated website of the foreign language department of the PH Zug (Pädagogische Hochschule Zug, 2021). In summer 2020, I added videos for the remaining units, which were very well received. Based on this, I will create a further set of videos for Year 5 and 6.

- Enthused by the ASV tasks, Ms Marple asked me to create a set for her Year 3 class. She was positively surprised by how easy they were to teach and that her Year 3 class was as motivated as her Year 4 class.

These outputs have led to several contributions to theory and practice in my field of teaching L2 to YL and L2 methodology in terms of integration of MIT into language teaching and L2 learning, oral DST in L2 classes, teaching speaking, translanguaging, and oracy in L1:

Firstly, the integration of MIT into language teaching and L2 teaching is not only a requirement of our recently implemented Curriculum 21 (D-EDK, 2018c), but a worldwide trend that has become even more important with the COVID-19 pandemic and subsequent homeschooling. Hofer-Krucker Valderrama and Kauffmann, (2021) claim that during the lockdown, digital teaching was increasingly project-based. This form of teaching, which needs to be carefully planned and carried out, should be implemented in the school in the longer term. My task design and DST tasks add to this need and at the same time offer differentiated learning. Such an easy and conducive learning setting can encourage primary teachers to adapt it in their L2 teaching as they have restricted space, and subject teachers prescribed teaching times (Holmes and Miles, 2019, cited in Macleroy et al., 2021) and limited access to ICT, and are less tech-savvy (Toohey et al., 2012). Several teachers in canton Zug have already successfully adopted my tasks in their YL English classes and more will follow with the tasks on our PH Zug website (Pädagogische Hochschule Zug, 2021).

Secondly, as storytelling is a common method in the YL classroom and has positive effects on language learning (Macleroy et al., 2021), I showed that its effects can be successfully translated to oral DST in L2 classes, which I have brought to Switzerland through my DST tasks in L2 teaching. DST is a purposeful teaching approach that fosters communicative and ICT skills that are important for the children’s future in terms of study and employment (Frazel, 2010). Furthermore, DST can spur creativity among the children, motivate them to learn an L2, work
more autonomously, and gain ownership over their work (Macleroy et al., 2021). My enquiry builds on this creative approach and demonstrates that teaching speaking can be more imaginative than the common approach of ‘listen and repeat’ and can thus support oracy in English. This is especially true for my DST tasks in which the children collaboratively create the text as the learning process is more important than the product (Lambert and Hessler, 2018), and I have also demonstrated the children’s desire to entertain their audience and respond to it (5.3). My approach is already proving motivating for Swiss primary teachers and might be motivating for more (primary) teachers to engage with DST and allow more creativity in their classroom.

Thirdly, oral DST is a suitable method to foster YL speaking. My research shows the importance of clearly stated differentiated learning aims based on Curriculum 21 and the children’s prior learning, which makes the playful collaborative tasks meaningful and relevant for them (D-EDK, 2016a). These and the clear structures of the holistic approach by Goh and Burns’s (2012) the teaching speaking cycle (2.4.3), supported the children throughout the process along with the necessary scaffolding and language support I provided. My research not only informed my own teaching at both institutions (primary school and PH Zug), but also the wider community of Swiss English methodology teachers who have used my article (Lustenberger, 2019) in their sessions, and primary teachers who have adopted my DST tasks, as supported tasks that build on existing knowledge/skills with clear aims are achievable and fun for children.

Fourthly, translanguaging enabled meaning-making and simplified collaboration which empowered learner autonomy and led to ownership of the children’s video. Unsupported by Curriculum 21 (2.6.4) and in its infancy in Switzerland (Krompàk, 2014), my enquiry brought the need for translanguaging for YL in the L2 classroom and translanguaging as a method to Switzerland. My above-mentioned presentation to L2 methodology lecturers raised numerous questions about translanguaging and I have had several informal talks with L2 methodology teachers about the topic, which resulted in the PH Zug buying the first book on translanguaging in the L2 classroom. This demonstrates that ‘the translanguaging paradigm shift is beginning’ (Seals et al., 2021, p. 276) in L2 teaching as so far the main focus on translanguaging research has been on minority languages. Translanguaging has only entered L2 teaching recently, and more insights are much needed (Sembiante and Tian, 2021). This is especially true for TBL, which is based on the assumption
of L2 exclusively in terms of input and learner interaction (Seals et al., 2021), both part of my research. In addition, my enquiry adds to the understanding of how translanguaging can foster collaboration, scaffolding and supporting learning an L2, and meaning-making to gain understanding.

Lastly, interdisciplinary competences, the basis of *Curriculum 21*, which are crucial for 'successful life management' (D-EDK, 2016a, p. 13, translated by the author) were practised by applying reasoning skills in collaborative problem-solving (Mercer, 2019). These comprised responsibility during the creation of ASV tasks in terms of collaboration, reasoning (Vriikki et al., 2019), and learning. Mercer's types of talk (2.7) are significant for building up interdisciplinary competences, and vital for teacher's attitude towards and decisions about how to employ the affordances of technology productively (Mercer, 2019). My research adds to this understanding in terms of collaborative DST, L2 teaching, and the provision of KWIC for collaboration. The types of talk influence my work at the Oracy Centre of the PH Zug (6.6) and me offering professional development courses at the PH Zug. Consequently, for my enquiry I focused on learner-learner collaboration and theories by Littleton and Mercer (2013) with their focus on making classroom talk supportive and accountable. I also drew on Alexander's framework for dialogic teaching, but it did not play a significant, direct role in my project, as its focus is more on the role of teacher talk through which student talk is largely ‘facilitated, mediated, probed and extended' (2018, p. 563). Having said that, Alexander’s framework would nevertheless improve teaching and learning in Switzerland, and I strongly recommend adopting it. There is clearly a need for development and more research in the YL DST classroom.

### 6.5 Future research

My case study was tailored to my context and thus, in a sense, the findings are ‘unique' to my particular setting. Nevertheless, I believe the implications (6.2) are of wider relevance and there are unexplored issues that could be examined, e.g., by modifying my research or using the software to stretch more fluent speakers.

**6.5.1 Modification**

As my study is valid for my context, an approximate replication in which the main variables stay the same (Riazi and Candlin, 2014) could further validate my results. As my setting is a relatively advantaged one, it would be insightful to try out this approach with schools with more disadvantaged students to see if the benefits
accrued and support Toohey et al.’s (2012) claim that multimodal literacy empowered weaker teenagers is also true for multimodal oracy in the YL L2 classroom.

Because of home-school inequalities during the COVID-19 lockdown I had to rely on the children’s self-assessment and teacher’s general assessment on language gains. To gain more detailed insights into what aspects of language (e.g., fluency, pronunciation, lexis, manner of expression, speaking strategies used, grammar) can be fostered through collaborative oral DST, pre-/post-tests, as originally planned, would be illuminating. These could be done with the whole class or even larger scale to develop theory on DST and language improvement. It would even be possible to start with DST tasks in Year 3 after half a year of L2 lessons and measure long-term motivation and language gains for more than one academic year.

As argued above, shyer or introvert children can benefit from practising the L2 in a safe environment that might empower them to become more outgoing and risk-taking. Here I would suggest a conceptual replication, i.e., investigating the same questions but applying other data collection methods or analytical tools (Riazi and Candlin, 2014). Video-/audio-recording of the tasks in this study provided insights into the children’s collaborative processes and how outgoing the children are in a dyad. This could be triangulated with video/audio-recordings of general classwork/groupwork in L2 and interviews with the participants to demonstrate their development.

Using a translanguaging approach allows children to make use of their L1 in (Swiss) German which could generate further work on how translanguaging supports learning not just in DST, English classes or other second language lessons, but in other areas such as Humanities too. This would further demonstrate the need for translanguaging in Curriculum 21 and Swiss state schools. Furthermore, it also has potential for supporting children learning German (and through German) as an additional language in Swiss schools or indeed through an additional language in other countries. I could easily imagine students producing induction videos for new arrivals, for example (Anderson et al., n.d.).

My research could also lead to other developments and be further extended (Riazi and Candlin, 2014). For example, I showed that the children were motivated to repeatedly rehearse their texts, which contrasts with the experience of teacher drills. However, mistakes may go unnoticed in pair work, but teachers could pick up on
these by changing step four of the teaching speaking cycle (Figure 9): instead of giving written feedback, an explicit language practice block could be taught before returning to the taskwork. Furthermore, pre-/post-tests containing the language of the tasks could give further insights into explicit teaching. To reveal and identify the value of this explicit input, it could be contrasted with an experimental group that gets individual written feedback and/or an experimental group that does not get feedback and/or does not do oral DST.

Planned discourse is more complex than spontaneous (Goh and Burns, 2012), but can develop speaking skills, which was the purpose of the language support introduced and provided, and through peer-teaching. Their effectiveness could be analysed by comparing the language used in AS videos with spontaneous pre-/post interviews/tests on the same topics. Findings could give insights into the children’s learning, and probably intensify the demand for professional development for teachers to support children in their L2 classes.

6.5.2 Exploring ASV

Drama pedagogy claims positive impacts on language learning (Bowell and Heap, 2013; Phillips, 1999). Oduke (2014) specifies this general claim in his study in Kenya about learning French through role-play and mentions improvement in fluency and self-belief. One of the reason for this might be the adoption of another persona which Calleja (2007) witnessed in video games. I have observed both in my research, but further studies involving TBL and ASV, or oral DST in general, could provide useful insights into these aspects of learner behaviour, and lead to theory and innovations in L2 pedagogy.

My study was designed to explore the development of L2 oracy through collaborative work, but it could also be adapted for other approaches, e.g., children working in larger groups or individually, allowing for assessment of different aspects of learning from social development (e.g., ability to work with others) to an individual’s language production. The individual videos would be suitable for deriving the level of competence of the individual (Dausend, 2017) with Pienemann’s teachability/learnability theory (Keßler, 2006) that reveals learner development and variation. This would facilitate further curriculum design and personalised learning. Based on this teaching, the extent of improvement of oracy could be measured by analysing the ASV. These would also show the amount of
language support the children used or if they continued making the same mistakes. This in turn could impact L2 speaking methodology.

Initially, Ms Marple wanted to grade the videos. However, this proved difficult, also because of inequality of the dyads. As a result, this course of action was not pursued. A future research project could develop a set of criteria for assessing the children. It would be valuable to see its impact on collaboration, motivation and learner autonomy as Lamb (2011) claims that teacher control impacts the construct of student identity.

As my research revealed, the children demonstrated a clear sense of audience design (4.1.1.3/5.3). I was not able to secure parental permission to share the videos more widely on this occasion, but it is easy to imagine that the prospect of uploading their work to a website or presenting their digital stories at a DST festival at school (Anderson et al., n.d.) might motivate children to even higher levels of accuracy and performance which could be researched further.

6.5.3 Adobe Spark

5.8 % of the schoolchildren in the town of Zug are native English speakers (Zehnder, 2021) and many more have visited an English playgroup, kindergarten or school. These children mainly need to develop their writing skills in English. Personalising teaching for this group of children is still in its infancy and is currently under discussion at the PH Zug. Insights from my study could lead to research on using AS tasks to develop writing skills, e.g., captioning and subtitling, story-writing, etc. I have already started creating writing tasks for Year 4 and 5 children.

6.6 Personal reflection

I finish this thesis with a personal reflection. My EdD journey and the above-mentioned various outcomes have personal value for me and have transformed me as a person, as a researcher, and as a teacher and teacher trainer in different ways.

On a personal note, my EdD journey started promisingly with the prospect of the pilot study in my classes and its dissemination in the Swiss magazine Babylonia (6.4). But then two months after its start, my Dad passed away unexpectedly. This was a big rupture in my life as I had promised to always look after him several years ago and had been his main carer for five years. Managing my EdD and the bereavement as an only child was a huge challenge personally. It was impossible
to please everyone which in the end strengthened my personality because I had to justify the decisions I had made, something I adopted in my EdD.

When I undertook my pilot study, I taught two Year 4 classes which was ideal for my experimental design: my participants were from my English class and the control group from my other class. This design allowed me to be in close contact with my participants, adjust the tasks, and see my participants’ progress. However, when I did my main study, I taught Year 3 and had to search for participating classes. Although several people showed interest in my initial study, they all declined to participate. While I continued my search for participants, I lived in uncertainty for several weeks. Then our headmaster at the time advised me to recontact the teachers and talk to them personally, which I had done already, but did anew which resulted in Ms Marple giving her consent just in time to contact the school leadership team about my main study before the summer holidays. I draw several consequences from this experience: firstly, even if I am excited about a project, others do not have to be. I can only inspire them. Secondly, it is better to talk to the people directly if possible than to ask them by e-mail. Thirdly, in difficult times, such as uncertainty, I can stay strong. This experience strengthened my perseverance and resilience even more and turned out to be a source of empowerment during the COVID-19 lockdown when my workload increased tremendously, and I had to reorganise the continuation of my research.

My journey also taught me to be patient with myself for two reasons: firstly, I often did not achieve as much as I wanted during a day, but Nordic walking, a habit I resumed during my EdD, proved valuable. Going for a walk was the best thing I could do to refresh my mind, get new inspirations, and care for myself. I will definitely keep up this habit. Secondly, my L1 is Swiss German and I have been writing this thesis in my L2 which took much more time than it would have taken in my L1.

Turning to my role as a researcher, at the beginning of my EdD, I attended the Tablet Days conference in Switzerland which allowed me to investigate digital teaching and establish contacts with like-minded people whom I have contacted again during my doctorate. This inspiring event was a motivational start and taught me the need to interact with people at conferences and other gatherings.

In my pilot study I transcribed all the Swiss German talk in Standard German because I am not used to writing or texting in Swiss German. However, I realised that this did not do justice to the children’s actual language use or indeed to Swiss
German. Consequently, in my main study I transcribed all the data (about one thousand minutes) in its original language as explained above (3.7). This made things more difficult and time-consuming as there are currently no established spelling conventions for Swiss German, but it was worth the additional effort in helping me stay closer and truer to the children’s language and meaning-making.

My insider role was particularly helpful for establishing contact with the participants, knowing local rules and regulations, and reflexive TA supported it, but also allowed me to step back and look at the data through different lenses: events, meanings, and implications. I gained the insights presented in my thesis that would not have been revealed to me if as a teacher I had employed L2 oral DST and not researched it.

Another significant turning point on my journey was the COVID-19 lockdown in Switzerland on 16 March 2020 (1.6/3.8/5.3.6) when data collection at school was impossible for an indefinite period as the length of the school closure was extended several times, and only ended on 10 May 2020. Talking to my supervisors, I was provided with the adaptation of the proverb ‘When life deals you lots of lemons, make a lemon drizzle cake to go with the lemonade!’, which became a precious personal mantra for my life. It made me search for other opportunities to carry on with my research and find methods that are compatible with my paradigm and that would generate valuable and reliable data. This in turn sharpened my research focus: whilst beforehand I had been more narrowly focused on the technological side of computer- and mobile-assisted language learning, it became clear to me that I was researching DST and in a more holistic sense.

My EdD journey showed me that research and examining data are fascinating, and the findings derived at my desk relevant to my wider environment. I can make a difference with my study. So far, I mainly had this experience in teaching which I, as a result, had preferred to office work. Because of this new insight, I can well imagine continuing to work in research and am looking forward to collaborating with the Oracy Centre at the PH Zug.

Finally, my role as an educator has changed as I have decreased my workload at school, where I now only teach English, and have become more involved at the PH where I went from being a research assistant in English language methodology to an English language methodology lecturer. Nevertheless, working at both
institutions in both roles, linking theory and practice, is an enrichment for me personally and – I hope – for all parties involved.

Reviewing the literature was particularly valuable for my teaching focus in primary, which shifted too. Being aware of choral drills and the lack of innovative practice, in addition to writing more DST tasks, I have sought for more authentic speaking activities which I have implemented with additional language support in my English classes. Whereas in the past the children were rather inhibited about speaking, now almost all of them can communicate with me using basic English at the end of Year 4.

My research has confirmed my belief in the power of embedding oral DST with YL and, as mentioned previously, I have already made at least one convert in the shape of Ms Marple, with whom I am collaborating in extending its use to other year groups.

Task-based DST in the YL L2 classroom is an efficient and fun way to foster oracy, which I have tried to convey in this research. As I have received a lot of support throughout my EdD journey from my schools and colleagues, I am equally hopeful that my thesis might prove inspirational for policy makers to see the need for and value of fostering oracy in L2 and L1, for other researchers to gain further insights and encourage further investigation, and for practitioners to try out DST. In my small world I have already been able to change a few things (6.4) and am sure others will follow because of the positive impacts and my participants’ enthusiasm about task-based oral DST in L2.

Finally, I would like to leave the last words of my thesis to my participants. Ms Marple concluded: ‘It’s a mega cool project. I find, the children were able to benefit immensely in terms of speaking and computer knowledge.’ It was not only her own motivation she commented on, she also said that the children were ‘extremely motivated’. Hansli, one of the children, commented on the benefits of our focus on oracy: ‘We were able to improve our English further by doing more of these tasks’, and at the end of the interview, he did not want to leave before testifying: ‘It was just a cool project.’
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## Appendices

### Appendix 1: Key Words and Phrases used for Literature Search

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key words</th>
<th>Secondary term (+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Digital storytelling</td>
<td>Adobe Spark&lt;br&gt;Adobe Spark Video&lt;br&gt;Adobe Voice (former version of ASV)&lt;br&gt;children&lt;br&gt;collaboration&lt;br&gt;collaborative&lt;br&gt;cooperative&lt;br&gt;computer&lt;br&gt;foreign language&lt;br&gt;iPad&lt;br&gt;laptop&lt;br&gt;L2&lt;br&gt;oracy&lt;br&gt;oral&lt;br&gt;primary (school)&lt;br&gt;second language&lt;br&gt;speaking&lt;br&gt;tablet&lt;br&gt;task&lt;br&gt;task-based&lt;br&gt;young learners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Exclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excluded theme (-)</th>
<th>Reason for exclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adolescents</td>
<td>older learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adults</td>
<td>older learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analogous storytelling</td>
<td>too general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first language</td>
<td>out of scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heritage language</td>
<td>out of scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kindergarten</td>
<td>younger learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>out of scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>literacy</td>
<td>out of scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nursery</td>
<td>younger learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-kindergarten</td>
<td>younger learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>storytelling</td>
<td>too general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teenagers</td>
<td>older learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writing</td>
<td>out of scope</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 2: Literature review: summary of YL L2 oral DST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Age of participants/ School (class)</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Methods and methodology</th>
<th>Key findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Chong and Reinders | 2020 | 3 studies in primary/ secondary | 16 studies between 2002-2017         | synthesis              |          |                         | • relevant real-life tasks  
• assisting cooperation, interaction, speaking  
• motivational  
• learner-centred learning  
• awareness of audience  
• improvement of speaking in general, lexis, structures, pronunciation  
• improvement of IT skills |
| Kirsch and Bes Izuel | 2019 | Luxembourg nursery and primary | 4 multilingual participants | 2 years | observation, 13 hours of audio- and video-recording, interviews with teachers, conversation with children | • advancement of collaboration and L2 learning with the app  
• co-construction  
• learners take on the role of an expert  
• use of L1/translanguaging enabled instructional learning/ mediation  
• metalinguistic awareness  
• mainly cumulative talk, evidence of exploratory talk |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Age/Year</th>
<th>Class/Teacher</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kirsch</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>nursery and primary Year 1/2</td>
<td>4 multilingual participants</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>recordings of the children working, recordings of the teachers interacting with the children, interviews with the teachers, conversations with the children</td>
<td>• translinguaging enabled meaning making/co-construction, supported collaboration and identity performance • translinguaging developed multilingualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dausend</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Year 1-4</td>
<td>5 classes/teachers 109 children</td>
<td>8 months</td>
<td>video-/audio-recording of selected dyads, interviews with selected students,</td>
<td>• writing/speaking tasks • opportunities and challenges in groupwork: compromises • creativity • learners enjoyed collaboration • use of L1 for organisation, planning, recording, reflexion, and metacognition • use of L2 for planning, recording and reflexion • highly motivated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun et al.</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Ø 6.5 years Year 1</td>
<td>35 CG 37 EG</td>
<td>12 weeks</td>
<td>pre-/post-tests, experimental: focus group interviews with EG</td>
<td>• EG: significant improvement in accuracy and fluency • EG: same progress in pronunciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Age/Year</td>
<td>Participants/Groups</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Kirsch        | 2016 | Luxembourg | 6-7 years | 2 multilingual     | 2 years  | observations, 10 hours of video-recording, 3 interviews with children, audio and visual material | • increase of attitude and motivation for speaking  
• high practice  
• lower anxiety  
• authentic context (daily life)  
• instructional learning  
• co-construction  
• features of exploratory talk  
• self-evaluation of the learning process  
• tablet = successful learning tool (repetition, former recordings served as resources, replay function)  
• motivational  
• goal-oriented tasks  
• purposeful: for their audience |
| Hwang et al.  | 2016 | China      | Year 6   | 29 CG 30 EG        | 6 weeks  | CG/EG: pre-/post-tests, EG: questionnaire, interviews                      | • EG: higher language learning gain  
• only individual DST was significant for learning achievement  
• learners prefer collaborative DST  
• metacognition  
• rehearsal of speaking  
• meaningful creative, and playful activity  
• higher retention of lexis  
• high learner motivation |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Data Collection Methods</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Pellerin, 2014 | 2014 | Canada      | 4x Year 1, 3x Year 2, 1x Year 1/2, 3x Year 3, 2x Year 4 | 16 immersion teachers with their class | video-/audio-recording, ethnography, artifacts, discussion with children, semi-structured interviews with teachers | • children's creation of authentic and meaningful language tasks  
• (self-)regulation of learning  
• metacognition  
• learner autonomy  
• high learner engagement  
• high learner motivation |
| Hur and Suh, 2012 | 2012 | United States | Year 3 and 4 | 11 students | 60-hour intensive summer program daily video podcasts, vocabulary tests, learner survey, photostory, interviews with teachers, classroom observation, report card, informal meetings with students and parents | • development of investigation, presentation, writing, and speaking skills  
• ownership of learning  
• effective scaffolding tool  
• practise L2 in a safe environment  
• engaging learning environments created by the teacher |

CG = control group  
EG = experimental group
Appendix 3: Topics for the interviews

Topics for the interview with the participants

motivation
informal work on the computer at home
(dis)like of ASV and reasoning
prior knowledge of ASV tasks
ASV: difficulty, English, at home
introduction of tasks
learning aims
audience
help with wordlists
collaboration
use of German, use of English, e.g., Das esch es nices Foti. Chumm, mier gönd zom merry-go-round.
my feedback during the break
sending ASVs to grandparents…
tasks: better ideas? Best task?
Improvement of oracy

Topics for the interview with Ms Marple, the Year 4 teacher

class
differentiated learning aims
oracy in L1/L2
focus in your L2 teaching
concerns about DST prior to the study
ASV tasks
L1 in lessons/L2 lessons
Introduction of tasks, language support
feedback after the break
sharing of ASVs
language gains

Topics for the interview with Ms Maloney, the Year 5 teacher
motivation in L2
oracy L2
features or strategies in L2 oracy
oracy L1
collaboration
audience design
## Appendix 4: Classroom observation analysis

| minutes | 5  | 10 | 15 | 20 | total occurrences in half a minute in the first part | 25 | 30 | 35 | 40 | 45 | 50 | 55 | 60 | total occurrences in half a minute in the second part |
|---------|----|----|----|----|-----------------------------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-------------------------------------------------
| teacher speaks English | 6  | 3  | 4  | 7  | 20                                           | 5  |     |    |    |     |     |     |     | 5                                                          |
| teacher speaks German  | 2  |    |    |    |                                              |    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 2                                                          |
| teacher speaks Swiss German |    |    |    |    |                                              |    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |                                                            |
| pupils speak English   | 4  | 7  | 10 | 9  | 30                                          | 2  |     |    |    |     |     |     |     | 4                                                          |
| Germanic constr. in English | 1  | 2  |     |    | 3                                           |    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |                                                            |
| pupils speak German    | 3  | 3  | 3  | 9  |                                              | 3  | 2  | 1  | 4  | 5  | 2  | 1  | 18                                                         |
| pupils speak Swiss German | 1  | 2  | 2  | 5  |                                              | 8  | 3  | 3  | 5  | 7  | 2  | 35 |                                                            |
| whole class            | 9  | 1  | 2  | 12 |                                              | 2  |     |    |    |     |     |     |     |                                                            |
| group                 | 8  | 1  | 5  | 8  | 22                                          | 2  |     |    |    |     |     |     |     | 2                                                          |
| pair                  | 1  | 7  | 4  | 2  | 14                                          |    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |                                                            |
| individual            |    |    |    |    |                                              | 9  | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 4  | 73                                                        |
| speaking              | 2  | 8  | 10 | 9  | 29                                          | 7  | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 4  | 73                                                        |
| writing               |     |    |    |    |                                              | 7  | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 4  |                                                            |
| reading               |     |    |    |    |                                              | 7  | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 4  |                                                            |
| listening             | 6  | 2  | 3  | 1  | 12                                          | 2  |     |    |    |     |     |     |     | 2                                                          |
| language support      | 1  | 8  | 2  | 11 |                                              |    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |                                                            |
| ZPD/IDZ               |    |    |    |    |                                              |    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |                                                            |
| pupil’s self-correction |    |    |    |    |                                              |    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |                                                            |
| teenage slang/swearword |    |    |    |    |                                              |    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |                                                            |
| fun with language     |    |    |    |    |                                              |    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |                                                            |
Appendix 5: Online questionnaire Jisc

Cover letter:

Doktoratsstudie: Fragebogen

Liebe Eltern der Schülerinnen und Schüler von Frau Marple

Von Herzen hoffe ich, dass es Ihnen allen gut geht.


Bitte zögern Sie nicht, mich bei Fragen oder Unklarheiten zu kontaktieren.

Ich danke Ihnen ganz herzlich für Ihr Vertrauen und Ihre Unterstützung.

Herzliche Grüsse

Andrea Lustenberger

Doctoral Study: Questionnaire

Dear parents of Ms Marple’s students

From the bottom of my heart, I hope you are all doing well.

At school, I got to make three videos with your child using Adobe Spark Video. Your child created great presentations. I would be happy to send you the videos at the end of the school year.

Because of coronavirus, I had to rearrange my doctoral study. Instead of an assignment at school, the children solved the homeschooling task at home. In these
videos, they again did a super job and gave exciting accounts of their day at home. For my slightly restructured study, I would like to compare the work done at school with the one done at home. For this purpose, I have created a questionnaire. It will take about 15 minutes to fill out. I would be very happy if your child would fill out the questionnaire at the following link by **09 May 2020**: [https://tinyurl.com/asv-Fragen](https://tinyurl.com/asv-Fragen)

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions or uncertainties.

Thank you very much for your trust and support.

Best regards

Andrea Lustenberger

---

**Online questionnaire Jisc:**

---

**Doctoral research with Adobe Spark Video – questionnaire COVID-19**

Dear children of Ms Marple’s class

You created mega cool presentations with *Adobe Spark Video*. I'm happy that I get to work with you. Working with you is totally exciting for me and my project "Promoting Oracy in the English Classroom with *Adobe Spark Video*".

Because of coronavirus, I had to modify my project. You have now made a video at home. That’s why I'd like to hear more from you about working with *Adobe Spark*
Video at school and at home. Your participation in this questionnaire is voluntary. However, with your answers you would help me tremendously to understand my work better.

That's why I'd really appreciate it if you could take the time to answer the following questions. There are no right or wrong answers and your answers will not give any marks.

By participating, you give me permission to use your answers for my work. All data will be collected anonymously. They cannot be assigned to your person and will be treated strictly confidential.

Thank you very much for your participation.

How much did you enjoy working with Adobe Spark at school?

😊😊😊😊😊

I liked…

I did not like so much…
How difficult was the task (animal party, fairground, interviewing someone about their job)?

very easy, easy, medium, difficult, very difficult

I liked…

I did not like so much…

How difficult was it to work with the software *Adobe Spark*?

very easy, easy, medium, difficult, very difficult

The easiest thing was…

The most difficult thing was…
How much did you enjoy working with *Adobe Spark* at home?

😊😊😊😊😊

I liked…

I did not like so much…

How difficult was the task (home-schooling)?

very easy, easy, medium, difficult, very difficult

The easiest thing was…

The most difficult thing was…
How difficult was it to work with the software *Adobe Spark* at home?

very easy, easy, medium, difficult, very difficult

The easiest thing was…

The most difficult thing was…

How many people did you send the link to your video (apart from Ms Marple and myself)?

0 – 1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

To more people:
Who did you send the link?

How did the people react?

Would you send me a screenshot of their answers, please?

Thank you very much.

That's why I didn't let the link upload on Padlet (password protected website)

I don't want other people to be able to watch my video.

I only want special people to watch my video.

I don't know what Padlet is.

Other reason:
Which work with *Adobe Spark* do you prefer?

In pairs at school.

Alone at home.

I don't mind.

Why?

Did working with *Adobe Spark* help improve your English?

Yes.

No.
What I would like to say:

I speak the following language(s) with my family:


Another language, namely:

I speak the following language(s) with my friends:


Another language, namely:
I speak the following language(s) with my neighbours:


Another language, namely:

Thank you very much for your answers. You have helped me a lot.
Appendix 6: Deductive/inductive codes

**Definition of deductive codes:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation for recording</th>
<th>Choice and scaffolding of text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis/evaluation of recording</td>
<td>Reaction after having released the record button, reaction when listening to their recording (also entire video)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of general language support: laminated sheet</td>
<td>Language support that is on the laminated sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of specific/task-related language support</td>
<td>Language support that is on the respective task sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disputational talk</td>
<td>‘... disagreement and individualised decision-making. There are few suggestions. ... short exchanges consisting of assertions and challenges or counter-assertions.’ (Mercer, 1995, p. 104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative talk</td>
<td>‘... speakers build positively but uncritically on what the other has said. Partners use talk to construct a ‘common knowledge’ by accumulation. Cumulative discourse is characterised by repetitions, confirmations and elaborations.’ (Mercer, 1995, p. 104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploratory talk</td>
<td>‘... partners engage critically but constructively with each other’s ideas. ... Statements and suggestions are offered for joint consideration. These may be challenged and counter-challenged, but challenges are justified and alternative hypotheses are offered. ... knowledge is made more publicly accountable and reasoning is more visible in the talk.’ (Mercer, 1995, p. 104, italics in original)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermental Development Zone (IDZ)</td>
<td>‘... creation and maintenance of a dynamic, contextual basis of shared knowledge and understanding… language use during joint activity both generates and depends on the creation of this contextual framework… success of any collaborative endeavour will be related to the appropriateness of the communication strategies participants use to combine their intellectual resources.’ (Fernández et al., 2015, p. 57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording</td>
<td>Recording itself as soon as someone pressed the record button until they released it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>free use of English, lexis that has not been learnt in English classes, not connected to the textbook, the units, the task, or language support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>looking up words</td>
<td>checking words online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>translanguaging</td>
<td>comprising all resources for meaning-making: languages (English, (Swiss) German), artifacts, gestures, media</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition of inductive codes:**

| Germanic construction | Germanic construction in English sentences |
| key/critical incidents | talking about motivational aspects, misunderstandings, contextual impacts, learner autonomy |
| other observations | ICT knowledge, mentioning their who-can-say-more-words competition |
| correcting themselves | collaborative improvement of pronunciation/spelling, English translation, monitoring and realisation of mistakes, |
| fun with language | joking with each other, puns, ‘language’ games/jokes, rhymes |
| teenage slang/swearwords | expressions children use in their freetime/in the playground, also to address themselves, swearwords and derivations of swearwords (e.g., gosh) |
| chunks | chunking learnt (in the textbook), or in the language support |
| understanding of ASV product | demonstrating ASV knowledge |
| lead | pupil who guided the other through the task by forcing to continue, concentrate, suggest photos/text, being in charge of the laptop |
| camera/video-/audio-recording | looking through the video-camera, checking the camera/voice recorder |
| T use of language | language use by the teacher: English, (Swiss) German |
Appendix 7: Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) approval

From: Research-REC-Review
Sent: 02 July 2019 10:46
To: Andrea.Lustenberger; Research-REC-Review
Subject: HREC/3292/Lustenberger: HREC Favourable Opinion

Dear Andrea

This message confirms that the research protocol for the following research project, as submitted for ethics review, has been given a favourable opinion on behalf of The Open University Human Research Ethics Committee.

Project title: An investigation into promoting oracy using mobile devices in primary English in Switzerland

HREC approval date: 02/07/2019

As part of your favourable opinion, it is essential that you are aware of and comply with the following:

1. You are responsible for notifying the HREC immediately of any information received by you, or of which you become aware which would cast doubt on, or alter, information in your original application, in order to ensure your continued safety and the good conduct of the research.

2. It is essential that you contact the HREC with any proposed amendments to your research, for example - a change in location or participants. HREC agreement needs to be in place before any changes are implemented, except only in cases of emergency when the welfare of the participant or researcher is or may be affected.

3. Your HREC reference number has to be included in any publicity or correspondence related to your research, e.g. when seeking participants or advertising your research, so it is clear that it has been agreed by the HREC and adheres to OU ethics review processes.

4. Researchers should have discussed any project-related risks with their Line Manager and/or Supervisor, to ensure that all the relevant checks have been made and permissions are in place, prior to a project commencing, for example compliance with IT security and Data protection regulations.

5. Researchers need to have read and adhere to relevant OU policies and guidance, in particular the Ethics Principles for Research with Human Participants and the Code of Practice for Research - http://www.open.ac.uk/research/ethics/

6. The Open University’s research ethics review procedures are fully compliant with the majority of research council, professional organisations and grant awarding bodies research ethics guidelines. Where required, this message is evidence of OU HREC support and can be included in an external research ethics review application. The HREC should be sent a copy of any external applications, and their outcome, so we have a full ethics review record.
7. At the end of your project you are required to assess your research for ethics related issues and/or any major changes. Where these have occurred you will need to provide the Committee with a HREC final report to reflect how these were dealt with using the template on the research ethics website - http://www.open.ac.uk/research/ethics/human-research/full-review-process (HREC Final Report form)

Sent on behalf of the Human Research Ethics Committee

Professor Louise Westmarland    Dr Duncan Banks    Dr Claire Hewson
Chair                        Deputy Chair          Deputy Chair
Appendix 8: Information for participants

Information for Participants

Date: 19 August 2019

Title of research: An investigation into promoting oracy using mobile devices in primary English in Switzerland

Name of researcher: Lustenberger Andrea

I would like to invite you to participate in my study. I am telling you why I am doing this research and what you might do. I will go through the information sheet with you and answer any questions you have. Talk to others about the study if you wish. Ask me if there is anything that is not clear.

What is the purpose of this study?

As you might know, I have been using tablets in my English lessons from January 2016 onwards. Mobile devices can be used in class in many different ways. In this research I would like to find out if primary pupils can improve their speaking if they work together and solve tasks on tablets.

Why have I been invited?

You are being invited to participate because you are in Ms Marple’s 4th grade class at XXX school. I am inviting some participants like you to participate. All the others will also work on notebooks.

Do I have to take part?

It is up to you to decide whether or not to participate. If you do decide to participate you can keep this information sheet and you and your parents will be asked to sign a consent form. If you decide to participate you are still free to withdraw at any time and without giving a reason.

What will happen to me if I take part?

You will do tasks using Adobe Spark as everyone else in the class: You will get a task and you will discuss it with your partner, choose pictures and some written text.
Then you will both do audio-recordings on Adobe Spark. You will be video- and audio-recorded performing these tasks. In addition, you are going to participate in a short oral activity in English at the beginning and the end of the academic year. I will ask you some questions which you will answer in English. These will be video- and audio-recorded. Then I would like to interview yourself and your partner together in June about your work with Adobe Spark. The interview will be audio-recorded. All these will take place during regular class time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>all pupils</th>
<th>participating pupils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>video-recording of a short oral activity (September 2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tasks with Adobe Spark</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>video- and audio-recording of tasks with Adobe Spark</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>video-recording of a short oral activity (June 2020)</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>audio-recording of the interview with your partner (June 2020)</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What are possible disadvantages and risks of taking part?**

It could be that you might not feel at ease if being video-recorded. However, you will soon forget that there is a camera.

**What are the possible benefits of taking part?**

I would like to show you how to produce videos with Adobe Spark. I hope that the information I will gain, will help me explain what happens when children work on tasks with tablet computers. Consequently, I hope I can make speaking activities easier for you and other pupils in the future.

**What happens if there is a problem?**

If you have any questions about any aspect of this study, please let me know. I will take the time to answer your questions as best as I can. If you will still be unhappy and wish to complain, you or your parents can do this by contacting the University Research Ethics Officer. All contact details are given at the end of this information sheet.

**Will my taking part in the study be kept confidential?**

I will follow the law of the United Kingdom and Switzerland and I will treat all information about you confidentially.
If you join the study, the data collected for the study will be looked at by me. Authorised professors of The Open University will check that the study is being carried out correctly. All will treat every detail confidentially.

All information which is collected about you during the course of the research will be kept strictly confidential, stored in a secure and locked drawer. Electronic data will be stored on an encrypted USB stick and on a Swiss password-protected cloud that works under strict Swiss data protection. After having put together all data, all hard copies will be transferred to a secure location advised by my university.

Any information about you which leaves the university will have your name and address removed (de-identify) and you will have the opportunity to give yourself a nickname that will be used. De-identified data may also be stored in a locked drawer or on a password-protected Swiss cloud for future research in this area. Every possible precaution will be taken so that nobody will get hold of your data.

Although what you say in the interview with your partner about your work with Adobe Spark is confidential, should you say anything which I feel puts you or anyone else at any risk, I may feel it necessary to report this to the appropriate persons.

Your personal data (name, address, telephone number) will be stored during three years in order to contact you for research results.

**What will happen if I don’t want to carry on with the study?**

You are free to participate and to withdraw at any time, without giving any reason. If you withdraw then it might not be possible to remove the information collected up to that point. Your de-identified data might still be included in the project.

**What will happen to the results of the research study?**

The results of the research will be written in a report for my university (The Open University, Milton Keynes, United Kingdom). In addition, I might write a short article for a research magazine or I might present the findings at conferences. I will not use your real name but a de-identified name in my report, in the article or at conferences.

Who is organising and funding the research?

This research is being organised by me for my doctorate at The Open University in Milton Keynes (United Kingdom).

Who has reviewed the study?
All research at The Open University is looked at by a group of people, called a Research Ethics Committee, to protect your interests. This study has been reviewed and given a favourable opinion by the Ethics Committee.

Further information and contact details

Researcher: Andrea Lustenberger
(e-mail address)

Supervisor: Frank Monaghan (e-mail address)

Human Research Ethics Committee of The Open University: HREC
(e-mail address)

German version – used in the study:

Information für Studienteilnehmerinnen/Studienteilnehmer

Datum: 19. August 2019

**Titel der Studie:** An investigation into promoting oracy using mobile devices in primary English in Switzerland (Die Erforschung der Förderung der Sprechkompetenz durch den Gebrauch mobiler Geräte im Englischunterricht in der Schweizer Primarschule)

**Name der Wissenschaftlerin:** Lustenberger Andrea
Es würde mich freuen, wenn du an meiner Studie teilnehmen würdest. Ich möchte dir erklären, warum diese Studie gemacht wird und was das alles für dich bedeutet. Ich werde dir auch alles genau erläutern und du darfst heute und auch später jederzeit gerne nachfragen oder mit anderen über die Studie sprechen.

**Was ist der Grund dieser Studie?**


**Warum werde ich zu dieser Studie eingeladen?**

Du bist eingeladen, an dieser Studie teilzunehmen, weil du in Frau Marples Klasse im Schulhaus XXX zur Schule gehst. Ich lade einige Kinder ein, an der Studie teilzunehmen. Die anderen lösen ebenso die Aufgaben an den Notebooks.

**Muss ich teilnehmen?**


**Was passiert mit mir, wenn ich teilnehme?**

Aufgabe | alle Schülerinnen/Schüler der Klasse | teilnehmende Schülerinnen/Schüler der Klasse
--- | --- | ---
kurze mündliche Aufgabe mit Filmaufnahme (September 2019) |  | x
Arbeit mit *Adobe Spark* zu den jeweiligen Units | x | x
Filmaufnahmen/Audioaufnahmen der Arbeit mit *Adobe Spark* zu den jeweiligen Units |  | x
kurze mündliche Aufgabe mit Filmaufnahme (Juni 2020) |  | x
Audioaufnahme des Interviews mit deiner Partnerin/deinem Partner (Juni 2020) |  | x

**Welches sind mögliche Nachteile oder Risiken?**

Es kann sein, dass du dich nicht so wohl fühlst, wenn du mit der Kamera aufgenommen wirst. Doch du wirst schnell vergessen, dass eine Kamera da ist.

**Was sind mögliche Vorteile der Teilnahme?**

Ich möchte dir zeigen, wie man mit *Adobe Spark* Videos machen kann. Ich hoffe, dass die Informationen, die ich erhalten werde, mir helfen zu erklären, was passiert, wenn Kinder Aufgaben mit Tablets lösen. Somit erhoffe ich mir, dass ich Sprechanlässe für dich und zukünftige Schülerinnen und Schüler vereinfachen kann.

**Was passiert, wenn ein Problem auftaucht?**


**Ist meine Teilnahme vertraulich?**

Ich halte mich an englische und schweizerische ethische und rechtliche Gepflogenheiten und alle Informationen über dich und von dir werden vertraulich behandelt.
Wenn du dich zur Teilnahme der Studie entscheidest, werden alle Daten der Studie von mir angeschaut und ausgewertet. Autorisierte Professoren der *The Open University* werden überprüfen, dass die Studie korrekt durchgeführt wird. Diese Leute werden auch deine Daten vertraulich behandeln.

Alle Informationen, die ich während meiner Studie sammle, werden streng vertraulich behandelt. Sie werden in einer abgeschlossenen Schublade bei mir zu Hause verstaut und elektronische Daten werden auf einem verschlüsselten USB-Stick und in einer Schweizer Cloud, die passwortgesichert ist und strengen schweizerischen Datenschutzrichtlinien untersteht, gespeichert. Alle Papierdaten werden an einem sicheren Ort in der Universität gespeichert.


Alle deine Informationen werden vertraulich gehandhabt. Doch falls du im Gespräch mit deinem Partner/deiner Partnerin über eure Arbeit mit *Adobe Spark* etwas sagen würdest, das eine andere Person in Gefahr versetzen würde, werde ich diese Person benachrichtigen.

Deine persönlichen Daten (Name, Adresse, Telefonnummer) werden während drei Jahren gespeichert, damit ich dich über die Ergebnisse der Studie informieren kann.

**Was passiert, wenn ich nicht mehr an der Studie teilnehmen möchte?**


**Was passiert mit den Ergebnissen der Studie?**

Die Ergebnisse der Studie werde ich in einem schriftlichen Bericht meiner Universität (*The Open University*, Milton Keynes, Vereinigtes Königreich) zustellen. Ausserdem werde ich einen kurzen Artikel darüber schreiben. Es kann sein, dass
ich auch in der Schweiz und anderswo an Kongressen über die Studie berichten werde. Weder im Bericht noch im Artikel oder in einem Vortrag wird man wissen, dass du gemeint bist, weil ich einen unidentifizierbaren Namen benutzen werde.

**Wer organisiert diese Studie?**

Diese Studie organisiere ich im Rahmen meiner Doktorarbeit an der *The Open University* in Milton Keynes (Vereinigtes Königreich).

**Wer hat diese Studie überprüft?**

Alle Studien der The Open University werden von einer Gruppe von Leuten (Human Research Ethics Committee) angeschaut, um deine Interessen zu wahren. Diese Studie wurde überprüft und gutgeheissen.

**Weitere Informationen und Kontaktdaten**

Wissenschaftlerin: Andrea Lustenberger (e-mail address) oder (e-mail address)

Doktorvater: Frank Monaghan (e-mail address)

Ethikkommission der *The Open University*: (e-mail address)
Appendix 9: Consent/assent form

CONSENT FORM FOR PARENTS

Title of Study: An investigation into promoting oracy using online software in primary English in Switzerland

Name of Researcher: Lustenberger Andrea

Name of Parent: ______________________________

Name of Participant (Child): ______________________________

1. I confirm that I have read and understand the information sheet for the above study and have had the opportunity to ask questions.

2. I understand that my child’s participation is voluntary and that they are free to withdraw at any time, without giving any reason, and without their legal rights being affected. If I do not want you to use any of the information that my child has given you, you will destroy it if I ask you to within two weeks.

3. I understand that relevant sections of my child’s data collected in the study may be looked at and analysed by the researcher. I give permission for this individual to have access to these records and to collect, store, analyse and publish information obtained from my child’s participation in this study. I understand that my child’s personal details will be kept confidential.

4. I agree that the information gathered about my child can be stored by the researcher, for possible use in future studies. I also agree that the information about my child can be stored locked up and in a password protected Swiss cloud that works under strict Swiss data protection. Any data used will be fully anonymised, and my child will not be identified in anyway.

5. I agree for my child to take part in the above study

Name of Parent _____________________ Date __________ Signature _______________________

Please tick the box

ASSENT FORM FOR CHILDREN

Title of Study: An investigation into promoting oracy using online software in primary English in Switzerland

Name of Researcher: Lustenberger Andrea

Name of Participant (Child):

1. I have read and understood the information for the above study. I was able to ask the researcher about the study and I was happy with the answers to any questions that I asked.

2. I will participate voluntarily, and I can withdraw at any time. If I do not want you to use any of the information that I have given you, you will destroy it if I ask you to within two weeks.

3. I understand that the researcher (Ms Lustenberger) will do video and audio recordings of me and analyse these recordings. She is allowed to do video- and audio-recordings, analyse them, store them and report about the study. She will only use my nickname when reporting about the study and treat my data confidentially.

4. I agree that Ms Lustenberger is allowed to store the information gathered about for possible use in future studies. The information about me will be stored locked up and in a password protected Swiss cloud that works under strict Swiss data protection. Any data will only contain my nickname.

5. I agree to take part in the above study.

___________________________________________  ______________     ______________
Name of Child   Date          Signature

Please tick the box
Titel der Studie: An investigation into promoting oracy using mobile devices in primary English in Switzerland (Die Erforschung der Förderung der Sprechkompetenz durch den Gebrauch mobiler Geräte im Englischunterricht in der Schweizer Primarschule)

Name der Wissenschaftlerin: Lustenberger Andrea

Name der Eltern: ______________________________

Name des teilnehmenden Kindes: _______________________

1. Ich bestätige, dass ich das Informationsschreiben zur oben genannten Studie gelesen und verstanden habe. Ich hatte Möglichkeiten, Fragen zu stellen.

2. Ich verstehe, dass die Teilnahme meines Kindes freiwillig ist und es jederzeit und ohne Angabe von Gründen seine Teilnahme zurückziehen kann, ohne dass irgendwelche Rechte beeinträchtigt werden. Ich verstehe, dass bei einem allfälligen Ausstieg die bereits gesammelten Informationen nicht gelöscht werden können und unter Umständen in die Projektanalyse einfließen werden.


5. Ich stimme zu, dass mein Kind in der oben genannten Studie teilnehmen darf.

____________________  ______________  __________________
Name der Eltern      Datum              Unterschrift
EINVERSTÄNDNISERKLÄRUNG FÜR KINDER

Titel der Studie: *An investigation into promoting oracy using mobile devices in primary English in Switzerland* (Die Erforschung der Förderung der Sprechkompetenz durch den Gebrauch mobiler Geräte im Englischunterricht in der Schweizer Primarschule)

Name der Wissenschaftlerin: Lustenberger Andrea

Name des teilnehmenden Kindes: ____________________________

1. Ich habe die Informationen zur oben genannten Studie gelesen und verstanden. Ich durfte dazu Fragen stellen.

2. Ich nehme freiwillig an der Studie teil und darf jederzeit zurücktreten. Bereits gesammelte Informationen können eventuell nicht gelöscht werden und werden gebraucht.

3. Ich verstehe, dass die Wissenschaftlerin (Frau Lustenberger) mich filmt und/oder aufnimmt und die Aufnahmen analysieren wird. Sie darf mich filmen/aufnehmen, die Aufnahmen aufbewahren, analysieren und über die Studie berichten. Sie wird meinen Spitznamen dabei benutzen und meine Daten vertraulich behandeln.


5. Ich stimme zu, dass ich in der oben genannten Studie teilnehme.

__________________________  ________________________  ________________________
Dein Name                  Datum                      Unterschrift
Appendix 10: Task Unit 1

Unit 1 Five sensational senses

- Ich kann mehrere Attraktionen auf einem Jahrmarkt auf Englisch benennen.
- Ich kann begründen, warum ich eine Attraktion auf dem Jahrmarkt (nicht) mag.
- Ich kann mit meinem Lernpartner/meiner Lernpartnerin einen Dialog entwerfen, bei welchem wir zwei Attraktionen vorschlagen und uns fürs die dritte entscheiden.
- Ich kreiere einen interessanten und eventuell lustigen Dialog, auch mit anderen Textteilen (language support).
- Meine Aussprache ist natürlich.
- Ich kann etwas Zusätzliches zur Attraktion sagen.

Task: You are going to the fair and you need to decide where to go first.

1. In a pair, decide what stalls you will suggest to go to and why (not).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stall</th>
<th>Reasoning (why)</th>
<th>Reasoning (why not)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agreeing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Who’s going to be A and who’s going to be B? □

3. Read through the dialogue and complete it. □ □ □

A Hi .........................., let’s talk about the fair. Shall we go there together on Sunday?
B Hello ........................ Oh, yes, that’s a good idea. I like the ......................, it’s .............................. What do you think?
A No, I don’t like the .......................... I think it’s .............................. Why don’t we go to ..............................? I love the .............................. because it ..............................
B Oh, no I don’t want to go to .......................... because it’s .............................. Where else could we go? We could go to .............................. I like .............................. because it’s ..............................
A We both like .............................. I suggest we go there.
B That’s a brilliant idea.
A Cool, let’s go there first.
B Wonderful, let’s go there. I can’t wait to go.

(adapted from: Büttner, 2017, p. 20)
Useful phrases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To make a suggestion</th>
<th>Useful adjectives</th>
<th>To work together:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would like to go to...</td>
<td>exciting, great, fantastic,</td>
<td>because (weil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where else could we go?</td>
<td>awesome, brilliant,</td>
<td>I think (ich denke)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why don’t we go to...</td>
<td>interesting, boring,</td>
<td>you (du)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think we could go to...</td>
<td>sweet, sticky, fast, slow,</td>
<td>why (warum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I suggest that we go to...</td>
<td>high, loud, soft, salty,</td>
<td>where (wo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (totally) agree with you.</td>
<td>good, hot, tasty,</td>
<td>how (wie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>delicious, salty</td>
<td>what (was)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To make a choice</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All right, let’s go to...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good, let’s go to...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great, let’s...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okay, so let’s go to...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let’s go.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(adapted from: Büttner, 2017p. 19)

4. Practise the dialogue. ⊗ ⚫ ⚫

5. Start with your Adobe Spark. Look out for your name. Use the language support on this sheet and on the laminated sheet. ⊗ ⚫ ⚫

Log-in details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Username</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Password</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 11: Task Unit 2

Unit 2 A town like mine

Task: A reporter is going to interview someone in town.

1. In a pair, decide what job you want to present. The job: __________________

2. What does this person do? Fill in the table.

What do you do? _____________________________________
What else? _________________________________________
__________________________________________________

When do you get up? __________________________________
When do you get home? _______________________________
What do you like about your job? _______________________
__________________________________________________
What else?________________________________________

3. Who’s going to be the reporter? Who’s the other person?

4. Look at the other sheet and decide which sentences you’re going to use.
   Highlight them and add your information.

5. Practise the interview.

   Log-in details:
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Username</th>
<th>Password</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

To work together:

because (weil)
I think (ich denke)
Interviews Young World 2 Unit 2: A town like mine
(adopted from: Arnet-Clark and Stampfli-Vienny, 2006b, pp. 38-40)

Reporter:
• Good morning, sir/madam. My name is ... (name). I work for the local radio station. Can I ask you some questions about your job?
• Good morning. My name is ... (name). I work for the local radio station. Do you have time for an interview about your job?
• Hello, I'm ... (name). I work for the local radio station. Have you got time to tell us about your job?
• Hello. I'm ... (name). I work for the local radio station. Have you got time to tell me something about your job?

Job:
• Good morning Mr./Mrs.... (name). No problem. Go ahead.
• Good afternoon. Well, yes, why not?
• Good morning Mr./Mrs.... (name). Yes, if it' doesn't take too long.
• Good afternoon Mr./Mrs.... (name). Oh, well, yes...What do you want to know?

Reporter:
• What's your name and what's your job?
• You're the local ... (job). Can you tell us your name and then tell us what you do all day?
• Can you tell us your name and what you do all day?
• What's your name and what do you do all day?

Job:
• My name is ... (name) and I'm a ... (job). (Add what the person does all day long).
• My name is ...(name). As a ... (job) I have to get up ... (when: early/late), usually at ...(time) in the morning. (add what the person does all day long)
• My name is ... (name). I'm a ... (job). Normally I start work at the... (place) at ... (time) o'clock. I ... (add what the person does all day long). Then I go home for lunch. After that I'm in ... (place) again. I go home around ... (time).
My name is ... (name). Well, everybody knows my job, because ... (reason). I like my job. What I like best is ... (reasoning).

My name is ... (name). Well, ... what can I say about my day? I have to be here at ... (time). I prepare ... (what do you do). Then I ... (what do you do). Around midday .... After lunch I .... After that I ....

Reporter:
- Hmm. That sounds like a long day. When do you get up in the morning?
- What else do you do?

Job:
- Oh, well. I usually get up at ... (time).
- I'm ... (name) and I'm a ... (job). I get up at ... (time) every morning. I must be in the ... (place) at ... (time). First I ... (what you do)
- Oh, well, I help/do... and sometimes I have time for ...

Reporter:
- What do you like best about your job?
- Quite a long and busy day. What do you like about your job?
- What do you like most about your job?

Job:
- Well, I see and hear lots of things and I'm my own boss.
- I like .... And I like to (make) ....
- Well, lots of things. (give examples)
- But now I must be on my way. Bye.

Reporter:
- Thank you for the information. Have a nice day. Good bye Mr./Mrs.... (name).
- Thank you very much for the interview. Have a nice day. Good bye Mr./Mrs.... (name).
- Oh, yes, well thank you so much, Mr./Mrs.... (name), but I must go now, I still have a lot of interviews to do.

Job:
- Cheerio.
- Good bye.
- You're welcome, bye-bye.

Reporter:
- Goodbye Mr./Mrs.... (name). Phew, ... (reason)! I don't know if that's fun...?
- Thank you for the interview ... (name). And have a good day. Goodbye.
Appendix 12: Task Unit 4

Unit 4 Exploring nature

| ☑ | Ich kann ein Tier auswählen und drei Fragen zu diesem Tier beantworten. |
| ☑ | Ich kann zu einem anderen Tier drei Fragen stellen. |
| ☑ | Ich kann die Fragen und Antworten richtig auf Englisch aussprechen. |
| ☑ | Ich kann zwei zusätzliche Fragen zum Tier stellen und korrekt ausgesprochen beantworten. |
| ☑ | Ich kann weitere Fragen zum Tier stellen und sie mit korrekter Aussprache beantworten. |

Task: There is an animal party in the forest. Two different animals are going to talk to each other.

1. In a pair, decide which two animals you are going to be. Animals: __________________ and _______________. ☑

Find the animals in your list. Read the information. Find out any unknown information or words you don’t know how to say (www.pons.de). ☑ ☑

2. In the forest, there is an animal party taking place. ☑ Select three facts from the fact sheet and the relevant questions (language support below). Ask each other three questions and answer them. ☑


4. Ask two more questions and answer them. ☑

5. Ask for more information and answer the question(s). ☑

Log-in details:

| Username | Password |

Useful phrases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What about you?</th>
<th>To work together:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What do you do at daytime/night time? At daytime/night time, I...</td>
<td>because (weil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you eat? I eat...</td>
<td>I think (ich denke)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you move? I...</td>
<td>you (du)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where do you live? I live...</td>
<td>why (warum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>where (wo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>how (wie)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unit 4 Exploring nature: Animal profiles

**Squirrel/squirrels**
- At daytime: leave nest, gather food, play around
- At night time: sleep
- My food: plants, seeds, nuts, insects, caterpillars, eggs and meat
- How I move: jump
- Where I live: in burrows
- How old I get: 6-10 years
- How many young ones I have: 3-4 babies at the time
- My enemies: hawks and owls, foxes, coyotes, wildcats, weasels and snakes
- Something special: I cannot fly, I can really move across the sky.

**Bee/bees**
- At daytime: fly around on sunny days, gather nectar and pollen from flowers
- At night time: work in the beehive or sleep
- My food: nectar
- How I move: fly
- Where I live: in a beehive
- How old I get: 28-35 days, or in winter up to 9 months
- How many young ones I have: The queen can lay 2000 eggs a day.
- My enemies: frogs, birds and wasps
- Something special: I can do a waggle dance.

**Rabbit/rabbits**
- At daytime: sleep, awake at sunrise and sunset
- At night time: sleep
- My food: fresh fruit, berries, vegetables and grass
- How I move: hop, walk
- Where I live: in a burrow
- How old I get: 1-2 years
- How many young ones I have: 1-14 babies per litter
- My enemies: fox, wolves, lynx, weasels, raccoon, hawks, eagles and owls
Something special: More than half of the world’s rabbits live in North America.

**Hedgehog/hedgehogs**
- At daytime: sleep
- At night time: search for food
- My food: insects, slugs, baby mice, frogs, fish, worms, small snakes, eggs and fruit
- How I move: walk
- Where I live: in a burrow
- How old I get: 2-5 years
- How many young ones I have: 4-5
- My enemies: badgers, foxes, people
- Something special: I have spines.

**Spider/spiders**
- At daytime: spin webs and eat insects
- At night time: catch prey at time
- My food: insects
- How I move: walk, run, move and crawl
- Where I live: everywhere, on spider webs
- How old I get: 1-2 years
- How many young ones I have: 1000
- My enemies: lizards, fish, birds, wasps and other spiders
- Something special: I can spin the most impressive webs.

**Fox/foxes**
- At daytime: sleep
- At night time: hunt
- My food: fruit, berries, grass, rabbits and mice
- How I move: walk and run
- Where I live: in a hole or in a burrow
- How old I get: 2-5 years
- How many young ones I have: 4-6
- My enemies: lynxes, wolves, eagles, bears and people
- Something special: Grey foxes can retract their claws like cats do.

**Ant/ants**
- At daytime/at night time: I live in places that are dark such as underground nests, and I follow chemical trails that the scout ants make to lead me to food.
- My food: wood, honey and sugar, dead animals and seeds
- How I move: walk
Where I live: in an anthill
How old I get: males a few weeks, workers some months, queens up to 30 years
How many young ones I have: In just a few days, a single army ant queen can lay up to 300,000 eggs
My enemies: lizards, spiders, birds
Something special: I can carry twice my weight.

Deer
At daytime: sleep, some hunting
At night time: hunt
My food: fruit, grass, plants, flowering weeds, and other non-woody plants, wild flowers, vegetables like beans, potatoes, sweet potatoes, soybeans...
How I move: run, walk
Where I live: in a forest
How old I get: 10-13 years
How many young ones I have: 1-3
My enemies: bears, wolves, humans and their dog
Something special: I weigh about 700 kg.

Butterfly/butterflies
At daytime: active
At night time: sleep
My food: nectar
How I move: fly
Where I live: everywhere
How old I get: depends on the size
How many young ones I have: I lay between 100-300 eggs
My enemies: birds, spiders, insects
Something special: I attach the eggs to leaves with a special glue.

Mouse/mice
At daytime: sleep
At night time: hunt, search for food
My food: grains, fruits and seeds
How I move: run
Where I live: forests, open grasslands, farms, and cities
How old I get: 1-2 years
How many young ones I have: 8
My enemies: owls, hawks, cats, dogs, skunks and snakes
Something special: I have many young ones.

Snail/snails
### At daytime: sleep
### At night time: hunt
### My food: lettuce, leaves
### How I move: glide
### Where I live: under the ground
### How old I get: 1-3 years
### How many young ones I have: I lay up to 100 eggs.
### My enemies: rats, mice, weasels, squirrels, toads, salamanders, turtles, blackbirds and hedgehogs.
### Something special: I can glide over sharp items.

#### Owl/owls
- At daytime: sleep
- At night time: hunt
- My food: insects, spiders, earthworms, snails, reptiles, amphibians, birds
- How I move: fly
- Where I live: in trees, hollowed-out logs, inside cactus, a hole in the ground, barns or the abandoned nests of other birds
- How old I get: up to 15 years
- How many young ones I have: 2-7 eggs/babies
- My enemies: larger owls, hawks, eagles,
- Something special: I do not make my own nests.

#### Blackbird/blackbirds
- At daytime: hunt
- At night time: sleep
- My food: insects, worms and seeds
- How I move: fly
- Where I live: in trees
- How old I get: 3-4 years
- How many young ones I have: 2-5 eggs
- My enemies: foxes, hawks, cuckoo and cats
- Something special: I sing very pretty songs.

#### Woodpecker/woodpeckers
- At daytime: hunt
- At night time: sleep
- My food: nuts, berries, insects, worms, larvae, caterpillars
- How I move: fly
- Where I live: in forests
- How old I get: up to 11 years
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many young ones I have: 4 eggs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My enemies: snakes, other birds, cats, foxes, hawks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Something special: I peck wood.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 13: Task Unit 5

Unit 5 Are we there yet?

1. In a pair, decide where you’re going on holidays and what you’re going to do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place:</th>
<th>Place:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activities/ sightseeing:</td>
<td>Activities/ sightseeing:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Practise the dialogue. Use the language support below.


Log-in details:

Username
Password

Useful phrases
I’m really excited.
I’m going to to...
We’re going to to...
We’re going to be there for... days/weeks.

Useful adjectives/words
exciting, cool, fantastic, awesome, relaxing, great, interesting, boring
sightseeing, swimming in the sea, sunbathing, riding a bike, paddling, visit a museum
www.pons.de

Questions
What are you going to do?
Are you going to...?
Where is it?
Is it warm/hot/cold... there?

Working together:
because (weil)
I think (ich denke)
you (du)
why (warum)
where (wo)
how (wie)
what (was)
when (wann)
who (wer/wen)

That sounds like a ... holiday.
I hear it’s...
But that’s fantastic/great/fabulous!
I heard it’s important sight.
I’ll send you a postcard.
I’m looking forward to getting your postcard.
I’m looking forward to getting yours.

(adapted from: Büttner, 2017, p. 44)
Appendix 14: Home-school task

Home-schooling – My day at home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ich kann Eckpunkte meines Tagesablaufs nennen. (Tag der Woche, wann ich aufstehe, esse, wann ich was für die Schule arbeite, was ich sonst noch mache...)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ich kann detailliert erzählen und beschreiben, was ich während des Tages mache.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ich kann begründen, warum ich was mache und die Begründung ausführen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Task: Due to coronavirus you have to stay at home and have home-schooling. Explain what you do during the day.

1. Think about your day. Was machst du? What are you doing? ⊗ Schreibe einige Details auf. Write some more details. ⊗ Warum machst du das? Why are you doing these things? ⊗

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In the morning</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the afternoon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the evening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Log-in details:  
Username  
Password

Please send the link of your video to (e-mail class teacher) and (e-mail researcher).

Useful phrases
I'm telling you about my (Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday).
I get up at...
I have breakfast, lunch, dinner, a snack at...
I do Maths, German, Nature, Man and Society (= NMG), English, Art, Music, Sports, Handicraft, Typewriting at...
I bake..., I do..., I play..., I sing...