

A real experience in a high complexity school: Modelling small group conversations through coteaching in CLIL



CRISTINA CARRILLO LÓPEZ
Escola Duran i Bas (Barcelona)
ccarri2@xtec.cat



SUSANA BOLDÚ RODRÍGUEZ
Escola Els Horts (Barcelona)
sboldu@xtec.cat

CRISTINA CARRILLO LÓPEZ is an English teacher at Duran i Bas school (Barcelona) and a CLIL teacher and trainer. She holds a Bachelor's Degree in Instruction and Leadership.

SUSANA BOLDÚ RODRÍGUEZ is an English teacher and Head of Studies at Els Horts School (Barcelona). She is also a CLIL teacher and trainer. She holds a Bachelor's Degree in Philology (UB) and a Master's Degree in Training of Trainers (UPC).

To cite this article:

Carrillo López, C. & Boldú Rodríguez, S. (2024). A real experience in a high complexity school: Modelling small group conversations through coteaching in CLIL. *CLIL Journal*, 1(1), 50–73. <https://doi.org/10.60940/cjv1n1id430057>



Abstract

This paper aims to explore whether learning through coteaching promotes students' speaking improvement. It has two objectives: (a) to explain the implementation of a coteaching model in a Project-based-learning (PBL) context through a foreign language (L2) in a high complexity primary school in Barcelona, Catalonia, and (b) to analyse how teachers, through coteaching, model L2 conversations to improve students' discussions in small groups and their decision-making. As regards the implementation, the two teachers modelled interactions in the target language and provided the necessary scaffolding using visual aids and language support charts. Then students worked in small groups using a cooperative learning strategy called "Think-Pair-Share" (TPS) strategy. Regarding the coteaching model, the analysis of the video recorded lesson showed that the co-teachers' prior modelling of the conversation in L2 together with scaffolding and cooperative learning techniques helped to promote students' engagement and to improve their language fluency. These findings suggest that coteaching increased their participation in speaking activities, enhancing their confidence, and enriching their vocabulary repertoire. The article ends with some reflections on coteaching, the impact of modelling and the use of cooperative strategies on the students' active learning process and the implications for teacher professional development.

Keywords: Project-based-learning (PBL), coteaching, scaffolding, modelling, Think-Pair-Share (TPS), cooperative learning

Introduction

This article aims to share with the teacher's community an experience of coteaching in a high complexity primary school in Catalonia. It contributes to teacher development and reflective practise by examining how two co-teachers used different strategies and approaches to improve students' discussion in small groups.

The study of language acquisition and learning has become an important topic which attracts wide interest and generates fierce debate. Language based learning theories have presented a complex perspective of learning in general and language learning in particular, which consists of a continuum of three main interdependent processes: learning language, learning through language and learning about language (Halliday, 1985). Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) embraces those educational practices in which content subjects – excluding those labelled as “language subjects” – are taught and learned through a language of instruction, second or foreign, in which a learner has a basic or advanced developing communicative competence (Escobar Urmeneta, 2020, p. 203).

According to Cenoz (2015, p. 17), “The basic idea behind the integration of content and language is that languages are not learned first and then used but that they are learnt by being used.” Related to it and focusing on students’ oral production in a speaking activity, which is the object of study of this paper, the teacher can provide learners with a model. Modelling strategies are about learning through imitation and identification where a teacher explicitly shows the students how to complete an activity or assignment before the students begin to work on them independently. Previous research provides evidence that it is not only an extremely useful teaching tool that should be used as often as possible, but also an excellent class management technique that contributes to the reduction of the number of students who do not know how to do the tasks. There is nothing more frustrating for both teachers and students than when directions have been given but students still do not know how or where to begin. Modelling eliminates these frustrations and contributes to excellent classroom management. Kagan (1995) states that oral interaction among the students is produced by working in groups and using cooperative structures which can be adapted to accomplish full inclusion of language learners at all acquisition stages at once. The same structure can involve limited as well fluent speakers so that language practice and content mastery are combined.

Taking all this into account and to illustrate how these methodological approaches engage students to actively participate in class, this paper aims to explore whether learning through coteaching contributes to students’ speaking improvement. It has been done by analysing, on the one hand, how teachers model L2 conversations in a Project Based Learning (PBL) context to improve students’ discussion in a small group (by using cooperative strategies) and, on the other hand, how scaffolding contributes to generate students’ interest in using the foreign language (English).

Theoretical Framework

Previous research on PBL by Duch et al. (2001) considers it as a teaching method in which real-world problems are used to promote the learning of concepts and principles by the students as opposed to direct presentation of facts and concepts by the teacher. In addition to course content, PBL can promote the development of critical thinking skills, problem-solving abilities, communication skills and life-long habits of learning. It can also foster opportunities to apply research concepts, to work collaboratively and to communicate effectively.

According to Slavin (1980), students learn in groups in a much better way than they do it individually. It promotes ‘success for all.’ By interacting with others, children receive feedback on their activities, they learn socially appropriate behaviours, and they understand what is involved in co-operating and working together (Dewey, 1975). Previous research on group work to enhance learning show that peers could be trained to facilitate academic accomplishment, reduce incidents of disruptive behaviour, increase work and study skills and teach interactional skills (Damon, 1984).

Students need help to accomplish the task; they need some support which Bruner (1978) describes as scaffolding in the metaphorical sense in which we are using it here, as “the steps taken to reduce the degrees of freedom in carrying out some tasks so that the child can concentrate on the difficult skill s/he is in the process of acquiring” (p. 19). In the classroom scaffolding portrays “the temporary, but essential nature of the mentor's assistance” in supporting learners to carry out tasks successfully (Maybin, et al. as cited in Norman, 1992, p. 186). Scaffolding, however, is not simply another word for help. It is a special kind of help that assists learners in moving towards new skills, concepts or levels of understanding. Scaffolding is thus the temporary assistance by which a teacher helps a learner know how to do something so that the learner will later be able to complete a similar task alone.

At this stage, coteaching is an opportunity to better assist students. There are several possible arrangements of coteaching that can fit the lesson, according to Cook & Friend (1995):

- One teach, one observe
- One teach, one assist (*Supportive coteaching*)
- *Parallel teaching* (teachers plan jointly but split the class in half and teach the same information at the same time. Group size is smaller, allowing greater supervision by the co-teacher)

- *Station teaching* (the classroom is divided into various teaching centres. Both teachers divide the instructional content, and each takes responsibility for planning and teaching part of it. The students rotate through the stations)
- *Alternative teaching* or *Complementary coteaching* (co-teachers do something to enhance the instruction provided by the other co-teacher)
- *Team teaching* (both teachers are responsible for planning, and they share the instruction of all students)

Bearing in mind that speaking in English doesn't naturally appear when learning a foreign language, in a speaking activity the teacher can provide learners with a pre-production model. Modelling plays an important role because students learn through imitation and identification and thus students can become involved in agreement/disagreement discussions. It fosters critical thinking and quick decision making and students learn how to express and justify themselves in polite ways while disagreeing with the others.

Methodology

Context and Participants

The PBL lesson implemented through coteaching and analysed in this paper was done in a primary school in Catalonia. It is a high complexity primary state school located in a low socioeconomic neighbourhood. The participants were twenty-five 6th grade students, exposed to English for an average of 2,5 hours per week since they were 4 years old. In 2017 the school adopted a CLIL approach in order to increase students' exposure to the foreign language. From then on, different projects have been developed in the school to improve all languages of instruction (Catalan, Spanish and English) and to close the existing gap in a socio-cultural poor community. However, the students' English level is quite low, and they are reluctant to speak in English in class.

The teachers who participated in this experience were taking part in a Professional Teachers Development Program on CLIL at Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (UAB) and their aim was to reflect on the coteaching practice. They were not the regular teachers of the students, although one of the two teachers works at this school, and they had never taught together before, which might have affected the development of the lesson.

Driving Goals

This paper aims to explore whether learning through coteaching promotes students' speaking improvement. So, it aims (1) to explain the implementation of a coteaching model in a PBL context through a foreign language (English) in a high complexity primary school in Barcelona, Catalonia, and (2) to analyse how co-teachers model L2 conversations to improve students' small groups discussion and their decision-making in English. More specially, whether coteaching, the use of active methodologies and scaffolding strategies promote students' active engagement and generate interest and language fluency improvement. The following research questions were formulated:

1. How do the teachers model L2 conversations to improve students' discussion in small groups?
2. Is coteaching an appropriate approach to promote students' discussions?
3. In terms of promoting students' interest in using the English language as a second language, what kind of methodologies and strategies are suitable in a high complexity primary school?

Data Collection and Data Analysis Procedures

The data examined in the second part of the article was collected in a state primary school by setting a video camera at the back of the classroom and videorecording the PBL lesson, as videos allow one to notice some aspects and issues that aren't so evident in the moment of teaching. After repetitive views of the video, a five-minute excerpt – from the beginning of the lesson – was selected for the analysis to answer the research questions stated above. The analysis was done by focussing on three aspects: type of coteaching, types of interactions (teacher-teacher and teacher-students) and scaffolding provided.

Results

Implementation of Coteaching in a High Complexity Primary School

The lesson analysed here was part of a PBL project where English language and content (Maths) were integrated. The title of the project was “Let's create a business to earn some money to help those who have low *income in their families*” and it was meant to help families pay an “end of the year trip” that would allow them being together before going to a new secondary school in September. Thus, the goal of this project, among other things, was to

encourage students to take an active role by organising “a small business” in groups to make a profit by selling items in the different school’s events. This means that by developing the lesson plan, under a coteaching basis, students had to solve a real problem by finding ways to gather money to go on a trip together. During the lesson, teachers guided the students through all the process in their learning path:

1. Select a destination (national or abroad) through a questionnaire (google form) and analyse the results of the survey
2. Calculate the cost of the trip and compare it with their budget
3. Reduce the final cost of the trip (by selling T-shirts, snacks, organising a raffle, etc.).

The activities were designed to use mathematics, ICT and communicative skills to explore the business world. To introduce the topic and to set up the context, the teachers presented some visual aids (pictures of students in a summer camp) and asked them if they would like to do a similar trip to the one presented. Almost all the students showed great enthusiasm and agreed on the fact that travelling is a very exciting experience. However, in order to focus on the cost, the teachers asked them if they thought that travelling was expensive or not. Students realised that it is expensive and that it could be a real problem for some families who couldn’t afford an extra-expense at the end of the school year.

The lesson was developed following the 5 steps of PBL and it was designed considering the different *types of coteaching and planning* (Cook & Friend, 1995), to meet the students’ needs and to increase instructional options for all of them. These 5 steps were:

1. **Identifying a unique challenge or problem** - in this case it was that travelling is expensive and some families can’t afford it. The warm-up consisted of a brainstorming based on how students imagined the end of the school year. The conversation was delivered through the *complementary teaching* coteaching modality, where both teachers talked to the students and projected the lesson overview using a Prezi presentation (Figure 1).

Figure 1.

Lesson overview projected in class



- 2. Investigate the challenge using the inquiry process & apply ideas** in the discipline of mathematics. The inquiry question was: *What can we do to create a company/business to earn some money to help those who have low income in their families?* A video about “entrepreneur kids” was watched and students had to find a solution all together to get ideas about what products could be sold at the school. The “Think, Pair, Share” (TPS) strategy was used to promote all students’ participation making them to think first individually, then to share in pairs and finally in the whole group. This was the starting point to generate discussion in small groups in the classroom. This part of the lesson was carried out through the *team teaching* coteaching modality.
- 3. Explore the ideas and challenge students through cooperative activities** where they justified, argued and recognized multiple perspectives on the issue mentioned above to create the most appropriate proposals of school business. In this part of the lesson, students worked cooperatively and had to come up with a trip proposal to be carried out at the end of the school year, thinking together how to create a successful students-school business to collect money and estimating the total cost of the trip. At this stage, the lesson was centred on student interactions and students were provided with language support tables to help them to dialogue and express their opinions. The conversation was modelled by the two teachers so as the students could see and hear what they were expected to do in their small groups (Figure 2). This was the stage of *independence practice (group work)* and this time the *parallel teaching* coteaching modality was used by the teachers, where both of them moved around the classroom helping the different groups with the dialogues (Figure 3).

Figure 2.

Modelling a conversation



Figure 3.

Moving around and providing support



4. **Use statistics (design a bar graph) to analyse their ideas.** The last part of the lesson was the *wrap up (collecting group proposals)* and it was carried out through the *one teach, one assists* coteaching modality. First, the students had to use a tablet to answer a questionnaire saying what their preferences were about the school trip and the different ways to collect money to make the trip cheaper. After this, a bar graph was created to show the data collected from the different groups. One teacher was collecting the information from the different groups on the computer and the other teacher was moderating the sharing out.
5. **After conducting the lesson, both co-teachers reflected on the session:**
 - Did students meet the intended learning outcomes of the lesson? Why or why not?
 - Was the time frame appropriate? Were the directions clear?

- Did the activities planned actually support the intended learning outcomes or were they somehow off-track?
- What activities would the teachers do again? What would they do differently next time?

Analysis of Modelling Small Group Conversations through Coteaching in a CLIL Classroom

Research question 1. How do teachers model L2 conversations to improve students' discussion in small groups?

With the objective of improving students' discussion in small groups, L2 conversations have been modelled by means of following various coteaching approaches. As Table 1 shows, from the analysis of the chosen video fragment, it is observed that *alternative teaching (complementary coteaching)* was used in the warm-up stage of the lesson; *team teaching* in modelling a conversation to decide what type of business will be created, and *parallel teaching* in the interaction part in small group conversation. The video recording shows that all the types of coteaching used, together with the provided language support charts (Appendix A), offered an interaction model and effectively contributed to the improvement of students' discussions.

Table 1.

Teachers modelling L2 conversations (coteaching)

Arrangements of coteaching	Observed?	Part of the lesson			
		Warm up	Inquiry process	Group work	Wrap up
One teach, one assist (Supportive coteaching)	no				x
Team teaching	yes		x		
Parallel coteaching	yes			x	
Alternative teaching (Complementary coteaching)	yes	x			

Research question 2. Is coteaching an appropriate approach to promote students' discussions?

From the video analysis it can be seen that coteaching is a good approach to promote students' discussions in small groups (student-student interaction). It was observed that two teachers delivering the lesson were very helpful for the students because teachers could reach students' needs and students actively participated. In order to use the L2 in a discussion situation in small groups, it is noticed that teachers provided the students with comprehensible input and used a wide range of strategies to create a comprehensible classroom style to efficiently teach and help them interact: facial expressions and use of hands, paraphrasing, reformulating, modifying intonation, providing helping times, creating a good atmosphere, speaking slowly, emphasising, etc.

As it can be appreciated in Table 2, when teachers modelled L2 conversations, they used different approaches to promote students' interactions (Mann & Walsh, 2017).

Table 2.

Features of classroom interaction (based on Walsh, 2013)

Approach	Classroom Interaction	yes	no
1	The teacher accompanies her utterances with facial expression, hands and body movements	x	
2	Teachers accept contributions in L1 and translates the meaning into L2	x	
3	Teachers repair a wrong utterance by reformulating, emphasising, modifying the intonation	x	
4	The teacher moves across the classroom to show her closeness to all students	x	
5	Teachers paraphrase	x	
6	Teachers accept and promote that students ask clarification requests	x	
7	Teachers encourage partners to act as mediators by translating, setting a model or allowing a little bit of 'cheating'	x	
8	Teachers provide thinking time	x	
9	Teachers create an atmosphere of trust in order to become a community of learning	x	
10	Teachers model a conversation by speaking slowly and exaggerating to emphasise	x	

Examples are provided below to illustrate some of the approaches.

- **Approach 1**, consisting in the use of nonverbal language: facial expression, hands and body movements is deployed by Teacher 1 (T1) in Excerpt 1.

Excerpt 1: Use of Nonverbal Language.

42. **T1:** ((drawing on the blackboard while explaining)): in group. Okay? So, we've got 2 minutes individually, (wow, the chalk)
43. ((draws a pin man)) 2 minutes ((writing 2 under the pin man)), so then in pairs, ((takes the chalk again, draws a pin man and a pin woman). 3 minutes ((writes 3 under the pair)), and then in groups, okay? ((drawing four pin men forming a circle)).
44. So in groups, yeah? 5 minutes ((writes 5 under the team drawn))
45. **T1:** ((circles the time devoted to each task on the board)).
46. **S1:** ((to T2)) So we are making two groups "y"... ((he makes gestures to help him to be understood)).
47. **T2:** ((nods her head as a signal of approval)).
48. **T1:** Is that clear? So we are going to do Think-Pair-Share ((writing the letters T-P-S over the drawings previously done while speaking)).
49. We have already done this with another group.
50. Okay? Thiiiiink ((pointing to her head)),
51. Pair ((T2 moves her index finger from one to another student, T1 moves index finger from T2 to her)).
52. ((both teachers move finger from one to another))
53. and Share ((drawing a big circle on the air including a whole group of the class)). Yes?
54. Yes.
55. Okay. So, ready! Let's go ((she moves to the computer and sets the bomb countdown counter))
56. T1
57. Yes? ((there is no answer)). Ready? Go!! Come on ((she does one clapping)).
58. No. Individually (touching her head and addressing to the group that was speaking). 2 minutes individually (addressing the whole class). Think. Okay? Individually.
59. So, what do you think? ((T1 moves to student's group as he requests her attention by moving his hand from her to him))
- 60.

- **Approach 2** or accepting the students' contributions in the L1 in Excerpt 2 (line 8).

Excerpt 2: Accepting the students' contributions in the L1.

1. **T1:** So, do you think that we can collect some money to get something like this or something different to get money,
2. okay, to make our our camp cheaper, okay? *((points at the blackboard where the word is written and drawn))*,
3. not so expensive?
4. So, what are we going to do? To get cheaper, okay? *((makes a conventional gesture with hands to indicate money))*,
5. to get cheaper, do you know? Less money, not such a big amount of money, but less money, okay?
6. Not so expensive, just a little bit *((makes a gesture to indicate the amount of money))*.
7. **S1:** Que no cuesta mucho.
8. **T1:** Very good *((makes a gesture indicating approval))*.
Yes? So, what we are going to do is think, individually;
9. first, we are going to think *((touches her head with one finger))* about ideas that each of you can have to collect money
10. *((points to the flashcards on the blackboard))*. Okay?

- **Approach 4** or the teacher moving across the classroom to show her closeness to all students and **approach 9** or teachers' actions aimed at creating and maintaining an atmosphere of trust in order to become a community of learning are observable in Excerpt 3.

Excerpt 3.

61. *((children speak/whisper. T1 turns to them))*.
62. *((T1 moves to S1 again and he asks her something))*.
63. *((She bends down to be at the same high as the student and starts a conversation))*.
64. *((T2 moves around the classroom and stops in front of a different group and highlights what they are expected to do))*.
65. *((Both teachers move around the classroom showing individually how to use the language support table providing some examples with the sentences facilitated))*.
66. *((Both teachers move around the classroom showing individually how to use the language support table providing some examples with the sentences facilitated))*.
67. **T1:** Last minute!
68. *((Both teachers go on moving around solving doubts and helping))*

Approach 8 or the provision of thinking time can be seen in Excerpt 4 (lines 15 and 16).

Excerpt 4.

8. **T1:** Very good *((makes a gesture indicating approval))*.
Yes? So, what we are going to do is think, individually;
9. first, we are going to think *((touches her head with one finger))* about ideas that each of you can have to collect money
10. *((points to the flashcards on the blackboard))*. Okay?
11. **SS:** Okay.
12. **T1:** Yes?
13. **SS:** Yes
14. **T1:** Individually, Then
15. **T2:** 2 minutes *((shows 2 fingers))*, no?
16. **T1:** 2 minutes. And we are going to put the bomb, okay?,
just to take the time *((makes a gesture to indicate time))*.
17. So, then, in pairs *((points to 2 students in front of the class))*, we are going to exchange our ideas or
18. to share our ideas, yeah?, and finally, in groups of 4 or 5
((points to the groups of students)), in this case, okay?;
you are going to think about different things
19. that we can do to collect some money for the school camp
20. *((points to the flashcards on the blackboard))*.
21. Is that clear? Do you know what we have to do right now?
22. **SS:** Yes.
23. **T1:** Yes? Are you ready?
24. **SS (chorus):** Yes.
25. **T1:** Yes? Good!
26. **SS:** Yes.

- **Approach 10** where Teachers 1 and 2 model a conversation by speaking slowly and exaggerating to emphasise, see Excerpt 5.

Excerpt 5.

26. **T1:** And remember that to discuss and to reach agreements and to
talk about it, you can have a look at the second part that says
27. "Talking about collecting money", because now you have to say
"I think *((points at T2))*..."
28. T2, I think that we can... umm... we can make some chocolate
figures and to sell them.
29. What do you think?

30. **T2:** Umm... I think it's a good idea, but now with the Covid maybe it's not the best one.
31. **T1:** Okay. You are right! And... what do you think about making some knapsacks?
32. ((points to the flashcard with the knapsack))
33. **T2:** Oh! This is a good idea. I agree with you because we've got a... the materials, we make it and we sell it. Okay.
34. I agree. I like this idea... I like this idea.

The analysis of the video shows that regarding teachers modelling a conversation, both teachers spoke slowly and adapted their intonation to emphasise. Teacher 1 even used facial expressions to indicate agreement. Thus, excerpt 5 of the video is also an example of applying approaches 1, 9 and 10 in Table 2 during the classroom interaction between teachers.

To give an answer to our research question 2 and from this analysis, we can infer that when teachers modelled, they adapted their speech (intonation), used exaggeration to emphasise, accepted L1 contributions, used body language (facial expressions, moving hands) and showed nearness to students by moving around the classroom and being closer to the cooperative groups. In consequence, it was viewed in the excerpt of the video that students improved their discussion skills while they were following the model of reference. Moreover, their level of anxiety decreased, feeling more comfortable and willing to speak. Summing up, using modelling as a strategy to promote students' participation can be easier in a coteaching scenario.

Research question 3. In terms of promoting students' interest in using the English language, what kind of methodologies and strategies are suitable in that context?

As previously mentioned, the main focus of this lesson was to promote students' participation using L2. Therefore, teachers provided the students with the necessary language support (scaffolding) and used different strategies to facilitate students' understanding and participation during the lesson, as it can be seen in the table below (Table 3).

Table 3.

Scaffolding strategies

Scaffolding strategies	Video	Parts of the lesson			
	Excerpt	Warm up	Inquiry process	Group work	Wrap up
1. Teachers provide clues (definition, example, antonym, synonym)	no	X	X		X
2. Teachers provide language support (video, pictures, charts)	yes	X	X	X	X
3. Teachers use nonverbal language	yes	X	X		X
4. Teachers write keywords and phrases on the blackboard	yes	X	X		
5. Teachers draw	yes	X	X		

In the video section selected, it is noticed that the teacher used body language to make the information more comprehensible, so it was an interaction among teacher-students. It is important to emphasise the use of verbal communication as well as the nonverbal resources, especially when the students' level of English is poor.

- **The use of nonverbal language** for scaffolding purposes (**strategy 3**) is observable in Excerpt 6 (lines 16 to 19).

Excerpt 6.

16. **T1:** 2 minutes. And we are going to put the bomb, okay?,
just to take the time ((makes a gesture to indicate time)).

17. So, then, in pairs ((points to 2 students in front of the class)), we are going to exchange our ideas or

18. to share our ideas, yeah?, and finally, in groups of 4 or 5
((points to the groups of students)), in this case, okay?;
you are going to think about different things

19. that we can do to collect some money for the school camp

20. ((points to the flashcards on the blackboard)).

21. Is that clear? Do you know what we have to do right now?

As it is shown in Table 3, teachers used all possible strategies like drawing, writing on the board, etc. to make the instructions clear so the students understood them.

- **Scaffolding strategies 4** (writing keywords and phrases on the blackboard) and 5 (drawing) can be observed in Excerpt 7, lines 42 to 45.

Excerpt 7.

42. **T1:** *((drawing on the blackboard while explaining))*: in group. Okay? So, we've got 2 minutes individually, (wow, the chalk)
43. *((draws a pin man))* 2 minutes *((writing 2 under the pin man))*, so then in pairs, *((takes the chalk again, draws a pin man and a pin woman))*. 3 minutes *((writes 3 under the pair))*, and then in groups, okay? *((drawing four pin men forming a circle))*.
44. So in groups, yeah? 5 minutes *((writes 5 under the team drawn))*
45. **T1:** *((circles the time devoted to each task on the board))*.

Even the teachers' voice was modulated. Teacher 1 used exaggeration and high pitch in her voice to catch students' attention and emphasise some key words.

- **Scaffolding strategy 2** or teachers' provision language support by means of video, pictures or charts can be appreciated in Excerpt 8.

Excerpt 8.

1. **T1:** So, do you think that we can collect some money to get something like this or something different to get money,
2. okay, to make our our camp cheaper, okay? *((points at the blackboard where the word is written and drawn))*,
3. not so expensive?
4. So, what are we going to do? To get cheaper, okay? *((makes a conventional gesture with hands to indicate money))*,
5. to get cheaper, do you know? Less money, not such a big amount of money, but less money, okay?
9. Not so expensive, just a little bit *((makes a gesture to indicate the amount of money))*.
10. **S1:** Que no cuesta mucho.
11. **T1:** Very good *((makes a gesture indicating approval))*. Yes? So, what we are going to do is think, individually;
9. first, we are going to think *((touches her head with one finger))* about ideas that each of you can have to collect money
10. *((points to the flashcards on the blackboard))*. Okay?

11. **SS:** Okay.
12. **T1:** Yes?
13. **SS:** Yes
14. **T1:** Individually, Then
15. **T2:** 2 minutes ((shows 2 fingers)), no?

Taking into consideration the evidence provided by the analysis of the video excerpt, it can be stated that teachers successfully modelled L2 conversations to improve students' discussion in small groups through a coteaching setting. It is noticed from that analysis, that coteaching is an appropriate approach to promote students' discussions due to the fact that students' needs were attended by both teachers working in small groups. Moreover, the group work dynamics that were followed also enhanced the accomplishment of the goal. Teacher-students and student-student interaction took place in an atmosphere where students were relaxed and felt free to speak in English. In terms of promoting students' interest in using English as a second language, the instructional model adopted (PBL) and the scaffolding strategies used have been suitable in this high complexity primary school where students' level of English is quite low.

Discussion

This article is part of a Teacher Education Program whose general goal was to accompany the educational centres in the process of implementation and consolidation of their own plurilingual project by developing teachers' skills in teaching CLIL and through sharing with the teacher's community experiences in coteaching.

The analysis carried out shows how co-teachers using active methodologies and scaffolding strategies may promote students' active engagement (through working cooperatively) in a PBL lesson by generating students' interest, language fluency and decision-making in the L2. Regarding the execution of the lesson, both teachers were eager to implement coteaching in that school. Teachers actively delivered the lesson, and a dynamic classroom was created. Even though they had never co-taught together before that day, they planned the lesson co-ordinately and they delivered it in a synchronised way. However, there was also room for spontaneity in the delivery. Coteaching required a lot of planning together to come to agreements on the coteaching modalities to be used and the needed arrangements to deliver the lesson in a way that it appeared to be as natural as possible.

After analysing the video recording to observe the development of the lesson and reflect on it, teachers were aware of the students' engagement and participation despite the anomalous circumstances of having a camera in the classroom. Findings from the analysis of classroom data showed that modelling L2 discussion helped to develop students' language fluency by providing a linguistic model, giving them freedom in speaking, enhancing confidence as well as enriching the students' vocabulary. The coteaching experience facilitated that support was provided to all the cooperative groups.

In terms of promoting students' interest in using the L2, it was found that students tried to speak in English during their discussions in the group work. In order to establish an atmosphere where communication in English was effective, teachers constantly vocalised to exchange information, emotions and giving instructions. They also used nonverbal cues, for instance facial expressions, gestures, and body language. Furthermore, some paralinguistic cues such as teacher's tone of voice, rate, volume of speech and stress placed on words were used. Teachers accepted contributions in L1 and translated them into L2, providing praise, too.

Both teachers moved across the classroom to show their closeness to all students. Teachers solved the barrier of the language by checking for understanding constantly to ensure students' comprehension and felt comfortable to speak in English. During the lesson, co-teachers provided lots of opportunities to the students to speak out and share their ideas. However, students showed a great level of inhibition because of the camera recording. More oral production was produced when they were working in small groups. The teachers found a lack of participation in whole group class discussion, which could have been solved if a card would have been used to assign a role to each member of the group. What is more, teachers also encouraged partners to act as mediators, as in Approach 7 (Table 2). For example, when a student rephrased what one teacher had just said into Spanish and the teacher praised him by saying "very good" (excerpt 7, student 1, line 7 and teacher 1, line 8).

Different strategies were used during the examined lesson; a lot of repetitions were used and also teachers provided thinking time. The task was structured, and that students had enough time to think before sharing their ideas with the partners. It was observed that both teachers created an atmosphere of trust in order to become a community of learning by using first person plural ('we') and this was really important in the context in which the lesson was implemented.

The sentence frames or *language support charts* provided gave students practise with academic language and empowered those who might have needed additional support by providing a foothold into the conversation. This support increased the depth of academic

conversations by allowing students to build on one another's ideas and they decreased anxiety and ensured all students felt like a part of the learning community.

As a conclusion, it can be said that students gained knowledge and insights through the teachers' comments. They were motivated to speak thanks to a variety of resources such as visual aids (video, Prezi presentation, flashcards, drawings), language support charts and the teachers' teamwork and their use of different methodologies and scaffolding strategies during the lesson implementation.

Final Reflections and Conclusions

Before we came together and implemented the lesson, we were really excited to have the opportunity to coteach. However, it was a challenge to get in front of a class where one teacher didn't even know the student's names. After the implementation, we sat down and talked about our feelings and emotions. It was a great experience because it was the first time that one of us had the opportunity to teach in a high complexity school. The best part of the experience was that the students were motivated, and they did their best to accomplish all the assignments. Students' inhibition because of the camera recording could be felt in the classroom atmosphere but providing them with lots of opportunities to speak and support to share their ideas was of great help. Some studies refer to videorecording as a tool to help teachers reflect on their teaching practice and to collect students' performance on the oral interaction. After the implementation we have realised that each member of the group should have been given a card to have a role assigned, so each one knew his/her job in the group and the conversation might have flowed much better.

The unsatisfactory part was the timing; we agreed that students needed more time than scheduled to carry out the different activities. The timing of the lesson plan didn't fit the reality of this group of students because the lesson wasn't initially designed for a high complexity school. The fact that we provided a lot of comprehensible input (visual aids, language support) was a success. Especially because Teacher 1 knew the students. From the analysis performed, we consider that the lesson should have been divided into two parts to fit the level of the students. As a final reflection, we verify that even when a lesson has been planned in detail, the results might not come out as well as it was expected. We planned carefully how each section should be presented and received by the students. This part was accomplished because we were experienced teachers and have a solid background in teaching English as a second

language, but what could not be predicted was the students' embarrassment in speaking in public and in front of the camera.

As a result, the findings in the video recorded lesson in which the coteaching took place showed that co-teachers' prior modelling of L2 discussions together with scaffolding and cooperative learning techniques helped to promote students' engagement and to improve their language fluency. These findings suggest that the coteaching modalities used increased their participation in speaking activities, enhancing their confidence and enriching their vocabulary repertoire. Therefore, coteaching has positive implications for teacher education. It is made clear that the students were fascinated by the topic of the session, designing a school trip, which was the first lesson in a Project Based Learning. As research shows and from this experience in a high complexity school, we can state that it is an effective teaching approach. Moreover, applying this active approach generated a double positive effect on the students: one is related to the Maths content knowledge and the other to group work skills. All the strategies and methodologies applied to this lesson promoted students' motivation, a positive attitude towards the assignments and a positive dependence on the group's peers.

As a conclusion, we can state that coteaching, modelling, scaffolding and the use of the Think-Pair-Share strategy created an impact on the teaching and learning environment, students' learning, and the authors' own experience. Therefore, it can be widely applied to get the maximum benefit and the most of English lessons.

Acknowledgements

This paper is an outcome of a teacher development action (course references 3784/3 and 4625/1) funded by the Department of Education (Generalitat de Catalunya), developed and coordinated by the Faculty of Education of the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

References

- Bruner, J. S. (1978). The Role of Dialogue in Language Acquisition. In A. Sinclair, R. J. Jarvella, & W. J. M. Levelt (Eds.), *The Child's Concept of Language* (pp. 211–256). Springer-Verlag.
- Cenoz, J. (2015). Content-based instruction and content and language integrated learning: The same or different? *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 28(1), 8–24.
- Cook, L., & Friend, M. (2017). Co-teaching: Guidelines for Creating Effective Practices. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 28(3), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.17161/foec.v28i3.6852>



- Damon, W. (1984). Peer education: the untapped potential. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 5, 331–343. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0193-3973\(84\)90006-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0193-3973(84)90006-6)
- Dewey, J. (1975). *Democracia y educación*. Ediciones Morata.
- Duch, B. J., Groh, S. E., & Allen, D. E. (2001). Why problem-based learning? In B. J. Duch, S. E. Groh, & D. E. Allen (Eds.), *The power of problem-based learning* (pp. 3–11). Stylus.
- Escobar Urmeneta, C. (2020). Coteaching in CLIL in Catalonia. *CLIL: Journal of Innovation and Research in Plurilingual and Pluricultural Education*, 3(2), 37–55. <https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/clil.54>
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). Systemic background. In J. D. Benson & W. S. Greaves (Eds.), *Systemic perspectives on discourse, vol. 1 of selected theoretical papers from the 9th International Systemic Workshop* (pp. 1–15). Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Kagan, S. (1995). *We Can Talk: Cooperative Learning in the Elementary ESL Classroom*. Kagan Publishing.
- Mann, S., & Walsh, S. (2017). *Reflective Practice in English Language Teaching: Research-Based Principles and Practices*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315733395>
- Norman, K. (1992). *Thinking Voices: The work of the National Oracy Project*. Hodder & Stoughton.
- Slavin, R. E. (1980). Cooperative Learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 50(2), 315–342. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543050002315>
- Walsh, S. (2013). *Classroom Discourse and Teacher Development*. Edinburg University Press.

Appendix

Appendix A

Language Support Charts

TALKING ABOUT THE PHOTOS				
I can see	some children	carrying a backpack.		
		getting	on	a coach.
			off	
		playing.		
having fun.				
I think that In my opinion From my point of view	the children	are	going on excursion. staying in a camp. having fun. entering a country house. ...	

• GIVING OPINION	
To express AGREEMENT	To express DISAGREEMENT
	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● I agree with you / him /her ● I think that (student's name) is right ● Yes, of course! ● I think so, too 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● I totally disagree because... ● I'm afraid I don't agree with you because... ● I disagree because... ● I don't think so because...

• TALKING ABOUT COLLECTING MONEY				
I think that In my opinion	we	can <u>can't</u>	sell	roses. books. snacks.
From my point of view			make	bookmarks.

• TALKING ABOUT THE PLACE TO GO						
I	prefer	a national destination.				
		to travel abroad.				
		to go to	La Cerdanya	to	do adventure activities.	
			Delta de l'Ebre		practise aquatic activities.	
			Mallorca		do cultural activities.	
		London (UK)				
		Dublin (Ireland)				
		Paris (France)				
		...				
		would like to spend		3 days		
	5 days					
	a week					
	a fortnight (15 days)					