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Supplementary materials

1. Exercise suite on cohesive ties in the instructivist part of the online module

In the following, four screenshots of an exercise suite on cohesive ties are presented to showcase how they build upon each other. After the last exercise, more of this type followed for drill and practice.
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Figure 1. Screenshot of first exercise in sequence on cohesive ties
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Figure 2. Screenshot of second exercise in sequence on cohesive ties
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Figure 3. Screenshot of third exercise in sequence on cohesive ties
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Figure 4. Screenshot of forth exercise in sequence on cohesive ties

1. Guided reflection on model in the constructivist part of the online module
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Figure 5. Screenshot of a model solution
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Figure 6. Screenshot of guided reflection for comparison of model with own summary
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Figure 7. Screenshot of guided model elaboration concerning structure
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Figure 8. Screenshot of guided model elaboration concerning introduction content

1. Showcase for evaluation criteria of pre- and post-tests
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Figure 9. *Screenshot of a pre-test summary*
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Figure 10. *Screenshot of a post-test summary of the same participant*

These two screenshots of an individual student´s pre- and post-test exemplify a low degree of elaboration in the pre-test and a high degree of elaboration in the post-test. Although both summaries exhibit a three-paragraph structure, it is only in the post-test that this structure actually reflects a clear division in introduction, main part, and conclusion. The original interview structure of the radio feature was maintained in the pre-test, which is visible in the reference to the interviewer ("Der Moderator fragte, ob..." "The interviewer asked whether..."), and in direct questions ending in question marks. In the post-test, not only was the interview structure abandoned, but also the sequence of the topics covered in the interview was reshuffled to create a better internal coherence. The interviewee´s name recurs twice in the pre-test, erroneously combining the academic title with the first name ("Professor Hartmut"). In the post-test, several synonyms are used to refer to the interviewee ("Ursula Hudelist", "die Frau", "die Demonstrante" [sic], "die Parkschützerin"). To sum up, there is a clear progression with regard to content elaboration and co-reference strategies, although (a) the pre-test has more variation in cohesive ties (italicised), (b) the post-test shows no progression with regard to general accuracy (single-underlined), and (c) there is a relatively high number of content and pragmatic problems in both summaries (double-underlined). The latter two aspects can be attributed to the overall low proficiency of the student in question.

1. Transcript of excerpts from the focus group interviews (key questions 1 and 2), translated to English

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Focus group 1 (7 participants)  I = interviewer  S1-S7 = participants | |
|  | **Q6 (Key question 1):**  (...) |
| I | Now let´s talk about the online exercises. My first question is: Generally speaking, there were two types of exercises: In type one, you had to fill in gaps or select an answer between several choices, and you got direct feedback in form of an automated answer. In the other type you had to fill in a sentence or a text, and then you had to compare your answer to a model. Which type did you prefer personally? |
| S7 | Direct feedback, though often it said that your answer was incorrect while you had written the exact same thing [as the correct response provided] which was weird. But if you had to compare by yourself, it´s like - **you** think it´s OK but does **she** [the teacher] think the same? This was difficult to judge. |
| S4 | I also prefer to see whether you are wrong or right. That´s a lot clearer. |
| S1 | You could also see alternative answers [elaborated feedback]. So, if you were wrong you also could ask the teacher whether it was really wrong, and mostly it was like “yes, that´s another option but it hasn´t been included”. |
| I | Does that mean you felt insecure with the models? |
|  | Yes [several students] |
| I | From the models you could not deduce... |
| S7 | Yes alright you could deduce it but you never knew what the limits were of what´s still OK and what is not. |
| I | Any of you who liked the model solutions better? |
| S6 | No, because you automatically get model answers when you were wrong [elaborated feedback provided in some instructivist exercises]. You see a couple of alternatives, and then you can compare. |
|  |  |
|  | **Q7 (Key question 2):** |
| I | You had to evaluate your own summaries, comparing them with a model solution. Did you find this easy? Did it help you? |
| S2 | I didn´t find this useful because you always try to do your best when writing a text but you can´t assess grammatical accuracy. You might just as well only have 2 out of 10 while you give yourself 7 out of 10... You can´t judge whether your text is OK for a native speaker or not. |
| S1 | You always think when uploading your text that it is good, “I did a good job”, but it might just as well be bad again |
| I | Does everybody share that feeling? I see S7 in doubt... |
| S7 | Well, I just don´t get the idea of giving yourself a score. OK to some extent you can see that you make progress but ffffff [exhaling with a hiss] I think you can see it just as well like that, every week when you compare your own text with the model. |
| S6 | And you don´t have your text at hand when you have to compare it to the model... |
| S7 | Yes, you do, when you do it there [in class]. |
| S6 | Yes, but then I have to reopen it. |
| I | But if your score is 5 in week one and then 7 the next week and 9 the next, does this help you? |
| S5 | I still think it is better that two to three students hand in their summary every week – next to the exercises. Well, I think two summaries per week really shouldn´t be too much work load for a teacher to correct- and if everybody gets two to three individual texts assessed per semester, you have a clearer idea with regard to the exam. Actually, I didn´t dislike the exercises but I just missed personal feedback once in a while. |
| S1 | And if it isn´t personal feedback on your own text, I think that you can also learn from seeing other peoples´ errors [referring to a feedback routine practiced in the f2f lessons]. |
| S4 | Yes, that´s true, when they give you an overview of the most frequent errors, then you can see for yourself like “hey I also did this wrong”, and then you also know... |
| S7 | Even if it was a real bad text you´d get a better idea of where you stand. You get an example - “it should be like this but never like that”, then you can see whether you are more like how it should be or completely not, anyway that´s clearer.  (...) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Focus group 2 (6 participants)  I = interviewer  S8-S13 = participants | |
|  | **Q6 (Key question 1):**  (...) |
| I | Now let´s talk about the online exercises. My first question is: Generally speaking, there were two types of exercises: In one type, you had to fill in gaps or select an answer between several choices, and you got direct feedback in form of an automated answer. In the other type you had to fill in a sentence or a text, and then you had to compare your answer to a model. Which type did you prefer personally? |
| S8 | I think both are good and do have their pro´s and con´s. With the gaps it was sometimes difficult because it was so specific like “I want to hear **this** and you have to fill in **that”** - but if you can´t guess it and you don´t see the line, then you are lost, and when you see the correct response in the answer then it´s easy “ah yes, **that´s**  what it was”. But if you have to fill in whole sentences, you´ve got to **think** about it. I liked those exercises better because then you make more errors, more typical errors, and when you compare it with the model, you can see “ah, I have to keep this in mind”. But of course it is more difficult and tedious to compare it all. |
| S12 | Your response can be totally different, and then you don´t know whether this is also correct or not correct any more |
| S10 | Actually, there is also the teacher whom you can ask whether it´s correct |
| S11 | But then you have the teacher instead of the computer |
| S10 | The advantage of the other exercises is that you know where you stand |
| S12 | I think that a combination of both types is good. I think it wouldn´t be interesting to only have exercises that are all the same. It´s always interesting to get the correct result, but it´s also interesting to compare like “they said it like this but I said it like that and actually this could also be OK”, so, a combination is best. |
| S8 | Language is dynamic, hey... |
| S13 | I think this model solutions are really difficult to compare, so, personally, I prefer the gap exercises. But, indeed, a combination of both types might be more fun. |
|  |  |
|  | **Q7 (Key question 2):** |
| I | You had to evaluate your own summaries, comparing them with a model solution. Did you find this easy? Did it help you? |
| S12 | This wasn´t easy at all. First, because we actually did not get feedback on the other texts we had already written, so I didn´t know where I stood, and then you had to give yourself a score. I didn´t have a point of reference. |
| S10 | The problem is that you don´t know how many grammar errors you made. |
| S8 | You had a model, so you actually were able to compare the content, but at the end of the day... |
| S9 | I actually only compared like “what was **my** structure, what was **my** conclusion”, and a bit like “what topics are in there”, but indeed, with respect to grammar, you don´t get any feedback at all. I always gave myself the same score just because, well... |
| S8 | Actually, it did help me to formulate my introduction and conclusion better and so on. But at the end of the day to compare it every week was difficult, and especially to give yourself a score – the first two times I went like “well is that 8 or 4 [out of 10]?” Well of course it´s never going to be 8 but [laughs] |
| S13 | Yes I also found that part with the scores difficult. It´s like you don´t know how many errors you make and... |
| S11 | Yes, my structure was in most cases quite different from that of the model, and then you don´t know whether that´s OK. I sometimes had less, sometimes more, and then you don´t know whether that´s also OK. |
| I | And did the weekly scores help you in any way? |
| S11 | The only thing I learnt is that she always mentioned the source in the introduction. |
| S8 | But last year we didn´t have to do it like that... |
| S9 | Also the five wh-questions who what when where – I also learnt that, and to mention the source. But I think that, after all, I tried to keep in mind what I had done wrong while writing the next summary, and what was perhaps the reason for it.  (...) |