

STATISTICS

- Number of students affected: 205 students in the two first grades of Secondary school
- "2C" group includes those students who belong to the "Academic and Learning Improvement Programme (PMAR in Spanish)"
- Number of teachers affected: 9 main teachers (8 for ordinary groups + 1 for PMAR)

Nº	Grupo
alumnos	
22	1A
24	1B
30	1C
28	1D
24	2A
24	2B
27	2C
26	2D

THE ACTIVITY

We have decided to involve both main teachers and students in an activity related to *netiquette*. Last year, we also did it. However, there are some changes respect for the year before. The number of students affected is smaller because we have not included all the groups in Compulsory Secondary Education. Our previous experience showed that no matter how ambitious we could have been: even though we wanted to affect the bigger number of students, the real thing is that there were serious difficulties for all the main teachers to follow the activity the way it was designed. In fact, not all of them did it. That's why this year we have preferred only to select the groups of the first two years of Compulsory Secondary Education. It is in these grades that, according to different surveys, most troublesome cases appear (cyberbullying and so on...)

Initial planning for the activity

Main teachers were supposed to form a Whatsapp group with their students. Parents should give their permission by signing a document. In the group, there would be conversations that could or not be guided by the teacher and it could be analysed whether the rules of netiquette were followed or not. Those rules should have been previously explained to the students in a former session. In order to reinforce this message, one of the coordinators submitted a short video about netiquette to his Google site: https://sites.google.com/site/englishforemotion/home/tutoria-2oa-eso

The original number of sessions projected was at least 2 or 3. In the first one, the students should be informed about the rules of netiquette and they would get the written permissions for their parents to sign them. In the second, once the permissions would have been received by the teacher, he/she could analyse in class with the students their online conversations. it was assumed that, between session 1 and 2 they could use at least one week, enough time to receive the permissions and form the groups.

The calendar we proposed was:

- October 4th: by e-mail, coordinators informed teachers of the first two grades about WHAT and HOW to do and also WHEN to deliver short reports with the conclusions of the activity.
- November 3 and 4: talks (EDUCALIKE foundation) about social networks for these grades. In the e-mail mentioned above, teachers were also told that students should have taken notes during this talk in order to be able to create a poster to show what they had learnt. Another poster would also be created with the conclusions of students about netiquette. Both posters should form part of the classroom decoration.
- December 1st: deadline for teachers to deliver their reports. Almost two months for the whole process.

Real development of the activity: problems and data

Despite having two months for the activity, the real thing is that on December 1st, we had reports from 5 of the 9 groups (55%).

In relation to the paragraph above, it must be remarked that in November, both 1st and 2nd grade had different workshops about convivence and study techniques. However, it is also interesting to see that 5 groups could finish the activity anyway, reports included.

In connection with this, it is also relevant to add that the main teacher of PMAR gave also an informal (oral) report and her group accomplished the activity. Therefore, at the end of 2016, the groups who have not completed

the task yet are 3. We, coordinators, think we have been able to save this obstacle by insisting teachers to do the activity at the beginning of 2017. Their conclusions will be included as an appendix to this report.

Besides, we need to specify that only 2 groups completed the activity the way it was designed. The teachers of both groups accepted forming part of a Whatsapp group with their students. All the pupils of these classes are in the virtual groups. Indeed, both still maintain the groups as effective channels of communication (teacher-students).

In both groups, these are the common elements:

- ➤ The percentage of students who actively participated in the conversations is 25%. The others intervene sporadically and the topics they usually deal with are homework, exam dates, gossiping...
- ➤ The two most frequently broken rules of netiquette were: INVADING OTHERS' SPACE AND CORRECT USE OF LANGUAGE. Some students tend to share their YouTube videos or Instagram posts and it is relatively common to find spelling and grammar mistakes.
- Frachers normally work to make these and the rest of the rules effective. It is clear that if we insist, students respond positively.
- Regarding mutual respect, it seems quite remarkable that there have been some hints of lack of respect between students although never towards the teacher. Recently, there has been a case in which a boy insulted one of the girls and she answered in a rude way. The teacher stopped it and the boy voluntarily left the group, which was not the intention of any of the other members, including the teacher. The situation will be treated deeply in class once back from holidays.
- ➤ It must also be stated that 2°A students participated last year in a similar activity. That's why they are more familiar with the issue.
- -Respect for the poster to exhibit the conclusions of students in every group, only 2°A and PMAR created one and put it in the classroom. Th pictures which show these posters appear in our Twitter account: @Albenizprojects
- -Talking about the other groups (1°A, B and D),, these are the conclusions:
 - In general, students show interest to the topic. Teachers regard the activity as positive.
 - 1ºA and 1ºB students could watch the video from the site of one of the coordinators.
 - All the students are aware of the importance of mutual respect and of using language properly. 1°D also seems to have been especially motivated by these ideas:
 - Don't do the others what you don't want others to do to you.

- All that is written or sent on the Internet is there forever and may bring consequences.
- Don't say on the Internet what you would never say offline in public
- 1°B students, following the suggestion of the coordinators, were required to write a short essay about netiquette based on what they had seen in class or video. 11/23 students handed it in.

Evaluation from coordinators

We consider the data included in this report to be useful both as a qualitative and also quantitative piece of information. Considering this, the following correspondence could be established:

OBJETIVES	EVALUATION INTRUMENTS	LEVEL OF ACHIEVEMENT
-Students must know the rules of netiquette.	-1ºB essay	-LOW-MEDIUM (11/23 essays)
- Students must express themselve in Whatsapp, as a context for trial, following these rules.	-1°C 2°A conversations in the groups and analysis in class.	-MEDIUM-HIGH: observance of rules in general.
Tollowing triese rules.	-1ºA and B analysis of the video	-MEDIUM correct understanding according to the teachers.
	-1°D analysis of the rules in class	-MEDIUM: correct understanding according to the teacher.
	-PMAR and 2°A posters in the classroom.	-HIGH: good response despite some difficulties in PMAR.