



**Exploring synchronous, remote collaborative interaction
between learners using multi-touch tables in UK primary
schools**

Journal:	<i>British Journal of Educational Technology</i>
Manuscript ID	BJET-0276-May-2018-OMS.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Manuscript
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Beauchamp, Gary ; Cardiff Metropolitan University, Education Joyce-Gibbons, Andrew; Durham University, School of Education McNaughton, James; Durham University Young, Nick; Cardiff Metropolitan University, School of Education Crick, Tom; Swansea University, Department of Computer Science
Keywords:	Multi-touch, Collaboration, CSCL, Primary education, co-location

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Structured Practitioner Notes

What is already known about this topic

- Research suggests that collaborative interaction supports learning.
- Multiple users can jointly control and interact with each other on the same screen using touch, instead of traditional mouse

What this paper adds

- A new dimension, it is possible for two groups to work together to solve the same problem remotely, quickly establishing both inter- and intra-group collaborative working practices.
- SynergyNet technology was extensively researched in a lab environment, this study takes the evolving technology and explores participant behaviour in a more authentic school context.
- The immediacy of the flick gesture built a memorable and motivating link which inspired meaningful collaborative interactions between remote groups.

Implications for practice and/or policy

- Multi-touch surfaces can support synchronous collaborative interaction between groups in different locations which prove to be memorable and engaging for the participants.
- Further study is needed to explore further collaborative working practices between and within groups.
- Teachers are potentially able to lead sessions guiding both closely located and remotely located groups using video conferencing software.

EXPLORING SYNCHRONOUS, REMOTE COLLABORATIVE INTERACTION BETWEEN LEARNERS USING MULTI-TOUCH TABLES AND VIDEO CONFERENCING IN UK PRIMARY SCHOOLS.

Gary Beauchamp (Cardiff Metropolitan University)*, Andrew Joyce-Gibbons (Durham University), James Mc Naughton (Durham University), Nick Young (Cardiff Metropolitan University), Tom Crick (Swansea University)

*Cardiff School of Education, Cyncoed Road, Cardiff, CF23 6XD, Wales

gbeauchamp@cardiffmet.ac.uk

Tel: 029 2041 7262

Gary Beauchamp is Professor of Education & Associate Dean Research at Cardiff School of Education, Cardiff Metropolitan University. His research interests focus on the use of technology in teaching and learning. Andrew Joyce-Gibbons is an Assistant Professor, Durham University School of Education; his research interests focus on pedagogies for collaborative learning and CSCL. James Mc Naughton is a research associate at Durham University. His research interests include Human-Computer Interaction, natural user interfaces and augmented reality. Nick Young is a lecturer at Cardiff School of Education. His research interests are the uses of ICT in teaching and learning in the primary school. Tom Crick is Professor of Computer Science at Swansea University; his research interests include computer science education and cross-curricular digital competencies and pedagogies.

Abstract

This study explores remote, non-located collaboration via multi-touch table (SynergyNet) and video conferencing software (Skype). Twenty-four participants (aged 10-11 years) in two locations -- primary school classrooms located 300 miles apart in the UK -- engaged in simultaneous collaborative activity to solve a History mystery task. Audio-video data recorded in the first minute of the activity was analysed to explore the emergence of collaborative working practices both within groups in the same location (resizing for shared reading) and between the groups communicating via video conferencing software and through the 'flick' multi-touch gesture (sharing clues between groups). Results indicated that most groups focused first on the establishment of intra-group collaboration before reaching out to their remotely located partners. However, when the second data set was analysed, audio data from delayed interviews conducted after the original study, participants reported that the discussion between groups supported by the 'flick' gesture were the most important and memorable features of the activity. The study relates these findings to existing literature on collaborative learning using multi-touch tables and considers how teachers are best able to help support the emergence of collaborative practices.

Keywords

Multi-touch, Collaboration, Collocation, Primary, CSCL,

41

42 Introduction

43 This paper explores a new phase in the development of *SynergyNet*, a framework for
44 integrating multi-touch software in classrooms for collaborative learning. This technology,
45 developed and previously only tested under lab conditions, has been piloted in schools for
46 the first time. This study builds on previous research projects based upon using divergent,
47 collaborative tasks with a History curriculum focus. The principal difference between the
48 technology deployed here and that used in previous *SynergyNet* studies is the facility for
49 remotely located groups to work concurrently on a single problem, sharing information
50 digitally via a 'flick' gesture, as well as communicating in real-time with each other via video
51 conferencing software. The scope of this paper is to explore and analyse the role this new
52 gesture-based sharing has in the collaborative discussions of the groups, how able are
53 teachers to facilitate these inter-group interactions and finally, to explore the reflections of
54 participants on the activities after they have taken place to explore any enduring impressions
55 made by the activity.

56 In recent years, there has been an increasing interest in the educational potential of multi-
57 touch tables, where multiple users jointly control and interact with each other on the same
58 screen using touch, instead of traditional mouse control. In this context, 'the table surface
59 acts both as the screen and provides shared control.' (Mercier, Higgins and Joyce-Gibbons,
60 2014, p.2) and 'when working in a group around a multi-touch surface, there is no longer the
61 need to negotiate who has access to the content through a single interaction point.' (Mercier,
62 Vourloumi and Higgins, 2017, p.164). The use of large multi-touch surfaces (tables) was
63 explored in the *SynergyNet* project (funded jointly¹ by the ESRC and EPSRC, two of the UK's
64 national research councils) and, after developing innovative teacher orchestration software,
65 established that they did indeed support effective interaction between pupils (Higgins *et al.*,
66 2012). When compared to the outcomes of paper-based group activities conducted prior to
67 using the multi-touch tables, equivalent activities undertaken on multi-touch tables resulted
68 in greater uptake of ideas (Mercier *et al.*, 2016) and more engagement in sophisticated
69 reasoning, with more time being spent on problem-focused, rather than procedural talk
70 (Higgins *et al.*, 2012). Furthermore, data from these studies highlighted the importance of the
71 division of roles and different patterns of leadership (Mercier, Higgins and Da Costa, 2014),
72 the development of adaptive expertise among group members (Mercier and Higgins, 2013)
73 and the potential of the tables for structuring representations of reasoning processes
74 (Mercier and Higgins, 2014). In addition, data from teacher observations highlighted
75 differences in how teachers made decisions when moving between group and whole-class
76 dialogue (Joyce-Gibbons, 2017)

77 Other studies have examined the efficacy of multi-touch tables at various ages in educational
78 settings, from pre-kindergarten (Ward *et al.*, 2016) through to higher education (e.g. Shaer *et al.*
79 *et al.*, 2012; Martinez-Maldonado, Yacef and Kay, 2015), as well as informal settings outside of
80 education, such as museums (Ciocca and Schettini, 2011; Zaharias *et al.*, 2013) and tourist
81 information centres (Marshall *et al.*, 2011). Other studies have explored their efficacy in other
82 collaborative activities, such as gaming (Antle *et al.*, 2011) and working with children and
83 youths with special needs (Bossavit and Pina, 2013). Evidence suggests that multi-touch tables
84 can be applied effectively both in different areas of the school curriculum, such as


¹ Grant number: RES-139-25-0400

1
2
3 85 mathematics (Ladel, Silke and Kortenkamp, 2013), and beyond, such as English as Second
4 86 Language Learning (Lin *et al.*, 2016). All of these studies exploit the unique potential of multi-
5 87 touch, horizontal tabletops, such as collaboration, group work and problem solving (Mercier
6 88 and Higgins, 2014), using techniques such as clicking, zooming/resizing (Gao and Sun, 2015),
7 89 drag and drop (Hwang *et al.*, 2013), and rotating (Ku and Chen, 2013). When these devices
8 90 are networked these techniques become available to all users to share ideas developed using
9 91 them. As well as *how* the devices themselves have been used, the *SynergyNet* project also
10 92 explored the impact of use of various classroom layouts. These studies suggested that the
11 93 classroom layout had little impact, but that ‘the use of technology in the classroom may be
12 94 influenced by the location of the technology, both in terms of the learning outcomes and the
13 95 interaction behaviours of students.’ (Mercier, Higgins and Joyce-Gibbons, 2016; p.504). A
14 96 centred room layout, where all tables were facing inwards towards each other rather than a
15 97 traditional layout where all faced the front, encouraged a more collaborative discourse
16 98 among group members. The current study seeks to build upon these findings by incorporating
17 99 the metaphor of face-to-face group collaboration, echoing the ‘centred’ room layout in the
18 100 original study, between the groups through positioning of the video conferencing screen (see
19 101 Figure 2).

20 102 However, although previous *SynergyNet* studies replicated a classroom environment, they
21 103 were conducted in controlled laboratory conditions. U and users were networked in the same
22 104 co-located setting, where they could see and communicate with each other face-to-face,
23 105 working with other users they already knew, in the same room. –As such, there was a need
24 106 to explore the potential for collaborative interaction and learning by using the *SynergyNet*
25 107 software on multi-touch tabletops in *real* educational settings, with networked users in
26 108 *separate* geographic locations (i.e. non-co-located) – although the software allowed the
27 109 tables to still operate virtually as though one was co-located with the other. In addition, there
28 110 was a need to assess if collaboration was possible using real-time video communication (in
29 111 this case Skype), with others whom they had not met before. The study reported in this article
30 112 is the first attempt to explore this potential, working with pupils (aged 9-10 years) from two
31 113 primary schools located 300 miles apart within the UK. We have reported elsewhere on the
32 114 technical challenges involved in adapting the software and ensuring an adequate network
33 115 connection (McNaughton *et al.*, 2017). This study explores the pedagogical interactions
34 116 between learners participating in remote, synchronous collaborative activities using
35 117 networked multi-touch tables in two different geographic locations.

36 118 An innovation from the previous *SynergyNet* project was the development of the ‘Network
37 119 Flick’ gesture which allowed learners working at each table to ‘flick’ content from a table in
38 120 one location to the other in the other location (see Figure 1). This ability to quickly share
39 121 (predefined) content in either direction was a key addition to the verbal interactions
40 122 facilitated by the video feeds.

41 123



124

125 Figure 1 - The use of the network flick gesture to transfer content between two interfaces

126 **Research Questions**

127 This exploratory study sought to build on the work of the earlier *SynergyNet* studies by
 128 piloting synchronous non-co-located collaboration in the school rather than the single co-
 129 located lab setting to explore what behaviours emerged when groups worked in different
 130 locations. This exploration was guided by the following research questions:

131

132 RQ1: What *intra*-group collaborative practices did the groups establish during their initial
 133 strategies?

134 RQ2: What *inter*-group collaborative practices did the groups establish during their initial
 135 strategies?

136 RQ3: How did the recollections of the participants relate to the collaborative problem solving
 137 or subject-knowledge based experiences in the task?

138

139 **Methods**


140 The two participating primary schools were approximately 300 miles apart in the UK: one in
 141 the North East of England and the other in South Wales. Both schools were located in villages
 142 with a common industrial heritage based on an historic thriving coal industry, but in recent
 143 time the mines have closed with an associated socio-economic decline in each area. Both
 144 were positive about the potential of technology to improve learning outcomes and keen to
 145 be involved in projects which would broaden the experience of their pupils.

146 To facilitate the remote collaboration a multi-touch table was located in a quiet teaching
 147 room in each of the two primary schools. Each was connected to the internet using a wireless
 148 dongle – as the school network security blocked ad hoc network connections (see
 149 McNaughton *et al.*, 2017) – and to the other table using the *SynergyNet* software. In addition,
 150 each location had a tablet device facing the table which connected to the other location using
 151 the video conferencing software Skype to allow the children to see and talk to each other.

152 Following Falcão & Price (2011), pupils were divided into groups of three around a shared
 153 interface, with one group working together at each location. Each group was video-recorded
 154 by two fixed cameras positioned to capture interactions, both verbal and non-verbal,

155 between learners, teachers and the tables. The technical set up and data capture are
 156 summarised in Figure 2.

157



158

159

160 *Figure 2: Summary of technical set-up and data capture between school 1 and school 2*

161 In each location, a researcher (a qualified primary teacher) worked with each group of three
 162 pupils to set up the technology and explain the task. In total 24 children, aged 9-10 years, in
 163 two primary schools (n=12 in each) took part in the study, organised into four groups of three
 164 in each school. One group from each school collaborated together in real time. Prior to each
 165 data collection session, the children from each location introduced themselves to each other
 166 over skype and explored common interests to establish a rapport, which they quickly did due
 167 to their familiarity with skype interactions from other school activities and their fascination
 168 with each other's regional accents! Each data collection session lasted for approximately 20
 169 minutes. The activity was then repeated with paired groups from each location. Prior to taking
 170 part, informed ethical consent was gained from school, parents and pupils, in line with
 171 institutional protocol. Each group was mixed-gender and membership was determined by
 172 their class teacher. Participants were introduced to the other group via the video-
 173 conferencing software prior to the beginning of the exercise. They were told each other's
 174 names and encouraged to talk and ask questions of the members of the other group.


175 **The task**

176 Both schools were chosen based on the common heritage of their communities in the mining
 177 industry. Each paired group were trying to solve a Mystery task, validated in the original
 178 *SynergyNet* project, to investigate an historic mining accident that involved a 10-year old boy
 179 who had suffered injuries. Based on the available evidence they were asked to jointly arrive
 180

180 at an explanation of what had actually happened to cause his injuries. The Mystery task
 181 represented an attempt to engage the learners in a collaborative activity and give them the
 182 opportunity to share their understanding.

183 The groups of pupils were 'facing' each other via the video conferencing software (allowing
 184 them to both see and hear each other). The task commenced with a pile of clues, which the
 185 pupils dragged apart to read and discuss – see Figure 3.

186



187

188

Figure 3 – The SynergyNet Mysteries app with task content

189 The SynergyNet framework allowed any clue to be manipulated by users through common
 190 multi-touch gestures to move, resize and share between locations through the flick gesture.
 191 Collaboration was encouraged through the task design as groups in each school only had half
 192 of the clues (n=12) each on their screens. As one pupil described them, "like boxes, and they
 193 had, like, ideas in them". (W2)

194 The researcher facilitators in each location jointly introduced the activity, setting the
 195 geographic context and introduced the main protagonists involved in the mystery task to the
 196 pupils. Pupils were given a very short familiarisation time with the multi-touch tables, as they
 197 had all used iOS or Android tablet computers and were familiar with basic touch controls.
 198 They were then encouraged to start the activity and engage in reading the clues.
 199 Collaboration was built into the task from the outset as to view all the clues, the pupils had
 200 to share with the other group via the network flick gesture - which would send the selected
 201 clue to the other school. The facilitators encouraged the groups to articulate their reasoning
 202 via the video conferencing software and to come to an overall decision as to who was to
 203 blame for the accident.

204 Data and analysis

205 The activities resulted in two main data sets: video from both settings of all practical sessions;
 206 as well as -and- audio and contemporaneous notes from the pupil interviews in both settings.
 207 Each are analysed separately below after a brief overview of the analysis involved in each.

208

209 Analysis of interaction

210 To explore emerging collaborative practices using the tables, video data from the first minute
 211 of each task was analysed to replicate the analysis (Higgins, *et al.*, 2012) used in previous
 212 SynergyNet studies. This allowed analysis of both intra-group (resizing) and inter-group (flick

gesture) activity. Frequencies of [intra-group](#) resizing and [inter-group](#) flick gestures by participants were counted. Resizing could either be an action which enlarged or reduced the size of a clue. A resizing gesture or flick gesture was considered shared if two or more participants discussed it, simultaneously touched it or simultaneously read it for a period of at least one second during the first minute. If no discussion, shared touch or shared reading event took place then it was considered a non-shared gesture. The frequencies of each gesture (*Resizing–not shared*, *Resizing–shared*, *Flick–not shared*, *Flick–shared*) are presented in Table 1. Rotation of clues to orientate them prior to reading was not counted as an indicator of agreed salience or joint attention. Similarly, resizing or flicking caused by technical issues was not counted as indicating agreed salience or joint attention. [To aid in the analysis, the first minute of each session was also transcribed, noting additional features such as gaze and silent reading. All the videos were rated independently by two researchers based on agreed definitions above. This resulted in 81.3% agreement \(26/32\). Any disagreements were resolved by simultaneous video analysis, leading to the final agreed figures presented here.](#)

Researchers also noted any behaviours by individuals working on the tasks which either were either similar to those noted in the previous *SynergyNet* studies or those which were in some way different. The focus was on whether these gestures were shared in some way as part of a collaborative activity or whether they were used by one individual. Shared resizing gestures could indicate the emergence of intra-group joint attention during discussion or an agreement on the salience of a piece of information (Higgins, *et.al*, 2012).

After the activity was completed, each group of pupils (in their activity groups) took part in a semi-structured interview in each location with a research team member not previously introduced to the participants. The role of these interviews was to triangulate data on participants' recollections to enhance the validity of data interpretation. It also sought to give an initial indication of post-test durability of the experience in the memories of the participants, seeking to explore whether novel forms of communication (Skype or flick) became associated for the participants with either the collaborative practices or the subject content.

The study took place at the end of the participant's summer term in their school Year 5. The original plan was to interview them about their recollections during the autumn term of their Year 6. However, logistical and professional commitments among the research team, the long school summer holidays and planned school activities, meant this was delayed until the winter term. Nevertheless, all pupils were able to easily recall the activities and were keen to discuss. The delay makes the recall of the participants all the more noteworthy. Each interview was audio recorded, as less obtrusive for the pupils, with contemporaneous field notes taken during the interviews, noting social cues (Opdenakker, 2006), and particularly use of gesture – such as the 'flick'.

250

251 ~~Data and analysis~~

252 ~~The activities resulted in two main data sets: video of all sessions and audio and~~
253 ~~contemporaneous notes from the interviews. Each are analysed separately below.~~

254

255 Video data from activities

256

257 Group 1 (G1): School 1 (S1) and School 2 (S2) speech and gesture

258 Table 1 shows clear differences between the schools in each group in their emergent
 259 collaborative practices. For example, the differences between G1S1 (group 1, school 1) and
 260 G1S2 (group 1, school 2) reflect different approaches from the start. G1S1 were very
 261 individualistic, with much sorting and reading done individually rather than together. Each
 262 struggled to get the other's attention when they wished to share a clue or an idea.

263

264

265

		Resize			Flick		
		Not Shared	Shared	Total	Not Shared	Shared	Total
Group 1	School (G1S1) 1	2	1	3	2	1	3
	School (G1S2) 2	0	2	2	0	0	0
	Total	2	3	5	2	1	3
Group 2	School (G2S1) 1	0	1	1	0	0	0
	School (G2S2) 2	2	1	3	0	0	0
	Total	2	2	4	0	0	0
Group 3	School (G3S1) 1	3	2	5	1	0	1
	School (G3S2) 2	1	1	2	0	1	1
	Total	4	3	7	1	1	2
Group 4	School (G4S1) 1	2	1	3	1	0	1

	School (G4S2)	2	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	2	1	3	1	0	1

266 Table 1: Frequency of resizing and flick gestures by groups in the first minute of the task.

267

268 In contrast, as shown in Table 2, the participants in G1S2 ~~were~~ spent much time in silent
 269 reading. The direction of gaze implied that much of the time two or three participants
 270 simultaneously focused their attention on individual clues, reading silently or in turns. They
 271 undertook resizing after a brief discussion or with the tacit approval of other group members
 272 indicated by hand gestures and nods.

Time	G1S1 Speech	G1S1 Gestures	G1S2 Speech	G1S2 Gestures
9.38	S1B: I think we should send this one over.	S1B: Points to clue in front of him.		
9.40	S1C: Wait, give us look.	S1C: Reads to himself		
9.48	S1A: Yes	S1A: Begins to touch the clue.		
9.51	S1C: Do it	S1A: Puts their finger on the clue.		
9.53	S1A: Should we send it	S1B: Begins to manipulate another clue and reads silently	S2A: Robert has six younger brothers and sisters, his oldest sister ...	S2A & S2B reading together until clue arrives.
9.54	T1: Yes send whatever you like.	S1C: Sends clue S1B: Tries to send a clue (no discussion)		
10.01	T1: But if they're reading	S1B: brings clue back after it does not slide and gets stuck on edge of screen.	S2A: Stopped it	S2A & S2B both tried to stop clue by touching it.
10.04	S1A: You've got it.	S1C: leans across and pulls over clue from in front of S1C	S2C: We just received it.	S2C Was talking to her own group not camera.

10.06	S1B: I think we should send this one.	S1B: Slides clue to edge of screen and it disappears. They cheer.	T2: What's that one say?	S2B: Resizes clue – rotates and enlarges.
10.09			S2B: Wages	
10.10			S2A: Wages	S2A & S2B laugh and read silently.
10.14			S2B: Depended on the price of coal...	
10.16			S2A&S2B: If the price was low the miners had to dig more coal to keep the same wage and work longer hours.	G1S1 send another clue but it bounces off the back wall and G1S2 were unable to stop it rebounding back.
10.19	S1A: Workers at the mine had to supply their own candles.	S1A: Resizes (enlarges) clue in front of her and reads it out.		
10.10	S1C: Ah this one.	S1C: Resizes (enlarges) clue moves to centre of table.		
10.16	S1C: Here comes one.	S1B: touches clue which stops the flick. He then tries to flick it.		
10.19	S1C: [S1B] Leave go.	S1C: Continues to try to flick it.		
10.21	S1B: Why isn't it going?	S1C: Continues to try to flick it. S1A jumps up and down with excitement as clue arrives from S2.		
10.26			S2B: Oh no!	
10.27			T2: If there's words you don't understand, just ask.	

10.29	S1A: That's the one I just sent.	S1A: Points at the clue which has just arrived.		
10.31			S2A: The weather has been unusually hot this summer.	
10.34	S1B: The mine inspectors had reported that there was not enough fresh air in the mine but John Robson thought that they were being too fussy and had not done anything about it. Bye!	S1B: Reads clue with finger on it all the time. When he has finished reading he flicks the clue to the other school.	S2B: What about this one. Robert normally works from 6am to 6pm but recently he has had to work longer because wages have gone down.	

273 Table 2: Group 1 dialogue and gestures observed in first minute of activity

274 In G1S1, pupils S1A and S1C both use resizing gestures to enlarge clues and engage in initial
 275 moves to discuss them with other group members. When they decide to flick it is after some
 276 attempt at discussion with their school group members as well as an attempt to communicate
 277 with the other school via the video conferencing software. Pupil S1B focuses on private
 278 reading without resizing and then flicking without consultation.

279 In G1S2, all three participants focus on joint reading of the clues they have, reading aloud and
 280 working systematically through them as a unit. S2A and S2B are the more vocal in the group,
 281 but S2C remains peripherally involved throughout.

282 Group 2: School 1 and School 2 speech and gesture

283 Table 3 shows that for both schools in Group 2 there was less resizing, and no flicking
 284 observed in the first minute of the activity. This did not indicate that there was no
 285 development of collaboration using the tables; rather, these took very different forms and
 286 were influenced by teacher intervention in the case of G2S1 (group 2, school 1).

Time	G2S1 Speech	G2S1 Gesture	G2S2 Speech	G2S2 Gesture
3.48			T2: There's loads of clues here guys so have a think what's the most important clues	
3.50			T2: So you can resize them... read them and decide then which are the best ones to share.	T2: Demonstrates resizing and rotation as speaking.
3.58	S1D: So you read the first one.			

4.00	S1F: The coal mine is the only employment in the village			
4.02			S2D: Robert Dixon is ten years old...	S2D reads, S2E looks away, S2F looks at clue S2D is reading.
4.05	S1D: That is not important.			
4.06	S1F: Not important.			
4.07	S1E: So shall we just leave it over there?		S2D interrupted by non-participant children entering the room	
4.08	S1D: So shall we just leave it here?	S1D: Pulling clue towards them.		
4.11	S1E: Dude!	S1E shakes fist in mild frustration.	S2D: ... He works down the mine as a trapper.	
4.13	S1F: Right, [S1E]			
4.14	S1E: Wages varied on the price of coal, if the price was low then miners had to dig more coal and work longer hours to keep the same wages.			S2D gestures to another clue, S2E looks and S2F nods. They may whisper but it is unintelligible
4.25	S1D: That's not important.		T2: You can talk guys, ok.	
4.26	S1E: But it kind of is because then they had to work more to keep the prices.	S1E explains to S1F. S1D moves clue with one finger.		
4.30	S1D: Oh, yeah, flick it then.	S1D makes flicking gesture with fingers in the air.		S2D resizes and reorientates clue so they and other group members can read it.
4.32	S1E: Don't they?	S1E to S1F		

		S1E brings clue towards them (as if preparing to flick)		
4.33	S1D: Yeah.			
4.34	S1F: Yeah.			
4.35	S1D: There's one coming to you.	S1D shouts at the video conferencing screen.		
4.36	T1: Well wait, just keep that for now and look at the other clues before you send them ok?	S1E draws another clue to the centre (perhaps to start reading).		
4.38	S1D: Oh, ok.			
4.39			S2D: Those two look good.	
4.41	T1: If you think it's important then put it somewhere maybe.	S1F: Takes clue about wages and moves to far corner in front of them.	S2F: Yeah.	
4.44	S1E: So that pile's...		T2: If you think any are important and worth sharing...	
4.45	S1D: So that's the important ones	S1D: Points at clue but does not touch. S1F moves clue to corner.		S2D and S2F both select and rotate clues S2E focuses on clue already enlarged by S2D directly in front of him.
4.47	S1E: Whoa, whoa, you made it	S1F touches clue and it enlarges involuntarily.		S2D, S2E and S2F engage in individual reading.

287 Table 3: Group 2 dialogue and gestures observed in first minute of activity

288 G2S1 began to engage in reading and discussion of the merits of the clues immediately. S1D
 289 took the initiative and appeared to assume an organisational leadership role from the outset.
 290 S1E shows signs in this extract of developing as the group's intellectual leader, a role they
 291 could be said to be fulfilling later in the session. Although the group did not resize clues,
 292 preferring to move them to the centre of the screen to allow for shared reading without
 293 enlargement, they were eager to begin flicking clues to G2S2. The teacher intervened to stop

294 them doing so, possibly to enable them to focus more closely on reading the clues they had
295 before sharing.

296 G2S2 (group 2, school 2) were quiet, but focused on the clues. After a period of distraction
297 through interruption the group settled into a routine of individual reading with occasional
298 discussion. S2D was active, rather than dominant, as they were the only one to engage with
299 the resizing possibilities of the table. T2 (Teacher in school 2) was anxious to encourage talk
300 between the children, but they remained reticent to do so in this first minute of the task.

301

302 **Audio data from pupil interviews**

303 The audio recordings were transcribed and analysed using an iterative open process of initial
304 and then focused codes. These codes emerged easily as the pupils in both locations as both
305 groups had very similar memories of the activities. While they varied in their recollections of
306 the actual content of the activities (the events of the disaster), they were remarkably similar
307 in their memories of using the table. The most significant codes that emerged from the data,
308 both in terms of frequency and richness of description, were:

- 309 1.) use of gesture (predominantly flick and resize);
- 310 2.) (collaborative) problem-solving procedure they adopted;
- 311 3.) problems with the software;
- 312 4.) fun/exciting (including meeting new people)

313

314 *1.) Use of gesture*

315 During the interviews, pupils either described in words, or used their hands to imitate,
316 predominantly two gestures: flip and resize/rotate. The dominant theme with all groups in
317 both locations was the use of the 'flick' gesture.

318 There was some technical fascination with the novelty of flicking, such as

319 *'Well, I'm really amazed how they were flicking it over to their side even though they were very far*
320 *away.'*

321 **Group W2**

322 *"That it was just really clever, that you could flick it, like- I know it's not half way across the world,*
323 *but like- ..."*

324 **Group W1**

325 All of the groups were clear, however, that the 'flick' was an essential and purposeful part of
326 the collaboration, and not just 'fun'. A typical explanation is shown in the extract below when
327 discussing the flick gesture:

328 *Facilitator: Why did you want to send it to them?*

329

330 *Child A: They might have needed it.*

331

332 *Child B: To know more about.*

333

334 *Child C: It could be interesting information that they didn't know and then they could send us one*
 335 *back that we didn't know.*

336 **Group E1**

337

338 Nearly all explanations in the interviews were accompanied by the use of a physical memory
 339 and mirroring of the actual gestures used on the tabletops, such as:

340 *Child: If you wanted to send something to somebody, if you wanted to send it to them and you*
 341 *didn't want to press send, you would push, like uh.*

342

343 *Facilitator: You just flicked your fingers up?* [Referring to gesture child had made on table – field
 344 note]

345

346 *Child: Yes, because normally you would have to press send, but then that would load for ages. With*
 347 *that, all you had to do was flick it and then it would go over to them. Then that didn't really take*
 348 *much time.*

349

349 **Group E1**

350

351 This was also true of references to resizing and rotating:

352 *Female: Yes. You have got to, like, to make it bigger you just like open your fingers out, and then*
 353 *to make it smaller. And to move it, you just hold down and you can turn it whichever way you want.*

354 *Male: And rotate.* [Pupil was pinching and un-pinching, and twisting with two fingers – field
 355 note]

356 **Group W3**

357 2.) (Collaborative) problem-solving procedure they adopted;

358 All groups in both schools were clear that using the tabletops allowed them to solve the
 359 problem collaboratively by a mixture of discussion and sharing of clues through the flick
 360 gesture. The pupils were clear, however, that the ability to share content and then discuss at
 361 either an intra- and inter-school level, was important to their ability to work collaboratively
 362 as exemplified in this exchange:

363 *Female: We worked together.*

364

365 *Male: And we had to listen.*

366

367 *Female: Yes, we had to listen to each other, so you could know what the information they got, and*
 368 *what information we got. And we just basically worked together to see what information needs to*
 369 *go to [name of] school.*

370

371 *Facilitator: And how did you decide which to flick to the other school then?*

372

373 *Female: Because they would, we would, read out a piece of the clue, then they would say, then*
 374 *they would read a bit out, and if, if it like matches, we would ask them to send it over. And then if*
 375 *we didn't need it, they would keep it,*

376

376 **Group W3**

377 It is worth noting that although collaborative problem-solving was the research focus of the paper, for
 378 the pupils this was less important, or less memorable, to them than the other themes.

379

3.) *Problems with the software:*

It was, perhaps, inevitable that trialling a completely new technology, using secure school networks between different across two nations (who manage security settings – including firewalls – for schools in different ways) or using the internet wirelessly would present some technical and logistical challenges. Most groups of pupils mentioned problems (some more than others reflecting their experience), but none in a pejorative manner. If anything, they added to the fun element of the activities, particularly at the start. Besides actual malfunctions due to connections issues, the main problem encountered was a control issue with flicking clues, making it hard to ‘stop’ the clue as it arrived. As one child explained, ‘if you flicked it too hard it bounced back [from one school to another].’ (Group E3) All the pupils who mentioned this were not distracted from their task, but rather they enjoyed it as in the extract below:

392

Child 1: Yes. We (Laughter) tried to catch it, but it was really hard.

Child 2: Yes because if you flicked it too hard it would bounce back to us.

Child 3: We were all trying to catch one

Group E2

This problem was, however, easily overcome by the pupils as they calibrated their flick speed, due to their previous experience of similar technologies.

399

4.) *Fun/exciting (including meeting new people)*

There was also a strong theme of regarding the ‘fun’ element of the activity, including as a learning experience, as shown in the following extract:

403

Facilitator: You're flicking your finger, aren't you? (Laughter) Yes?

405

Child: ...instead of shouting all the time. For example, if someone on a different table didn't know what to write, you can just send them an idea.

407

Facilitator: For the recording, you're flicking your finger again at me! (Laughter)

409

Group E2

410

411

Child: ... and it was really cool how they got the information that we had on our screen.

412

Group W3

413

414

Also, part of the fun was in meeting pupils from outside of their school as summed up below:

415

416

Child A: Communicating with people who are actually really far away and from a place where I've never been. ...

417

418

419

1
2
3 420 *Child B: My favourite thing about it is that we actually met new people, that we actually met new*
4 421 *people from a different school. It made it a little bit like feeling like you're in a house full of*
5 422 *strangers. (Laughter) I'm not sure why.*

6
7 423 **Group E2**

8 424
9
10 425 *Female: It was good how they were all confident in speaking to us, and it seemed as if we knew*
11 426 *each other for like ages, but we actually knew them for like five minutes.*

12
13 427 **Group W3**

14 428

15
16 429 **Discussion**

17
18 430 **The results presented here compliment some key findings from the original *SynergyNet* study.**
19 431 **In particular observed group behaviours surrounding emergent collaborative practices,**
20 432 **negotiation of salience, intellectual and organisational leadership. This suggests that non-**
21 433 **collocated collaboration is potentially a fruitful learning strategy to deploy using touch screen**
22 434 **devices and offers a meaningful collaborative experience with multiple channels of**
23 435 **communication and dialogue at different levels. As such non-collocated collaborative activity**
24 436 **using *SynergyNet* is worthy of continued study both technically and pedagogically.**

25
26 437 *RQ1: What intra-group collaborative practices did the groups establish during the first minute*
27 438 *of each task?*

28
29 439 **A range of both individual and collaborative practices were observed in the first minute of the**
30 440 **activity. Some individual resizing gestures were focused on exploring the technical potential**
31 441 **of the multi-touch gestures and while these behaviours were not always task completion**
32 442 **focused, individual practices were closely connected with subsequent collaborative ones (See**
33 443 **Table 1: G1S1). Resizing was used by some groups to indicate salience, as clues were enlarged**
34 444 **for shared reading and reduced in size if not regarded as important (See Table 2: G2S1). Such**
35 445 **behaviour relates directly to that reported in Higgins, *et al.* (2012). Participant interviews**
36 446 **indicated that everyone had enjoyed participating, both as individuals and as part of an intra-**
37 447 **and inter-group activity.**

38
39 448 **Some emergent leadership practices showed initial signs of developing (Mercier & Higgins,**
40 449 **2016). Some group members showed early signs of emergent organisational leadership (e.g.**
41 450 **S2D or S1D) or intellectual leadership (e.g. S1C). It is important to note that intra-group**
42 451 **behaviour when using these tables, though linked to other groups remotely, showed some**
43 452 **features of previously reported behaviours.**

44 453

45
46 454 *RQ2: What inter-group collaborative practices did the groups establish during the first minute*
47 455 *of each task?*

48
49 456 **There was almost no attempt by group members to talk to each other during the first minute**
50 457 **of the task, participant S1B being a notable exception. This is perhaps not surprising given**
51 458 **that the groups had already been introduced to each other during the pre-task introduction**
52 459 **preceding the data presented here. It also perhaps reflects the focus of the participants at**
53 460 **this point in the task on their own clues, their attempts to read and then evaluate these before**
54 461 **sharing them. The facilitators themselves played an important role in this lack of interaction.**

1
2
3 462 Facilitator 1 stopped G2S1 flicking a clue they had decided was important to their partners,
4 463 G2S2 (See Table 3). Facilitator 1 was also tried to encourage, but also temper the enthusiastic
5 464 flicking of S1B and others in G1S1, anxious that the other group should have the time to read
6 465 before being sent additional clues (See Table 2). The focus of Facilitator 2 was on encouraging
7 466 dialogue between group members, sometimes of any kind. In the case of G2S2, Facilitator 2
8 467 began by seeking to encouraging dialogue, but seeing the joint attention of the group
9 468 emerging, they started to try and shift group attention to sharing important clues (See Table
10 469 3).

11
12
13 470 There was no appreciable lag between the two groups, the positioning of the screens and
14 471 speakers used for Skype meant that children were aware of the other group's dialogue.
15 472 However, many showed signs of ignoring this and focusing on their own discussions until such
16 473 time as one or more group members wished to deliberately talk to the other group. This was
17 474 frequently supported by the teacher, who recruited the other group's attention. Group 2
18 475 developed the convention of a group wave. When all three members of one school group
19 476 were waving it signalled that they required the other school group's attention. Sometimes it
20 477 was the teacher who noticed that this was happening and brought it to the participant's
21 478 attention, on other occasions it was a participant themselves. Facilitator intention and focus
22 479 when scaffolding the interactions was not specifically directed in the design of the task.
23 480 However, it appears that the different priorities of teachers here may echo those discussed
24 481 by Joyce-Gibbons (2017), which inform the teachers' decisions to intervene in group
25 482 discussion.

26
27
28
29
30 483 The focus of participants in the early stages on familiarising themselves with their own group's
31 484 clues is very understandable. It is remarkable that inter-group interaction was seen at this
32 485 early stage. Future studies will explore whether there is a shift in focus from intra- to inter-
33 486 group interactions as the groups develop in their exploration of the task. This study choses to
34 487 focus solely on the first minute of the task for two reasons. Firstly, the study draws upon the
35 488 findings of an earlier *SynergyNet* study which explored emerging collaborative practice in the
36 489 initial stage of single-group versions of this activity (Higgins, et al. 2012). The second reason
37 490 is that teacher instruction during the tasks diverged between the groups depending on the
38 491 technical and conceptual needs of each group. For meaningful comparisons between groups
39 492 to be made throughout the task, a more structured design should be implemented, where
40 493 sharing and dialogue between groups are interspersed by periods of intra-group discussion
41 494 and teacher support focuses on managing the transitions between these different levels of
42 495 interaction.

43
44
45
46 496

47
48 497 *RQ3: How did the recollections of the participants relate to the collaborative problem solving*
49 498 *or subject-knowledge based experiences in the task?*

50
51 499 It was clear from the responses that the gestures supported by the tables, resizing and flick,
52 500 were regarded as very important by the participants. In particular, they found the flick, a
53 501 facility by which to share with the other group to be very important and memorable. They
54 502 regarded their interactions with the other group as primarily confirmatory. They shared
55 503 information which they already believed was important, seeing their role as to curate the
56 504 important clues they had been given.

57
58
59 505 The gestures within *SynergyNet* which support collaboration were readily recollected by the
60 506 participants. However participants rarely, if ever, mentioned the content, relating to a

1
2
3 507 historical mystery or the collaborative problem-solving process itself. Given that the mystery
4 508 content was not related to the History curriculum in general terms but was a standalone
5 509 investigation, not incorporated in to their regular History scheme of work, it is perhaps
6 510 unsurprising that this was not as memorable as novel gestures and communication
7 511 (Department for Education, 2014).
8
9

10 512

11 513 Conclusions

12
13 514 This study set out to explore some of the emergent working practices that groups located in
14 515 different schools developed when working simultaneously on the same History problem. We
15 516 believe there is a clear relationship between a range of collaborative practices established by
16 517 groups working on similar problems in single groups in one location and reported in previous
17 518 studies of the *SynergyNet* project, and those which were established by groups in this study
18 519 in two locations. Specifically, these relate to group organisation of clues, the emergence of
19 520 intellectual and organisational leadership roles and the roles of the facilitators in influencing
20 521 the collaborative interactions both within and between groups.
21
22

23 522 The enthusiasm of the pupils evident from the interview responses indicates that *SynergyNet*
24 523 and the Network 'flick' gesture both have a great, and possibly unique, potential as
25 524 pedagogical tools supporting collaborative investigation. The addition of a school linked
26 525 remotely by video conferencing software and by 'flick' gesture adds a range of possible
27 526 interactions that can enrich the teaching and learning experience for all participants,
28 527 regardless of the distance between them. Furthermore, with recent significant changes to the
29 528 structure and assessment in the English and Welsh national curriculums -- especially in the
30 529 context of ICT and cross-curricular digital competencies (Brown, Sentence, Crick and
31 530 Humphreys, 2014; Arthur, Crick and Hayward, 2013) -- we envisage future application of our
32 531 approach across two diverging educational jurisdictions, with the potential for impact on both
33 532 pedagogy and practice.
34
35

36 533

37 534 Acknowledgements

38
39 535 The research described in this paper builds upon the original *SynergyNet* research projects
40 536 which was funded jointly by the Economic and Social Research Council and the Engineering
41 537 and Physical Sciences Research Council through Teaching and Learning Research
42 538 Programme – Technology Enhanced Learning, research grant number: RES-139-25-0400.
43 539 The authors would like to acknowledge the support and work of all the *SynergyNet* team.
44
45

46 540

47 541 The *SynergyNet* framework is available for free download from:

48 542 <https://github.com/synergynet>.
49
50

51 543

52 544 Statements on open data, ethics and conflict of interest

- 53 545 a. The researchers do not have permission to share the data.
54 546 b. The research was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Durham University School of
55 547 Education.
56 548 c. The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.
57
58

59 549

60 550 References

- 1
2
3 551 Antle, A.N., Tanenbaum, J., Seaborn, K., Bevans, A., & Wang, S. (2011). 'Futura: Design for
4 552 collaborative learning and game play on a multi- touch digital tabletop' in *Proceedings of*
5 553 *Conference on Tangible, Embedded and Embodied Interaction (TEI'11)*, ACM Press. 93–100
- 7 554 Arthur, S., Crick, T., & Hayward, J. (2013). 'The ICT Steering Group's Report to the Welsh
8 555 Government'. Retrieved 21 September 2018 from:
9 556 [http://learning.gov.wales/docs/learningwales/publications/131003-ict-steering-group-](http://learning.gov.wales/docs/learningwales/publications/131003-ict-steering-group-report-en.pdf)
11 557 [report-en.pdf](http://learning.gov.wales/docs/learningwales/publications/131003-ict-steering-group-report-en.pdf)
- 13 558 Bossavit, B., & Pina, A. (2013). 'An interdisciplinary methodology for designing and
14 559 implementing educational tools for children and youth with special needs'. *ACM SIGACCESS*
15 560 *Accessibility and Computing*, 105, 4-8.
- 17 561 Brown, N.C.C., Sentence, S., Crick, T., & Humphreys, S. (2014). 'Restart: The Resurgence of
18 562 Computer Science in UK Schools'. *ACM Transactions on Computer Science Education*, 14(2), 1-
19 563 22.
- 21 564 Ciocca, O., & Schettini. (2011). 'Browsing museum image collections on a multi-touch
22 565 table', *Information Systems*, 37, 169–182
- 24 566 Falcão, P.T. & Price, S. (2011). 'Interfering and resolving: How tabletop interaction facilitates
25 567 co-construction of argumentative knowledge', *Computer Supported Learning*, 6(4), 539–559
- 27 568 Gao, Q., & Sun, Q. (2015). Examining the Usability of Touch Screen Gestures for Older and
28 569 Younger Adults. *Human Factors: The Journal of Human Factors and Ergonomics Society*, 57(5),
29 570 835-863.
- 31 571 Higgins, S. E., Mercier, E., Burd, E., & Hatch, A. (2011). Multi-touch tables and the relationship
32 572 with collaborative classroom pedagogies: A synthetic review. *International Journal of*
33 573 *Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning*, 6(4), 515-538.
- 35 574 Higgins, S., Mercier, E., Burd, E. & Joyce-Gibbons, A. (2012). Multi-Touch Tables and
36 575 Collaborative Learning. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 43(6), 1041-1054.
- 38 576 Hwang, Shadiev, Huang, Cai, Yang, & Su. (2013). Effects of drag-and-response interaction
39 577 mechanism of multi-touch operated tabletop technology on users' awareness and
40 578 collaborative performance. *Computers & Education*, 67, 130-141.
- 42 579 Joyce-Gibbons, A. (2017). Observe, Interact and Act: Teachers' Initiation of Mini-Plenaries to
43 580 Scaffold Small-Group Collaboration. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, 26(1), 51-68.
- 45 581 Ku, C., & Chen, L. (2013). Age and Gestural Differences in the Ease of Rotating a Virtual 3D
46 582 Image on a Large, Multi-Touch Screen. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 116(2), 382-405.
- 48 583 Ladel, S. & Kortenkamp, U. (2013). An Activity-Theoretic Approach to Multi-Touch Tools in
49 584 Early Mathematics Learning. *International Journal for Technology in Mathematics Education*,
50 585 20(1), 3-8.
- 52 586 Lin, M., Preston, A., Kharrufa, A. & Kong, Z. (2016). Making L2 learners' reasoning skills visible:
53 587 The potential of Computer Supported Collaborative Learning Environments. *Thinking Skills*
54 588 *and Creativity*, 22, 303-322.
- 56 589 Marshall, P., Morris, R., Rogers, Y., Kreitmayer, S., & Davies, M. (2011). Rethinking 'multi-user':
57 590 An in-the-wild study of how groups approach a walk-up-and-use tabletop
- 59
60

- 1
2
3 591 interface. *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing*
4 592 *Systems*, 3033-3042.
- 5
6 593 Martinez-Maldonado, R., Yacef, K. & Kay, J. (2015). TSCL: A conceptual model to inform
7 594 understanding of collaborative learning processes at interactive tabletops. *International*
8 595 *Journal of Human - Computer Studies*, 83, 62-82.
- 9
10 596 McKechn, S. & Ellis, J. (2014). Collaborative learning in the Scottish curriculum for excellence:
11 597 The challenges of assessment and potential of multi-touch technology. *Education 3-13*, 42(5),
12 598 475-488.
- 13
14 599 McNaughton, J., Crick, T., Joyce-Gibbons, A., Beauchamp, G., Young, N., & Tan, E. (2017).
15 600 Facilitating collaborative learning between two primary schools using large multi-touch
16 601 devices. *Journal of Computers in Education*, 4(3) 307-320.
- 17
18 602 Mercier, E. M., & Higgins, S. E. (2013). Collaborative learning with multi-touch technology:
19 603 Developing adaptive expertise. *Learning and Instruction*, 25, 13–23.
- 20
21 604 Mercier, E., & Higgins, S. (2014). Creating joint representations of collaborative problem
22 605 solving with multi-touch technology. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 30(6), 497–510.
- 23
24 606 Mercier, E. M., Higgins, S. E., & Da Costa, L. (2014). Different leaders: Emergent organizational
25 607 and intellectual leadership in children’s collaborative learning groups. *International Journal of*
26 608 *Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning*, 9(4), 397–432.
- 27
28 609 Mercier, E. M., Higgins, S. E., & Joyce-Gibbons, A. (2016). The effects of room design on
29 610 computer-supported collaborative learning in a multi-touch classroom. *Interactive Learning*
30 611 *Environments*, 24(3), 504–522.
- 31
32 612 Mercier, E., Vourloumi, G. & Higgins, S. (2017) Student interactions and the development of
33 613 ideas in multi-touch and paper-based collaborative mathematical problem solving, *British*
34 614 *Journal of Educational Technology*, 48(1), 162–175
- 35
36 615 Mercier, Emma M., & Higgins, S.E. (2013). Collaborative Learning with Multi-Touch
37 616 Technology: Developing Adaptive Expertise. *Learning and Instruction*, 25, 13-23
- 38
39 617 Mercier, E., & Higgins, S. (2014). Creating Joint Representations of Collaborative Problem
40 618 Solving with Multi-Touch Technology. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 30(6), 497-510.
- 41
42 619 Mercier, E.M., Higgins, S.E. & Joyce-Gibbons, A. (2016). ‘The effects of room design on
43 620 computer-supported collaborative learning in a multi-touch classroom’, *Interactive Learning*
44 621 *Environments*, 24(3), 504-523.
- 45
46 622 Opdenakker, R. (2006) ‘Advantages and Disadvantages of Four Interview Techniques in
47 623 Qualitative Research’, *Forum Qualitative Social Research*, 7(4)
- 48
49 624 Shaer, O., Strait, M., Valdes, C., Wang, H., Feng, T., Lintz, M., Ferreirae, M., Grote, C., Tempel,
50 625 K. & Liu, S. (2012). The design, development, and deployment of a tabletop interface for
51 626 collaborative exploration of genomic data. *International Journal of Human - Computer*
52 627 *Studies*, 70(10), 746-764.
- 53
54 628 Ward, J., Branson, S., Cross, M., & Berson, I. (2016). Exploring Developmental Appropriateness
55 629 of Multitouch Tables in Prekindergarten: A Video Analysis. *Journal of Research on Technology*
56 630 *in Education*, 48(3), 227-238.
- 57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

631 Zaharias, P., Machael, D., & Chrysanthou, Y. (2013) 'Learning through Multi-touch Interfaces
632 in Museum Exhibits: An Empirical Investigation', *Educational Technology & Society*, 16 (3),
633 374–384.

634
635
636
637

Peer review only

	Reviewer comments	Author response	Amendment with track changes
1a 1h	<p>Original comment:</p> <p>... However, I gather the 'co-location' still involved separate rooms ie no communication other than through Synergy Net, so the authors need to explain what made this distant collaboration different – does the extent of physical distance in itself matter if the 2 studies both involve interacting only via SynergyNet?</p> <p>Also, were there differences from the previous studies in that the 2 groups of children would have had no familiarity with or previous knowledge of each other?</p> <p>Revision comment:</p> <p>My point in this comment (perhaps not clear enough, since the authors don't address this in the specified revision) was: what is the most important new feature in the current study, given that in this and in the earlier work, classes are communicating via Skype, albeit at different distances? I did pose the suggestion about differences in familiarity of two classes.</p>	<p>Revision response</p> <p>We agree that our original text did not make it clear enough that in all earlier studies there was <i>no communication via skype</i> as all participants were co-located in <i>the same room</i>, but they <i>did</i> communicate with each other outside of Synergynet.</p> <p>In addition, we have clarified that in previous studies <i>participants already knew each other</i> and in the current study <i>they did not</i>.</p> <p>We have tried to make this clearer as it improves to logic for the study but, more importantly, we feel that both these factors also help to address 1h as reviewer 1 was basing this comment on our lack of clarity about originality and substance.</p>	<p>See track change lines 106-109, 113-115, 170-174</p>
1e	<p>Original comment:</p> <p>The analysis is launched into quite quickly: it would be helpful to have an initial overview of the analysis plan. I found it quite difficult to know where to focus during reading –although there is nothing wrong with a descriptive analysis, it helps to have some explicit organising cues.</p> <p>Revision comment:</p>	<p>Revision response</p> <p>A short overview of analysis has been added by moving the 'Data and analysis' heading earlier in the text to introduce analysis. This has been slightly revised to provide an initial overview.</p>	<p>Lines 210-213</p> <p>Lines 216-217</p>

1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13	1g	There is no information about inter-rater reliability of coding.	We have added clarification on the process of inter-rater reliability. Lines 230-234
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
29			
30			
31			
32			
33			
34			
35			
36			
37			
38			
39			
40			
41			
42			
43			
44			
45			
46			

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

11	<p>Original comment: Discussion: it's not as clear as it might be how the results add to previous findings: the authors cite the previous work on questions about collaboration and leadership. The authors could make a stonger case for how the present study adds to what we know – e.g. why might we expect differences in this study, and is it surprising that there seem primarily to be similarities?</p> <p>Revision comment</p> <p>I think there remains a question about how substantive the findings are, and whether they would be better placed in a larger analysis with other data from the study.</p>	<p>Revision response</p> <p>As highlighted in 1a above, we feel that the greater clarity in the added text about originality makes it clearer that the findings are substantive and worthy of a study on their own.</p>	
----	--	--	--

	Reviewer comments	Author response	Amendment with track changes
1a 1h	<p>Original comment:</p> <p>... However, I gather the ‘co-location’ still involved separate rooms ie no communication other than through Synergy Net, so the authors need to explain what made this distant collaboration different – does the extent of physical distance in itself matter if the 2 studies both involve interacting only via SynergyNet?</p> <p>Also, were there differences from the previous studies in that the 2 groups of children would have had no familiarity with or previous knowledge of each other?</p> <p>Revision comment:</p> <p>My point in this comment (perhaps not clear enough, since the authors don’t address this in the specified revision) was: what is the most important new feature in the current study, given that in this and in the earlier work, classes are communicating via Skype, albeit at different distances? I did pose the suggestion about differences in familiarity of two classes.</p>	<p>Revision response</p> <p>We agree that our original text did not make it clear enough that in all earlier studies there was <i>no communication via skype</i> as all participants were co-located in <i>the same room</i>, but they <i>did</i> communicate with each other outside of Synergynet.</p> <p>In addition, we have clarified that in previous studies <i>participants already knew each other</i> and in the current study <i>they did not</i>.</p> <p>We have tried to make this clearer as it improves to logic for the study but, more importantly, we feel that both these factors also help to address 1h as reviewer 1 was basing this comment on our lack of clarity about originality and substance.</p>	<p>See track change lines 106-109, 113-115, 170-174</p>
1e	<p>Original comment:</p> <p>The analysis is launched into quite quickly: it would be helpful to have an initial overview of the analysis plan. I found it quite difficult to know where to focus during reading –although there is nothing wrong with a descriptive analysis, it helps to have some explicit organising cues.</p> <p>Revision comment:</p>	<p>Revision response</p> <p>A short overview of analysis has been added by moving the ‘Data and analysis’ heading earlier in the text to introduce analysis. This has been slightly revised to provide an initial overview.</p>	<p>Lines 210-213</p> <p>Lines 216-217</p>

	Still persists		
1g	There is no information about inter-rater reliability of coding.	We have added clarification on the process of inter-rater reliability.	Lines 230-234
1h	<p>Original comment: It would be useful to have more of a rationale for choice of the first minute: in particular the authors comment on the use of indicative actions for intragroup activity, not intergroup: this seems to be a function of looking at the first minute. Would it have been more informative to look beyond the first minute to see whether and how intragroup moved to intergroup action and how this was managed?</p> <p>Revision comment</p> <p>I still wasn't entirely convinced by this, nor by the rationale for using just the 1st minute, when other later data exists that would add a wealth of information.</p>	<p>Original response:</p> <p>While we agree with this observation, there were two reasons why we are reporting only the first minute of each task. Firstly, the original BJET article (Higgins, et al., 2012) focused on emergent behaviours in the first 30 seconds of the same activity run for single groups. The intention of this article is to develop the line of inquiry reported in this paper further with the two, non-collocated, groups. The first minute is used rather than the first 30 seconds to account for differences in the initial interactions of teachers when giving instructions to the groups. This was an uneven process reflecting the developmental nature of the tables and the differences in questions asked and perceived possibilities of the tables by the different groups involved. The second reason why subsequent segments were not used relates to the divergence in the technical robustness of the multi-touch tables (one was prone to more technical difficulties than the other), this was reflected in differences in the levels of technical and cognitive scaffolding support which each teacher was required to give to maintain group focus. Future studies will indeed report behaviour in later segments. However, for these two reasons, practicality and continuity, we felt it was most productive to focus on the first minute alone in this study.</p> <p>Revision response</p> <p>We still maintain that we need to use the same unit of analysis as the original BJET studies of Synergynet (Higgins, et al., 2012). We feel that a much longer article is needed to move beyond the first minute and this is not within the scope of the BJET guidelines.</p> <p>We also suggest that this <i>does</i> allow analysis of both intra-group (resize, shared and to shared), and inter-group activity (flick shared and not shared). This was not sufficiently clear in the text, and this has now been clarified.</p>	<p><u>Lines 213-214</u></p>

11	<p>Original comment: Discussion: it's not as clear as it might be how the results add to previous findings: the authors cite the previous work on questions about collaboration and leadership. The authors could make a stonger case for how the present study adds to what we know – e.g. why might we expect differences in this study, and is it surprising that there seem primarily to be similarities?</p> <p>Revision comment</p> <p>I think there remains a question about how substantive the findings are, and whether they would be better placed in a larger analysis with other data from the study.</p>	<p>Revision response</p> <p>As highlighted in 1a above, we feel that the greater clarity in the added text about originality makes it clearer that the findings are substantive and worthy of a study on their own.</p>	
----	--	--	--