5-2023

Teaching Reflection on Collaborative Writing in the Spanish Second and Third-Grade DLI Classroom

Lucía Martín García
Utah State University

TEACHING REFLECTION ON COLLABORATIVE WRITING IN THE SPANISH SECOND AND THIRD-GRADE DLI CLASSROOM

by

Lucía Martín García

A portfolio submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SECOND LANGUAGE TEACHING

Approved:

Dr. Sarah Gordon	Dr. María-Luisa Spicer-Escalante
Major Professor	Committee Member
Dr. Cacilda Rêgo	Dr. Crescencio López González
Committee Member	Department Head

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY

Logan, Utah

2023

ABSTRACT

TEACHING REFLECTION ON COLLABORATIVE WRITING IN THE SPANISH SECOND AND THIRD-GRADE DLI CLASSROOM

by

Lucía Martín García

Master of Second Language Teaching

Utah State University, 2023

Major Professor: Dr. Sarah Gordon

Department: World Languages & Cultures

This portfolio was written and compiled by the author while completing the Utah State University Masters in Second Language Teaching (MSLT) program. The documents included are: a discussion of the author's teaching environment and experience, a teaching philosophy statement of the approaches that inform the author's teaching practice, a required professional development peer observation of another instructor, a main paper that investigates benefits of and strategies for collaborative writing in the L2 classroom, and a statement of personal goals for the future. In the main paper, the author offers a concise literature review and a reflection on collaborative writing strategies and tools in the author's teaching practice. (76 pages)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deep appreciation and gratitude for the invaluable support and guidance that I have received throughout my academic journey to all the people involved. Without their help, I would not have been able to complete this Masters in Second Language Teaching degree. Therefore, I would not have been able to achieve the professional success that I have today.

First and foremost, I would like to thank my whole family for their unwavering support and encouragement. Their love and understanding have been my source of strength throughout my pursuit of higher education. They truly are the number one reason I was able to travel to Utah in the first place and finish this masters as well.

I would also like to extend my gratitude to my committee members for their expertise, knowledge, and mentorship, which have played a critical role in shaping my academic and professional growth. Dr. María-Luisa Spicer-Escalante has taught me not only endless ways to connect my teaching practice to Second Language Acquisition (SLA) research and vice versa, but also how to be an example for other Dual Language Immersion (DLI) teachers and support them to the best of my ability. I am grateful for the opportunity to have presented at an international pedagogy conference with her. I would also like to extend my gratitude to Dr. Sarah Gordon for the tremendous number of hours, knowledge, and kindness that she has provided during the process of this portfolio. Her enthusiasm and the teaching strategies taught in her MSLT classes inspired me to be a better teacher by expanding my teaching repertoire. I am very grateful to Dr. Cacilda Rêgo for her kind support and helpful input.

My heartfelt appreciation also goes out to my fellow DLI teachers, who have instilled in me a love of learning and provided me with the tools and skills necessary to succeed in my own

classroom during all the observations that I have done in their classrooms. Thank you also to María Teresa Gallo for inviting me to observe her classroom and thanks to all my other colleagues in Spanish or other languages that I have had the opportunity to observe. I am especially grateful to Shauna Winegar, DLI and World Languages Coordinator for the Cache County School District. Shauna's dedication and passion for the DLI teaching program have motivated me to pursue my academic and professional goals with diligence and perseverance.

Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to Ofelia Wade and her Spanish DLI State Team, whose friendship and support have made my academic journey an enriching and enjoyable experience. I am honored to have had the opportunity to learn from and alongside such talented and inspiring individuals, who inspired me to persist in my academics despite any struggles.

Thank you all once again for your support, guidance, and encouragement. I am incredibly thankful to each and every one of you for your constant contribution to this goal of mine.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT…….3

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS……...4

CONTENTS…….……...6

LIST OF ACRONYMS……..…….7

INTRODUCTION TO THE PORTFOLIO ……...…….8

PROFESSIONAL ENVIRONMENT ……..…….……...…….9

TEACHING PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT……..……...12

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT THROUGH CLASSROOM OBSERVATION.....20

MAIN PAPER …….....24

STATEMENT OF FUTURE GOALS...……....69

REFERENCES……..……..…..71

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ACTFL- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages

AF- Affective Filter hypothesis

AP- Advanced Placement exam

CLT- Communicative Language Teaching

CMTS- Collaborative Modeling of Text Structure

CW- Collaborative Writing

DLI- Dual Language Immersion

DOK- Depth of Knowledge

DLL- Dual Language Learner

ELL- English Language Learner

ESL- English as a Second Language

K-12 Kindergarten through Twelfth Grade

L2- Second Language

LRE- Language-Related Episodes

MSLT- Master of Second Language Teaching

OL- Oral Language

PD- Professional Development

PF- Peer Feedback

SDLI- Spanish Dual Language Immersion

SLA- Second Language Acquisition

SRSD- Self-Regulated Strategy Development

STEM- Science Technology Engineering and Math

TPS- Teaching Philosophy Statement

TPR- Total Physical Response

TPRS- Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling

USU- Utah State University

WL- Writing Language

ZPD- Zone of Proximal Development

Introduction to the Portfolio

This teaching portfolio provides select examples of the author's coursework, research, and reflections on teaching while participating in the USU Masters of Second Language Teaching (MSLT) Program and working as a K-12 Dual Language Immersion (DLI) teacher. Documents included give a picture of the author's approaches to teaching in the DLI classroom. First, there is a description of the author's professional environment and journey as a teacher. Second, the Teaching Philosophy Statement (TPS) summarizes the approaches to teaching that most inform the author's daily practice in the classroom, incorporating the approach of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). The TPS explains how the author's teaching involves reducing the affective filter, using aspects of the CLT approach, boosting sociocultural interaction, and setting expectations for student success. Third, because observation and reflection are important in professional development, an example of a reflective peer teaching observation of a DLI class is provided. Fourth, the author includes a main paper as one example selected from many papers written during the MSLT program. This paper focuses on benefits, limitations, and best practices for collaborative writing (CW) in the L2 classroom and includes a literature review grounding it in the current research, as well as a reflection on teaching with CW and a discussion of practical implications for DLI teaching and professional development. Finally, the author looks forward to her future in teaching, professional development, and program building in the domain of DLI education.

Professional Environment

For over 12 years, I have been a language teacher in some capacity. My teaching career started while I was still a student myself, in college. I earned a study abroad scholarship and moved from Madrid, Spain to Liverpool, UK to study English. In addition to improving my English proficiency, I became highly motivated to start teaching and I decided to become a volunteer teacher in a charter school for 2 years.

For me, as both a learner and a teacher, learning a language is about communicating in the L2, not just practicing parts of it. As a student of English myself, I have been practicing English through grammar and vocabulary lists since I was 9 years old. I will always be in the process of improving my English but at least now I have found more effective ways to learn, teach, and communicate and have moved beyond merely practicing and memorizing. I now believe that, as Lomb put it, "We learn grammar from language, not language from grammar" (Lomb 2008, p. 73). Today, my own past experiences as an ESL learner in an immersive environment inform my own teaching philosophy as a DLI teacher, because I know the value of providing context, authentic materials, and comprehensible input. I now emphasize language for everyday communication, and I do not rely on students memorizing vocabulary lists or doing meaningless drills. As Brown (2014) has reminded us, learning and teaching are tied together and "your understanding of the components of language determine to a large extent how you teach a language" (p. 6). For these reasons, I know that my previous experiences and beliefs will be reflected in my teaching methods.

In Madrid, Spain I initiated my professional teaching development as a kindergarten homeroom teacher, while I was also teaching English in third and fourth grade for 4 years. Currently, I live in Utah, where I have been teaching for over eight years in the Spanish Dual

Language Immersion program. The 50/50 DLI Utah model assures that DLI students will receive math, science, language arts, and culture instruction in Spanish for 50% of their instructional time and math review and language arts in English for the other 50% of their school day. During Spanish instructional time, DLI teachers only use the Spanish language to teach the content-based lessons alined with the Utah Common Core curriculum 100% in the target language. Due to the effective teaching strategies that the DLI model presents for DLI teachers and its positive cultural impact on DLI students, I chose to stay in Utah. The significant benefits that I found teaching the DLI model made me seek out a further in-depth understanding of the reasoning behind the strategies that the program has to offer. To deepen my knowledge of pedagogical approaches and methods in language teaching is why I pursued a Masters of Second Language Teaching (MSLT) at Utah State University.

The MSLT program has introduced me to a broad variety of different second language acquisition (SLA) theories and L2 teaching methodologies. In addition, I have benefitted from the valuable opportunity to learn from other language teachers, such as Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Portuguese, and Russian teachers that were my classmates or instructors. Applying all the new theoretical approaches gained from the MSLT program and the practical application of them to my DLI classroom, I collaborated with Dr. María-Luisa Spicer-Escalante presenting on the teaching of collaborative writing in DLI, at an international pedagogy workshop in Los Angeles (Spicer-Escalante & Martín García 2020). Thanks to the honor of collaborating with Dr. Spicer-Escalante, I then began collaborating with the Utah State Board of Education Spanish Team for the last 3 years in adapting the Spanish curriculum for K-12 schools. More recently for this team, I made a presentation on how to teach writing in the Spanish DLI program for all Spanish DLI teachers. Now I am one of the ten DLI model teachers for the State of Utah; this

means that school district representatives, principals, and DLI teachers from Utah and other states visit my classroom to observe my method and teaching strategies. I intend to continue teaching in the SDLI classroom and contributing to professional development. Furthermore, I am interested in program building and would like to continue developing the Spanish curriculum, aiding and coordinating fellow Spanish DLI teachers in their implementation and professional development, and expanding the DLI program in Utah.

Teaching Philosophy Statement

In my classroom, I focus on providing an effective immersion experience, following the ACTFL standards and proficiency guidelines and empowering students with Can-do statements (ACTFL 2017), and providing meaningful context and opportunities for communication using the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach. As explained below, I believe in reducing the affective filter and in fostering a safe, comfortable space for learning. I aim to boost sociocultural interaction and collaboration.

Using the CLT approach gives students opportunities for meaningful communication and interaction. CLT may be defined as an approach to language learning and teaching that emphasizes the use of language for communication: "It is a model in the sense that it describes the processes involved when learners encounter input, are involved in interaction, receive feedback, and produce output" (Gass & Mackey, 2020, p. 193). In addition to being a model for teaching, CLT has evolved over the last few decades and communication may also be defined more recently and fully as: "communication is the expression and sometimes negotiation of meaning in a given context. What is more, communication is also purposeful" (VanPatten, 2017, p. 22). Some of the main characteristics of the CLT approach that inform my teaching the most are: authentic language in context (relevant to students' lives, goals, and interests); learner-centered activities; everyday oral communication in real-life situations; comprehensible input; and the negotiation of meaning. Therefore, by combining the CLT and with opportunities for interaction and collaboration I will help my students increase their proficiency levels, improve skills, and meet their language learning goals.

As a language teacher, my primary goal is to facilitate my students' language acquisition process and help them become confident, proficient, and effective communicators in the target

language. During all these years in the Masters of Second Language Teaching (MSLT) program at Utah State University, I have increased my knowledge about Second Language Acquisition Theories, pragmatic implications in the culture of each individual and teaching-learning methodology. In this teaching philosophy statement, I will elaborate on my beliefs and principles as well as my learnings in the MSLT as an educator, drawing upon my understanding of students' feelings in relation to learning, the communicative language teaching approach, sociocultural interaction, and high expectations for student performance.

Affect in Language Learning

Learning a new language can be an intimidating and overwhelming experience for many students, especially if they have not had any previous knowledge of the L2. Feelings and emotions are evident in the classroom and part of language learning. Therefore, I believe that creating a positive and supportive learning environment is crucial for facilitating language acquisition. Krashen (1982) pointed out the importance of the Affective Filter Hypothesis (AF), which suggested that a learner's negative emotional state of mind can affect their ability to acquire the language. Krashen argued that negative emotions such as anxiety, stress, boredom, and low self-esteem can create a high AF, making it difficult for learners to receive and process new language input. On the other hand, positive emotions and motivation, interest, or self-confidence can lower the affective filter and increase the likelihood of interaction and successful language acquisition. Therefore, Krashen's AF hypothesis has important implications for language teachers. Teachers must create a positive and supportive learning environment that can reduce anxiety and foster motivation and engagement among all learners. Teachers can use a variety of strategies to lower the affective filter, such as providing positive feedback, creating a relaxed classroom atmosphere, using humor, and promoting student participation and

collaboration. I strive to make my classroom a safe and inclusive space where all students feel valued, respected, and encouraged to interact and participate actively in the learning process.

One of the ways I create a positive learning environment is by getting to know my students on a personal level. I believe that building strong relationships with my students is essential for understanding their individual learning needs, strengths, and challenges. I take the time to listen to my students' individual concerns, interests, and goals, and I use this information to tailor my teaching to their needs. By showing my students that I care about them as individuals, I hope to motivate them to take ownership of their learning and become more invested in the language acquisition process.

I prioritize my students' feelings in language learning by creating a low-anxiety classroom environment. This is important because language acquisition requires taking risks and making mistakes while producing output (Swain, 2006). I believe that students learn best when they feel comfortable experimenting with the language without fear of being penalized by teachers or ridiculed by classmates. I strive to create a classroom environment where making mistakes is seen as a natural and essential part of the learning process, and where feedback is constructive and supportive. I give positive verbal and written feedback just as often as I provide corrective feedback and suggestions. I do correct accuracy, often by kindly reframing what students have said. In addition, I usually use humor to demonstrate my own mistakes and I make my classroom a space in which all students may feel comfortable trying new things and expressing themselves.

Communicative Language Teaching

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) is a tried and true approach to language teaching that emphasizes the importance of communication and authenticity in the classroom.

According to VannPatten (2018), CLT is an approach that focuses on the communicative competence of learners, rather than just their ability to learn the rules of the language. CLT has evolved over several decades and remains an effective method of teaching because it allows students to use the language they are learning in meaningful and contexts.

In my classroom, I strive to create a communicative and interactive environment that fosters students' communication skills. I use different activities, such as: pair work, group work, games, and role-plays, to encourage students to communicate with each other. These activities provide students with opportunities to create output in a real-life, meaningful context, allowing them to develop their communication skills through interaction with others. I am very intentional about collaborative writing strategies (such as pairing, metatalk in collaborative dialogues, and peer feedback, based on recent research in this area) and in supporting my students in collaborative activities to increase opportunities for meaningful interaction.

Sociocultural Interaction

Sociocultural interaction plays a vital role in the learning process. According to Swain (1998), Long (1996), and Vygotsky (1978), and Shum & Glissan (2016), learners need to interact with other L2 speakers and learners to best develop their language skills. I believe that sociocultural interaction is essential in language learning because it allows students to learn from their peers and develop their social and cultural competence. Developing social and cultural competence means (in the specific context of elementary DLI Spanish) that, for example, my students will learn and be aware of Spanish-speaking different cultures, and understand their own culture better. It also means the capacity to increase unity among cultures, to empathize with other cultures, and to understand and act in a pragmatically appropriate way with a culture

different from their own (Spicer-Escalante, 2017). I want to support cultural competence in communication and foster positive attitudes towards multicultural communities.

In my classroom, I try to create opportunities for students to interact with each other, both in and outside the classroom. For example, I encourage students to work in pairs or small groups to complete tasks or participate in class discussions. I also use technology to connect my students with other learners and Spanish speakers from different countries, providing them with an opportunity to interact and learn from different cultures. Technology today offers many affordances, for instance we can use: the HelloTalk platform to chat with native speakers; Nearpod and Kahoot games to interact with each other in the classroom; or Flipgrid to create videos and interact with each other through asynchronous video; or Google Docs for students to engage in collaborative writing activities together, just to name a few of the tools I have used in K-12 DLI.

Expectations for Students Performance

Setting high expectations for students' performance is essential for their academic success. I believe that when teachers set high expectations for their students, they encourage them to work harder and achieve their goals. Students need to know that their teacher believes in their potential to succeed and is willing to support them in their journey. In my classroom, I set high expectations for my students and challenge them to strive for excellence. I provide students with constructive feedback on their performance, encouraging them to reflect on their work and improve their skills. Positive verbal feedback, praise, and reward (even prizes) are also important in the K-12 classroom, in addition to corrective feedback. I also believe in recognizing and celebrating students' achievements, no matter how small they may seem, to help build

confidence and motivation. Above all, I want my students to feel comfortable and engaged in my classroom, and motivated to continue learning Spanish.

In setting high expectations for my students, I rely on the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) guidelines and Can-Do performance descriptor statements. According to the guidelines and what I learned from VanPatten (2003) in terms of second language acquisition, the goals that I will operate in my classroom are based on Can-do statements in order to assess proficiency levels on a Global Can-Do Benchmark shown in ACTFL (2017). All of the goals outlined by the ACTFL guidelines are then also defined by grade level, subject content, and term, since they are subject to the moment of learning in which the students are. By implementing Can-do statements, teachers ensure "the ***ABC's*** of the DLI program: **A**cademic **A**chievement, **B**ilingual and **B**iliteracy, and **C**ultural **C**ompetence" (Fortune, 2013, as cited in Spicer-Escalante, 2017, p. 4). These are necessary to promote DLI student engagement in a multicultural world (Fortune, 2013, as cited in Spicer-Escalante, 2017, p. 4). For these reasons, Can-Do statements can be very empowering for both students and teachers; they help structure formative assessment for teachers and students can see the proficiency progress they have achieved. Moreover, the methodology used for reaching SLA proficiency goals is supported by the framework provided by Lee and VanPatten (2003). Implementing their communicative approach has meant not only a revolutionary change in my teaching methodology, but also has made a tremendous positive impact on my students' learning process.

More concretely, in my DLI classroom while teaching STEM content in the L2, I experienced how students describe content such as math and multiplication strategies in L2 to their peers. Amazingly, students are able to transfer that math content from the L2 to perform on a standardized English math test. Additionally, we may meet similar learning objectives in a

Gallery Walk display (or a print-rich environment) while providing the opportunity for L2 cultural references. Gallery Walk activities allow students to be actively engaged reading content in the L2 as they walk throughout the classroom to see posters they have created and drawn. Likewise, those aims will help students to see themselves on a path to achieve biliteracy at university level.

Furthermore, in over 12 years of teaching experience, I have recognized the complex commitment that a second language teacher needs to have toward collecting and interpreting data. Admittedly, collecting data has been challenging for me, but in interpreting the data I have collected, I have found some strategies more effective and concrete for SLA than others. In assessing writing samples, for instance, there is a strong indicator of language development for L2 students; however, the ways in which language teachers should implement writing assessments or collect data have been evolving. As mentioned in Kennedy (2018), academic and professional writing skills need to be included in DLI teachers' professional development training to address teachers' writing preparation. Furthermore, formative and summative assessment need to be conducted through video recording, projects, and writing short essays, along with standardized tests in order to collect further data in DLI writing. In the future, such data will help to measure student learning and my teaching effectiveness and will be used as a reference to improve teaching.

Finally, in setting students up for success, I believe we all play a part. According to research by Thomas & Collier (2004), the DLI education community is large and includes parents, teachers, principals, school districts, and boards of education, and we need to work toward the same goals to provide students not only a safe space but also high expectations. One part of their investigation highlights that students who have a family that are supportive of

teachers and the program are more likely to attain higher standards. This is one of the reasons why I invite parents to participate in my classes and to take other active roles. It is important to make that connection between school and family.

In addition to preparing my students for high expectations, I support the effectiveness of the DLI program. L2 research has highlighted some of the benefits of the DLI program such as academic, cognitive, sociocultural and economic (Spicer-Escalante, 2017). I believe that by providing a challenging learning environment and helping them to develop a sociocultural awareness, DLI students will be better prepared for the global working community.

In conclusion, my teaching philosophy is based on creating a positive and inclusive learning environment where all students feel valued and motivated to interact with each other and to engage with the language and cultures. I believe that creating a learning environment that promotes confidence, using the CLT approach, promoting sociocultural interaction, and setting high expectations for students' performance are all essential in creating a successful learning environment. As an educator, my goal is to provide students with opportunities to communicate and interact with their peers, allowing them to develop their communication skills and cultural competence naturally. I believe that by implementing these practices, I can create a welcoming classroom environment for dual language immersion students to learn and thrive.

Professional Development through Classroom Observation

Introduction

As is common practice in the MSLT portfolio, below I include one example of a peer observation. This is representative of the type of dozens of peer observations that I have conducted while in the MSLT program and continue to conduct regularly for professional development in my current DLI teaching position. I have chosen to include this particular observation because I learned a lot from the experience and it gave me additional valuable opportunities to reflect on DLI strategies, on the use of literature in the L2 classroom, and on my own teaching. It is beneficial to observe other L2 teachers for improving one's own teaching strategies. I regularly carry out a large number of observations as a DLI mentor. Here, I have chosen to reflect on an observation made at SDLI in a school in Sandy, Utah. First, I will introduce the background of the DLI school. Then I will review the DLI strategies used. Finally, I will consider how this observation may positively influence my own teaching strategies and how professional development might better support DLI teachers in the practice of conducting peer observations.

DLI Teaching Observation

Language: Spanish

Grade Level: First term, 2nd grade

Proficiency Levels: N1-N2, ACTFL novice-low through novice-high, with 5 native speakers of Spanish

Class size: 28 students

This class is part of the Utah DLI public schools model. It is important to note first that this Utah DLI school follows the 50-50 model of instruction, where students are 50% of the day

in their target language class and the other half in English (as studied by Spicer-Escalante, 2017). The curriculum is largely pre-determined by the state. Corresponding to the Utah Common Core, standards for Language Arts at the second-grade level will be taught by certified Dual Immersion Language teachers through the TL. It should be noted that the observation took place during literature instructional time, where a mandatory authentic book with a variety of genres has been pre-selected and provided from the state.

Description of DLI strategies implemented

Another reason I have opted to select this particular observation for inclusion in this portfolio, is because I observed a highly effective use of language acquisition strategies and reading strategies. As a DLI mentor, I used the official framework of the DLI observation checklist assessment provided by the Spanish DLI Utah State Board of Education team, in order to reflect and support the evaluations made. Due to the length of the checklist, I will have chosen to focus on just a few of its key points.

Comprehensible input

One of the DLI assessments for elementary teachers measures how DLI teachers will make input comprehensible, integrate language, content and culture, thereby promoting students' positive output. Comprehensible input, in other words meaningful interaction in the target language as first suggested by Krashen (1982), is vital to the CLT approach. It should be noted that the class I observed had previously learned science content about "Animals adaptation to their habitat" in this unit. The teacher very effectively makes input comprehensible by using mainly body language and gestures, Total Physical Response (TPR) methods, Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling/TPR Storytelling (TPRS), and visuals such as a Google Slide presentation with images from the story, to communicate meaning. She makes

frequent use of comprehension checks that require learners to demonstrate their understanding, for instance asking the L2 learners to describe the vocabulary word in their own words. What's more, to demonstrate content learning, students paraphrase the main idea of the reading between peers. Moreover, the teacher models accurate use of language (slowing down and simplifying language) during her first explanation of the concept.

The teacher integrates language, content and culture by specifying content and language objectives for the lesson. Furthermore, she compares "Animals adaptations to their habitat" in dryer and more humid areas of Latin America providing learners the cultural perspective.

This instructor effectively makes input more comprehensible by enquiring students to produce output to explain and use meaning in content during cooperative techniques such as think-pair-share. This teacher promotes extended student output by structuring and facilitating high-interest student-centered activities. (example: students have the opportunity to create and explain a discourse about different habits). Learners interact and produce content output by negotiating meaning through the teacher's arranged speaking-writing prompts.

Takeaways

As a supervisor, I need to make sure that DLI teachers implement the strategies in the most effective way possible. In the case of this teacher, I have not only evaluated her effectiveness but I have also expanded my repertoire of strategies. One strategy that I have now incorporated into my class from watching this teacher is to include the game of "find the differences." This is a board game in which students have to work in pairs to complete a paragraph. It takes a jigsaw learning approach, and in it student A has different vocabulary words than student B and together they will discuss which words are the most appropriate to complete the meaning of the paragraph related to the story.

I believe there are countless benefits from observing and exchanging ideas with other teaching professionals. Before I was a mentor, I observed twice during the school year, one at the beginning of the school year in August in 2nd grade to remind myself where my 3rd grade students came from. The second time was in March with 4th grade to properly prepare my students for the year to come. I think teachers would benefit from additional opportunities to observe others and to be observed and reflect on their teaching. Thus, I would like to encourage school districts to increase Professional Development days (from the current amount of only 1 to potentially 3 days) and to invite early-career teachers to conduct and respond to observations frequently as part of an initial self-assessment. Therefore, school districts could promote more reflective teaching and could combine more mentoring and peer observations to increase opportunities to collaborate among teachers and to reduce burn-out in the early stages of the profession.

Main Paper

TEACHING REFLECTION ON COLLABORATIVE WRITING IN THE SPANISH SECOND AND THIRD-GRADE DLI CLASSROOM

Introduction

Writing is a complex activity in the first language and it is even more complex in the second language (Canagarajah, 2002). Understanding this complexity and various pedagogical approaches to writing are the keys to the effective teaching of writing (Cheung, 2016). If language teachers do not receive adequate professional development related to writing, then "they cannot teach their students to write" (Spicer-Escalante 2011 and 2015). Consequently, this paper explores collaborative writing in the K-12 DLI context in theory and practice, reflecting on its many affordances and also some of its challenges. To begin with, I present an initial overview of what is at stake with writing in the DLI context in which I teach. Then I offer a discussion of approaches to collaborative writing and its benefits and limitations, including a synthesis of select research related to these areas (Dobao, 2012 and 2013; Teng, 2020; Hanjani & Li, 2014; Ishikawa, 2018; Storch, 2005; Watanabe & Swain, 2007; Coffin, 2020; Chen & Lee, 2022; Bueno-Alstuey, Vasseur & Elola, 2022). The paper aims to provide a carefully curated, but not exhaustive, literature review, covering select key research related to this topic that informs both this reflection paper and my own teaching practice. In particular, I have chosen to focus on research that investigates some sociocultural aspects of collaborative writing and also best practices in facilitating student interaction. Finally, I reflect on CW activities in the second- and third-grade Spanish DLI classroom and discuss strengths and weaknesses of my implementation. This paper has broader implications for DLI teachers, suggesting effective CW methods and strategies, as well as opening up pathways for future research or methods to try in the classroom.

First, it is important to recognize in general that L2 writing is not a stand-alone skill because it entails L2 reading comprehension, as well as high order thinking skills. More specifically, in the DLI classroom, DLI students will achieve biliteracy by managing the learning of the content area while acquiring the L2 in interaction with their teacher and their peers. One of the assurances of the DLI Utah model is that 80% of the DLI students will achieve grade level proficiency benchmark according to Utah Common Core Utah (Dual Language Immersion Assurances, 2019). For that reason, DLI teachers need to focus classroom time on writing and incorporate effective approaches to writing. In order to develop L2 writing, L2 learners will need to be exposed to a safe classroom environment in which to engage in welcoming social interaction with their DLI teachers and peers, while the DLI teacher ensures the completion of high learning standards.

However, despite the fact that L2 writing is crucial for L2 learners' proficiency levels and skills development, sometimes teachers' professional development (PD) may often ironically hinder them being able to support students effectively in L2 writing. On a personal note, I have been teaching in DLI classrooms and assisting with DLI State trainings or District trainings for 8 years now, and have noticed that their focus tends to be on communicative (mostly verbal) interaction and the reading of a variety of genres of authentic texts and reading strategies. I have found the professional development training lacking L2 writing support in the elementary levels. This is why I found it vital to look for research in this area and for ways of improving my own L2 writing teaching strategies. Much of the research points to collaborative writing as one particularly effective approach. After reviewing a number of useful existing research studies in this area, I have begun incorporating collaborative student-centered writing tasks with the purpose of enhancing L2 writing in my own classroom.

Some explanation of our system and assessment process is helpful here as background. By the ninth grade in Utah DLI students of all languages will take the College Board Advanced Placement (AP) Spanish Language and Culture Exam, which contains two L2 writing assessments: (1) personal writing and (2) interpersonal writing (as outlined by the Utah K-16 Language Immersion program and Bridge Program Advanced Language Pathways 2019 website). Anecdotally, I have observed in fellow instructors' classrooms and experienced myself the improvement in my students' writing learning outcomes when there was a shift in my teaching philosophy following professional development training. I am confident that when DLI teachers will receive the PD instruction and learn the best practices needed to implement and evaluate L2 collaborative writing (including recent research) they will be able to introduce them more effectively in their daily DLI teaching practice. Writing is a foundational academic and career skill, and K-12 programs need to help students progress toward writing benchmarks that will ultimately be aligned to college writing objectives (Spicer-Escalante & González, 2022) Consequently, DLI students will have more opportunity to practice collaborative writing, may achieve better outcomes in writing, and may ultimately even feel more confident in the L2 writing, thus, boosting their language writing proficiency level and potentially performance on the AP. Given these possibilities, I have shaped this paper and literature review around the optimization of my teaching-learning L2 collaborative writing strategies with two goals in mind: (1) enhance my students' L2 writing proficiency skills and (2) support other current and future DLI teachers in the implementation of collaborative writing in the L2. In addition, because I am a current DLI teacher, in the future I will be able to continue to explore in practice some of the theoretical ideas and methods presented in the research reviewed below and reflect on them in relation to my own classroom experiences.

L2 learning and interaction

Generally speaking, learning another language helps students with critical thinking skills and many other skills, and this is one of the main justifications for a DLI education. As L2 teachers, we must keep in mind that, "Mental action requires an abstract system of symbols, and this is provided by the most powerful and pervasive symbolic system available to humans–Language" (Lantolf, Poehner & Thorne 2020, p. 225). As a proponent of the CLT approach, from VanPatten's (2020) perspective language is twofold: (1) communicative and (2) psychological; both functions impact on the mediation with others and with oneself. Mediation, and by extension interaction with others, are vital areas for language learning.

Sociocultural theory defines learning as a social process of acquiring thoughts while interacting with others (Vygotsky, 1978). Again, language acts as a mediator for social processes and interactions, in part because: "Language is the semantic tool mediating this process and learning is the gradual internalization of the socially constructed knowledge." (Dobao, 2012, p. 41). Therefore, somewhat reciprocally, language and learning rely on each other to construct themselves. In other words, the human communicative function raises the psychological function and vice versa, as several decades of research continue to confirm (Vygotsky, 1978; Ishikawa, 2018; Lantolf, Poehner & Thorne 2020).

According to Swain (1995, 2006) in the output hypothesis, oral and written language simultaneously provides thoughts and reorganizes the function of the language itself, in a metatalk termed "languaging." Later researchers suggest that oral and written skills are not always equal in all contexts. For example, although oral language and writing language are both means to express and construct language, writing provides learners with the endless possibilities of revisiting and editing due to their easy access (Ishikawa, 2018).

From a Sociocultural theory viewpoint, constructed knowledge occurs in interaction among learners with different proficiency levels (as Dobao, 2012, discussed further below, reminds us). During the interaction in a L2 classroom described by one study, learners engage in a communicative act while applying the L2 in collaborative tasks, such writing in groups or pairs (Dobao, 2013, as summarized below). From Swain's (2006) perspective, these dialogues, here collaborative dialogues aimed at problem solving, promote learners' use of solving language-related problems such as what and how to express their ideas to concur or reach a consensus in finding a solution. Collaborative dialogue implies the use of scaffolding to co-construct meaning, with learners working together and testing hypotheses (Swain, 2006), and explicit corrective feedback among peers (Dobao, 2013). Collaborative dialogues also known as language-related episodes (LREs) (Swain, 2006; Dobao, 2013). Due to the use of scaffolding through LREs, L2 learners with different proficiency levels move from one level of cognition to a higher level that they would not have achieved without that supported guidance from their partners (Swain, 2002). This margin within levels where learning is acquired is defined using Vygotsky (1978) and Shum & Glissan (2015, p.24) Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). L2 research indicated "what a L2 learner is capable of achieving in collaboration is equivalent to the performance that one individual will be able to perform independently in the future, as one of the ZPD features" (Lantolf, Poehner & Thorne, 2020 p. 229). This 2020 study argues that with the correct identification of L2 learners' ZPD, teachers can expand learners; cognition development and academic achievement. Providing learners the possibility of moving from other-regulated to self-regulated when the mediation and scaffolding are eliminated. In short, L2 learning will be better developed in collaborative writing due to the implementation of LREs (Dobao, 2013).

Collaborative writing process

The process of two or more learners producing a combined written text that requires a cooperative dialogue and shared responsibilities is considered collaborative writing (CW) (Storch, 2019; Dobao, 2013). As mentioned above, CW promotes increased learner involvement in problem-solving in regard to content and language itself (LREs), thereby facilitating L2 learning (Swain, 2006; Dobao, 2013). CW research has found that learners participating in such interaction scored higher in L2 communicative skills, and form complexity, lexical accuracy and text complexity in writing competition (Storch, 2005; Watanabe & Swain, 2007; Teng, 2020). As seen below, the types of collaborative dialogues that may occur during CW interactions have been the focus of much L2 research, not only studying how learners co-construct knowledge, but also investigating how pairing or grouping different proficiency levels together might affect CW and linguistic outcomes (Storch 2005; Watanabe & Swain 2007; Teng, 2020).

Below, I present a summary of key research on CW in L2 teaching. I look at the benefits of CW and consider CW teaching strategies, such as pairing, rubrics, and types of dialogue. Here I only take into consideration handwritten CW, due to the young age of my students and constraints in my current teaching environment (and will not cover digital CW). For each study considered below, I summarize key points of the research design, methodology, findings, and possible implications. I seek to provide theoretical and pedagogical insight for current and future DLI teachers, for my own teaching, and potentially even for further research in DLI classrooms.

Literature Review

In Ana Fernández Dobao's (2012) study, 111 adult English native speakers at a public university in the United States in an intermediate Spanish language class participated in a CW task. The research aimed to answer (1) if the number of participants impacted the accuracy, fluency, and complexity of the written texts, and (2) if the number of participants mattered in the

frequency and quality of language-related episodes (LREs) produced. The study compares the outcomes of a CW task carried out in 3 different ways: pairs, small groups of 4 learners, and individually; by analyzing the written texts and recorded dialogues. Participants first received a 15-minute grammar review on the Spanish past tense, then completed a writing task based on 15 images that they were prompted to sequence in order to create a story. Every group or pair completed the CW task; the learners working independently received the same instructions but instead were only expected to complete a single writing composition for each individual.

The researchers found in regard to the written composition that CW texts created in small groups tended to produce less grammatical or lexical errors but found no significant difference in mechanical accuracy errors compared to CW in pairs. Comparing the CW in small groups, CW in pairs and independent writing had few differences in fluency and complexity**.** Texts written by small groups showed higher levels of accuracy. In terms of the number of LREs used during CW tasks, groups created more number of LREs than the pairs, with more form and lexical dialogues, and higher mechanical LREs. Examination of LREs revealed that groups and pairs produced an amount of unresolved LRE problems and the same amount of incorrectly resolved LREs. However, groups scored higher (than pairs or individuals) in correctly resolved LREs with a 74.46% compared to pairs with a 63.96%. In sum, whether the teacher conducted CW in groups, pairs, or individually, did not show significant evidence of affecting the text results; nevertheless, the outcomes for group interactions developed more language focus and more frequent use of strategies for problem solving related to language.

Dobao's (2012) findings are that CW in groups showed stronger success in LREs. Her insight is that the more members in the group, the more opportunity there is to co-construct the language. Due to the four members, learners are able to build up language lexical or form

scaffolding on each other's ideas and prior knowledge. She also identified the lack of labels among members of the groups due to each of them being at novice or expert level in different aspects of the language use. All group members seemed to encounter a language issue that they were not able to solve individually. In addition, corrective feedback could be reinforced by more than one member of the group, by confirming or rejecting a form, with the learner(s) that made the receiving feedback. Therefore, one broader implication of these research findings for classroom teachers is recognizing that group work identifies and corrects some language form and lexical issues that would not be able to be solved in pairs or individually and there is a better proficiency balance.

Dobao also conducted a related learner perception study the following year. Dobao (2013) focused on learners' attitudes towards CW in pairs versus in small groups. Participants included 55 intermediate Spanish at a public university in the United States. The course combined reading, writing, listening, speaking skills, vocabulary knowledge, and grammar accuracy. In the process of the study, all the students produced pre- and post-test activities. During the CW task, very similar to the 2012 study above, learners first received a 15-minute grammar lesson on the preterit and imperfect verbs. Then, L2 learners created a story after sequencing a single page of 15 images, with the learning objective of effectively using the past tense. After that, students had 30-minutes to complete the CW task. Finally, a survey tool was used, combining a Likert rating scale and open-ended questions, and administered in English to gauge student perceptions of CW.

Dobao's (2013) findings in regard to learners' attitude towards CW in pairs versus in groups of four was that the learners themselves considered collaborating in pairs or small groups helpful, very helpful, and extremely helpful. In vocabulary and grammar comparison, some of

the learners indicated how being in a small group provided them with a larger range of vocabulary and grammar implementation due to each other's knowledge or how students build up each other's sentences or helped to identify errors. Also, there was stability in carrying out the conversation and managing the workload. In contrast, the qualitative responses revealed some issues that might be useful for a classroom teacher to be aware of; for example, one student mentioned the difficulty of working with a less-prepared classmate, and another student considered the small group less collaborative due to a larger number of participants decreasing the number of individual participation. Overall, Dobao (2013) suggests that proficiency imbalance would not occur in small groups because there are more members collaborating together.

In sum, there was no statistically significant conclusion determining why students prefer pairs or small groups in CW (this might be because the teacher let them choose their partner and/or group choice at the beginning of the task). Nevertheless, many students expressed preference for pairing and grouping compared with individual task options. Dobao's (2013) article has broader implications for CW research, because it demonstrates that learners not only achieve higher language and writing proficiency levels but also shows learners' preferences for collaboration over individual writing. The study suggests that student motivation and awareness of the reasoning behind CW also may improve their outcomes; however, further research would be needed to quantify this.

Mark Feng Teng (2020) examined sixth-grade intermediate ELL students from four elementary schools in Hong Kong (with between 34-38 students from each school). The four teachers selected had a bachelors degree in teaching English and over 5 years of experience in elementary school teaching. The focus of the research was to determine how the self-regulated

strategy development (SRSD) and a collaborative modeling of text structure (CMTS) affects the four group (SRSD+CMTS, SRSD-only, CMTS-only, and control) outcomes. Outcomes measured included writing and reading skills, such as: content expertise, text understanding, abstract main ideas, and writing composition.

The four groups followed different approaches due to the main focus of the research was to assess the CMTS effectiveness. However, all groups were exposed to the same texts and writing activities in the same order. In the traditional group, reading and writing skills were not supported by any instructions or prompts related to SRSD or CMTS. Students were given 10 minutes reading and 30 minutes writing time. During this time, the teacher supported individual learners struggling to complete the activities and had 10 minutes to correct their writing composition and offer feedback after completion. In group 1 (SRSD + CMTS) learners received 6 sessions of SRSD and another 6 sessions on CMTS. The main difference was the teacher used the SRSD+CMTS to teach the materials created for the SRSD and the CMTS. Group 2 (CMTS) had 6 lessons on SRSD. All the learners composed both a pre- and post-test writing composition on the theme of their "future life."

The findings revealed that better comprehension levels and writing performance were mastered by the SRSD and CMTD groups. There was also a significant growth from groups 1, 2, and 3 from the pre- to the post-test with an increase from 7.86 to 12.21, showing that students had better understanding. Group 2 demonstrated a higher number of dialogues composed. The traditional groups had only slight growth in each category. SRSD+CMTD combined more complexity in text structure, and increased content comprehension and writing quality. These findings suggest the necessity of explicit instruction about CW and self-regulated strategies for better performance in L2 text comprehension and writing skills. The role of corrective feedback

or teacher support might be two areas for further research that are not explicitly measured by the study. Additionally, this study is important because (1) demonstrated that SRSD and structured CW are teachable in the L2 classroom as well as in the L1, (2) the use a multicomponent approach (teachers' modeling a structured reading and CW process and SRSD) promotes better results in reading comprehension and writing essays, and (3) SRSD supports students' learning process while encountering failure interactions among peers. This study may be particularly relevant and useful to teachers of young learners.

Hanjani & Li (2014) investigated how EFL learners interact in CW and review tasks. They asked, to what extent did the CW review task develop better writing quality of EFL dyads? For this study, 5 pairs were organized by level proficiency of their L2 and gender in an Iranian university to complete a L2 essay-writing course. The research process contained 4 phases: in Phase 1, learners analyzed and discussed about a genre in a model essay, and wrote an individual argumentative essay, and learned how to deliver feedback to their partners supported by a peer interaction rubric. Phase 2, learned evaluated a copy of a sample student writing in regard to content, organization, language and mechanic according to a peer response rubric. In phase 3, learners reviewed their partners' essays and discussed them in collaboration. Then, based on their discussions, dyads re-wrote and improved their drafts. The last part of the phase received feedback from the teacher. In phase 4, students interacted in collaborative revision again and developed their essay following instructor feedback. Learner conversations were recorded during these collaboration periods. To determine feedback benefits, a scoring rubric was created and implemented.

The conclusion was that learners presented an increased focusing time being on task due to the pair interactions. Also, during pair correction, students appeared to work more on micro

levels of the L2 (grammatical, vocabulary, language and mechanics) errors than macro levels (content, organization, cohesion, etc). This indicates that CW and collaborative reviews increase the accuracy complexity of the L2. This might be related to the type of teacher's feedback and suggests to me that instructors need to be very mindful of the types of feedback given in this phase. Hanjani and Li argued that there is a tendency on micro language levels from the teachers' perspectives and encouraged them to include macro levels as well. There are also differences between peer collaboration in respect of the gender, seeing more polite and short dialogues in mixed gender dyads, that might be due to cultural aspects. One of the highlights of Hanjani & Li (2014) is scaffolding negotiations (p. 106). When learners were providing solutions to a linguistic problem that resulted in a more accurate and complex outcome, then the collaboration act was considered scaffolding negotiation. By looking into the one of the pairing results, 12 out of 36 of the negotiations were scaffolding negotiations, therefore 24 negotiations were divided by advising, responding to a question, decoding, repetitions, reading, expressing emotions, pronunciation, distractions, blaming others for one's mistake or lack of respect for comments. In conclusion, scaffolding negotiations were higher than any other type of dialogues with no correlation to proficiency level or gender found. Overall, the research revealed that learners showed an increase in writing development after CW reviews compared to their initial essays, resulting in an increase in writing quality. In other words, students were able to advance from their initial stages to their ZPDs.

I suggest this research could be useful when taken into consideration in the DLI classroom to provide a more effective scaffolding structure by: (1) incorporating writing activities and feedback through more clear, student-friendly rubrics, (2) properly modeling and scaffolding in the teacher-student interaction and student-student dialogues. Modeling might

better support the CW process among peers and avoid off-task dialogues or peer feedback that is not constructive. Furthermore, this study implies that it is crucial for teachers to reconsider both macro and micro language categories as feedback, in order to enrich student awareness in the CW process. Gender also is a variable that this study explored that deserves further attention; anecdotally, in my classroom, I try to be fair and equitable with all learners, no matter their gender.

Masako Ishikawa (2018) provides a strong sociocultural theoretical framework for studying CW in the L2 classroom. It investigates the effects of L2 writing on L2 grammar learning in a study of eighty-three intermediate or intermediate-low English Language Learners (ELLs) through collaborative dialogue and written private speech at two private universities in Japan. Due to the different proficiency levels Ishikawa divided the participants in 4 groups based on this scale created for the study: +Writing Language High (+WLH), -Writing Language High (-WLH), +Writing Language Low (+WLL), and -Writing Language High (-WLL).

The research methodology included one pre-test and two post-tests scored on grammar accuracy, the first post-test was without dictogloss, the second posttest was after the dictogloss. Dictogloss is a language teaching technique that involves listening to a text or a spoken passage and then reconstructing it based on memory. Further data was gathered through a survey. The grammar assessment tested the use of the conditional mood and a subordinate clause followed by a main clause, “If I had more time, I would travel the world” (p. 55). This grammatical form was selected according to the British National Corpora database of texts, based on what researchers assumed Japanese L1 speakers might struggle with. The last phase includes learners’ comparison of their own writing compositions with the original text.

The results from this study showed that the two groups +WLH and +WLL scored higher in L2 grammar application than the two groups -WLH and -WLL with no languaging reflection. According to Ishikawa, the reason is because of the larger amount of languaging that the learners with writing language would use, therefore encouraging more memorization. Despite this finding, the author highlighted that the lack of observable writing language on the 2 groups -WLH and -WLL does not indicate there was no languaging (the author conjectures that it could have been whispering oral language (OL), self-talk regulation as an inter-speech, or not at all). Consequently, better results for the +WLH and +WLL groups should not be considered as incompatible to inter-speech. On the other hand, the success obtained from +WLH and +WLL groups might be achieved by the use and metatalk of the language in OL and WL. Which Ishikawa supported by the output hypothesis defined by Swain in 1995. Ishikawa reminds us that these ideas are meant as assumptions, not as firm results. Although there was a higher result in the first posttest, the recognition test did not show a large improvement because learners maintained the same high score than they did in the first posttest. Ishikawa determined that this is due to a "ceiling effect" (p. 59) with an upper limit. Learners in the +WLH and +WLL groups achieved 90% in the recognition test which made it very difficult to notice growth. +WLL group showed the highest linguistic development in the two posttests compared to the +WLH group. +WLH group might have not been showing more growth due to the lack of challenge that the grammar form was for them. However, these showed a large improvement from the pre-test to the post-test in accuracy. In sum, the +WL groups showed statistically significant improvement in deeper processing with extensive and solid memory. So the take-away message for classroom teachers might be that (1) language teachers/textbooks publishers should be better familiar with their National Corpora and use that as a tool to anticipate possible language errors and challenge

L2 advanced learners, and (2) writing metatalk may be used as a self-regulated strategy, even when students are writing independently.

Neomy Storch (2005) carried out a study of 23 ESL adults in a beginner writing class at a large Australian university. Students were placed in this writing class after taking a university-developed diagnostic test that demonstrated students' intermediate language proficiency (therefore the oral proficiency required for a university course). However, these students needed additional academic writing and grammar accuracy development. In the study, learners were given the option of pairing or not pairing with their classmates; 18 learners chose the CW option while 5 opted for individual writing. The prompt presented a graphic with a comparison of Laotian and Vietnamese English proficiency before and after coming to Australia. The text was not scored; instead, students received written comments as feedback. Conversations among collaborative pairs were recorded in order to analyze their dialogues during the task.

In this study, Storch (2005) measured the assessments of composition: in CW and individually, in dialogues recorded during the task making, and in the students' perception of CW from interviews after completing the task. Fluency, accuracy, and complexity were measured to determine student writing skills development. Complexity was viewed by the author as a result of students' capacity to expand the use of the language out of the comfort zone of simple, controlled or memorized language expressions. The dialogues, which included language-related episodes (LREs), were assessed according to three variables: organization, writing development, and review.

Storch's (2005) results revealed that CW writings showed higher complexity and accuracy than individual writings. CW writing proved to be more accurate, with less errors, and more complex sentences with dependent clauses, for instance. On the other hand, longer word

production was shown in individual texts than in CW. On the dialogue analysis, students dedicated a short time to develop a plan to organize their writing that provided them a writing format. A longer conversational time was used for developing the writing task, resulting in longer time engaging with the task. In this stage of the CW process, students initiated ideas, and the use time for LREs. Less time consumption was needed for the review stage even though it was a clear expectation given by the teacher. Nevertheless, the time dedicated to all the above stages varied among CW pairs. The majority of the students considered CW a positive task in the interviews, their reasons were predominantly: the opportunity to contrast ideas, discern and learn from others, and improve their language skills through the LREs in regard to grammatical accuracy and vocabulary. Additionally, students found the CW task amusing. The 2 students that differed from these opinions considered collaborative tasks as better for dialogues and felt uncomfortable giving negative feedback to their peers. Time was the key here. The findings about efficient time management and review required for effective CW and the results showing the benefits of CW are useful takeaway messages for application in the L2 classroom.

Yuko Watanabe and Merrill Swain (2007) conducted research on patterns of pair interaction. Participants were 12 native-speakers of Japanese in a university-level ESL course in Canada. Two of the eight non-core learners (which may have limited or passive exposure to the language but are not actively enrolled or engaged in the language learning process) were paired with one of the core students, (core learners are individuals who are actively engaged in the language learning process and are actively trying to acquire the language, including attending other language courses). All of the participants were identified as low, intermediate, or higher language proficiency according to a modified version of their TOEFL scores. The research task

was to develop a CW in pairs. Similar to the previous study above, during a stage of the collaboration, students were recorded to further analyze their dialogues.

Their data collection was divided into 6 stages. Stage 1: learners were interviewed by Watanabe prior to any task being given to identify students' existing perceptions of working collaboratively. Stage 2: the first part was to connect students in a short 5-minute activity. Second, Watanabe explained the prompt and exemplified a practice for the learners, followed by students engaging in CW time in their L1. This brief 5-minute activity was considered a pre-test and was reformulated (p. 125) into English. Stage 3: because reformulating implies preserving learners' original ideas while writing the better version as a native speaker of English, learners are at the noticing stage. At this stage, learners compared original texts and the new version of it to develop dialogues about their observations. In Stage 4: learners were asked to re-write their first composition based on the feedback and dialogues in stage 3. This new version was considered the post-test. For Stage 5: stimulated recall (p. 128), the study refers back to Storch (2002) for the model of pair interaction (dividing interaction types into: collaborative, cooperative, dominant/dominant, dominant/passive, and expert/novice). According to the researchers, learners' social behavior will determine the type of collaboration or non-collaboration that the pairs will experience while performing the task. In Stage 6: final interview, core students were invited to ask questions and give input about their experiences in their CW process; the study reflects on this qualitative data, as well.

The study found that to pair within the different proficiency levels for CW has an effect on the amount of LRE interactions. The first finding was that the core-low learners needed to produce more adaptations in the reformulation phase and consequently the number of turns in LREs is higher than core-high learners interactions. However, in stage 2 (writing part), core-high learners showed a higher number of LREs and longer periods of talking time. This suggested that

stage 2 reformulating increased the opportunity to scaffold and metatalk, mostly for core-high learners. In addition, findings revealed that the stage 3 (noticing), core-low and core-high learners had a larger number of LREs compared with any other stages. This might be an indicator that the noticing stage provided to co-construct the CW using more LREs. This also resulted in higher scores in the post-test stage for overall composition for core-high pairs. Nevertheless, when comparing core-low and core-high pairing individual post-tests, core-low learners had higher results than core-high learners. Pair interaction patterns shown are: 3 pairs of expert/novice, 3 pairs of collaborative, and 1 pair dominant/passive. Collaborative pairs demonstrated the ability to engage with their partners in a constructive way. In expert/novice pairs, the study found that experts tend to promote novice participation by assuming the aid role without being authoritarian, while most novice participants accept the leader's insights. Dissimilar participation was observed often in the dominant/passive pairs, as the dominant participant controlled the talking and the outcomes, leading to minimum contributions from the passive learner. In short, there is a correlation between patterns in pair participation and the post-test scores (dominant/passive results were lower compared with collaborative and expert/novice pairs). On the other hand, when observing scores individually, then the experts and dominant participants presented higher scores than novice or passive learners.

This article makes an important contribution to existing CW research, in calling more attention to important aspects of pair selection and roles. It demonstrates that low proficiency students benefit from the CW, due to the larger number of LREs used. It shows that learners' personalities may have more influence than proficiency levels on the CW learning process. A takeaway message is that teachers being aware of individual personalities and proficiency levels in pair selection and pair roles can play an integral role in student engagement and success.

Prathana Coffin (2020) conducted a student perception study about how teachers and students carry out the process of CW in English as Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms, which focused on developing communication, content skills, and cultural understanding. The study measured both teacher and student perceptions. The data was collected from 70 students and 2 ESL instructors in a Thai university through content analysis of student work, observation, and video of conversations and interviews. Observations identified patterns in interaction and behavior. In the interviews, the questioner's purpose was to self-assess students' learning in the CW process and their opinions. Interviews gathered quantitative data and were designed to (1) evaluate students' CW organization, (2) identify students perceptions of and preferences in collaboration, and (3) measure student progress in CW process based on teacher perception.

According to Coffin's (2020) analysis and results, student collaboration occurred mostly during the opportunities given for informal discussions. From the recordings of the teacher with less experience, Coffin revealed that only the students at the front row were fully engaged and involved in the learning process. In contrast, the more experienced teacher's classroom showed more involvement with all rows of students, and this teacher was observed walking around and asking individual questions in every section of the classroom. Therefore, classroom management, classroom seating, teaching strategies, and teacher experience levels have an effect on students' CW process and outcomes; this was an important finding with many implications for DLI K-12 teachers like myself.

As for methodology, in evaluating content produced by students, Coffin used Norman Webb's (1997) Depth of Knowledge (DOK) well-known framework to measure the complexity of cognitive processes evident in each lesson. The study activities aimed to increase cognitive complexity in collaboration tasks: from simple recognition of previous knowledge, to a more

elaborate oral and written communication production, including collaboration skill and interpersonal skill use. Here a structured CW learning process was found to increase the cognitive learning process, as measured using the DOK. From the survey data, students recognized their individual contribution to each interaction and their active role in the learning process; in addition, they reported enhancing their communicative and problem-solving skills. During the interviews, students and teachers recognized CW as a positive tool that improved their self-directed learning skills, writing skills, research skills, and collaborative skills. Despite all the positive outcomes, teachers' perceptions reported some resistance to students' coping mechanisms to manage diversity in peers' opinions (noting the potential limitation of unbalanced teamwork). Teachers also disagreed with the objectives, content, and assessment of some CW processes and outcomes. Some things to keep in mind when looking at the negative aspects of teacher perception based on the findings of this study are: (1) teachers could be biased or not inclusive, or did not believe in individual students' potentials; (2) time limitations for the task; (3) how teachers were perceived by students when modeling the CW process; (4) expectations not clearly outlined or perceived negatively by students who reported stress.

Recently, Wenting Chen and Yueh-Ting Lee (2022) re-examined previous pairing CW research related to the effects on equity/inequity pairing in two high Chinese proficiency EFL learners' perceptions, and how learner's perceptions influenced their behavior during the CW process at a University in China. In this study, learners' CW task was to develop two argumentative essays during a sixteen-week EFL course. Two CW assessments involved learners' scores for: (1) the final CW product and (2) pair collaboration interactions. In addition, each partner received an individual grade determined by their partner based on their perceived collaborative behavior and contributions to the assignment.

For each pair, learner proficiency was divided into High Proficiency (HP) or Low Proficiency (LP) based on a placement test. Their analysis of the data revealed for example that one HP student, named Mei, perceived that working with a LP student influenced her writing composition; Mei reported shifting the focus of the task to a more language form approach while collaborating with the LP, named Lei. Mei also reported giving more cautious feedback because this was an LP learner, because of Lei's lower proficiency skills. In addition, Mei reported encountering feeling less inspired to put effort into the composition. In contrast, when working with an HP named Jiao, Mei's reported that she felt more inspired to achieve her personal best in writing, and that her motivation was increased. In sum, Mei felt she had the role of a "teammate" (p. 5) collaborating with the HP and a "helper" when working with the LP. Another study participant, Yue, reported a more equal and collaborative relationship between partners that were closer in proficiency levels in that pair. Equity appeared to be a concern in pairings.

The order of activities (in other words, the timing of feedback and mediation) is another aspect I explored in the existing literature in an attempt to inform my own use of CW in my teaching practice. Bueno-Alastuey, Vasseur & Elola (2022) considered the order in which the CW and Peer Feedback (PF) should be implemented in a Spanish as L2 course at a large university in the southwest of the United States in an individual writing assignment. Forty-one learners (most English native speakers, and a few Spanish native or heritage speakers) in a second-year Spanish course were divided in two groups that completed three individual assessments: (1) pretest, (2) posttest1, with either CW or PF as the first mediation tool and (3) posttest2 with a switch in either CW or PF, according to what score they received in the posttest1. The order in which mediation tools CW or PF were applied proved to be key in findings.

The data interpretation made visible that with the variable of complexity in writing, Group 1 (G1) and Group 2 (G2) scored higher from pre- to post-tests and even higher from posttest1 to posttest2 in lexical use. However, G1 presented more improvement from pre- to post-tests. Higher improvement in accuracy occurred with CW as the first meditation tool instead of PF. Regarding fluency, G1 and G2 developed more words after PF interaction than CW. There were increased scores for both groups. Learners showed better performance after receiving PF, in contrast to a previous L2 CW study cited. I suggest that some variables that need to be taken into consideration could be: different grade levels such as secondary versus university; English versus Spanish as an L2; prior knowledge; individual motivation, etc. In addition, responsibility or accountability might be factors to consider in a future study, because working collaboratively, students' shared responsibility might remove the individual responsibility that occurs in PF. Another aspect of this study that might be important to consider in the classroom is that the mediation *order* affects learner outcomes (as in this study, in which CW provided better results when applied *after* PF in terms of quality and fluency, although CW *before* PF increased syntactic complexity and accuracy).

The following are some take-away messages I have retained from conducting a literature review related to CW L2 research and some reflections on how this and other research I encountered might inform my teaching. First, I confirmed the value of student interaction and collaborative writing. Research showed that, with careful instructional design and pairing strategies, CW could support positive learning outcomes in more complexity, accuracy, and fluency, in L2 written compositions. Second, I learned some specific strategies for collaborative writing, such as self-regulated writing development, and micro- and macro-feedbacks. Furthermore, recent research findings I reviewed underlined that it is important to be aware of

individual learner differences and to be intentional in choosing pairs and groups for collaborative activities, based on proficiency levels, language learning goals, and other individual factors.

To recap, there is a large body of recent L2 collaborative writing research that tends to focus on the fundamentals of CW learning in pairs or small groups. Though the above exploration of existing literature is not meant to be exhaustive, on they whole I have found that the findings of many CW studies favor a student-centered approach, where learners play an active role, and are given choices in their own roles, tasks, decision making, and responsibilities in writing production and feedback (Coffin, 2020; Watanabe & Swain, 2007; Storch, 2005). Some CW research has come to the conclusion that CW can help improve interaction and L2 interpersonal communication skills, as well as helping increase writing complexity or resulting in better accuracy and fluency (Teng, 2020; Dobao, 2012; Watanabe & Swain, 2007; Storch, 2005). In most of the studies I reviewed, not all of which are summarized here, pre- and post- tests were provided comparing pair/small group and individual writing, indicating that CW students performed higher than individuals writing alone, in the linguistic and social skills mentioned above (Watanabe & Swain, 2007; Storch, 2005). Other studies have demonstrated CW's positive influence on teaching language forms and structures, because learners have access to more content and more varied vocabulary when working with others (Teng, 2020).

After analyzing the CW research above, and other articles not summarized here, I have come to the conclusion that CW is a significantly better output resource for L2 learners than relying solely on oral language interactions or individual writing activities. Moreover, I have become more aware of how and why CW can increase L2 proficiency levels. I have begun to implement strategies and activities suggested by these studies more often in my classroom already, even in different content areas that I describe below.

According to these studies, the CW process relies on collaborative dialogue. Some benefits of such dialogue may be: to connect cognitive and content development; to co-construct the common task towards shared goals; to boost engagement and interaction; to provide opportunities for the negotiation of meaning through learner dialogues (Coffin, 2020, p. 179; Ishikawa, 2018; Storch, 2005; Watanabe & Swain, 2007). These dialogues have been the focus of research on their different patterns and effects during peer interactions. From a linguistic perspective, these dialogues are used by L1 and L2 learners to explain the cognitive process of understanding and using the language itself (Swain, 2006; Dobao, 2013). The researchers found that metatalks and LREs will scaffold and co-construct the language used by employing a large number of interactions (Hanjani & Li 2014; Dobao, 2013; Swain, 2006; Storch, 2002).

From the social perspective (as seen for example in Watanabe & Swain 2007), personality patterns may influence these dialogues. Efficient pairing or grouping can take into account not only proficiency levels, but also personality and other factors in interactions among peers. In other words, some learners can be at an expert level and be collaborative or be dominant in the conversations, or vice versa, and could determine how efficient the pairing might be to develop higher results in CW (Watanabe & Swain, 2007; Storch, 2005; Dobao, 2012). The findings in these articles showed that some of the better linguistic and content results were from pairings with greater disparity in proficiency levels (for instance the expert/novice pairing) in terms of how lower proficiency will noticeably increase their outcomes. This is due to the larger number of LREs that both students need to develop in order to be successful in the interaction (Watanabe & Swain, 2007; Dobao, 2012). On the other hand, in more dominant/submissive dialogues, the novice student (which in research often correlated with the submissive personality/persona) will not always show a large improvement, possibly resulting in a stressful

interaction for both learners (Storch, 2005; Watanabe & Swain, 2007; Dobao, 2013; Coffin, 2020, Chen & Lee, 2022).

Additional implications for collaborative dialogues include providing feedback between learners and from the instructor to the learners in oral or writing collaboration. Some research has found that learners emulate teachers' feedback; hence if the teacher focuses on micro categories (vocabulary, grammar, etc.) peers will do similarly (Hanjani & Li, 2014). Therefore, it is important to anticipate all of this in the DLI classroom and try to: (1) plan pairing students by personality concordancy and proficiency levels, (2) become more aware of their type of feedback including macro categories, and (3) avoid students' conflict by training them and modeling self-regulated strategies (Teng, 2020). In this way, students may take control (and feel more responsibility, accountability, and agency) of their own process in any type of interaction.

Despite the positive benefits of CW shown in the researchers mentioned previously, there are some results that still invite further research in the future. One of them is teachers' capacity to implement CW combined with effective classroom management as well as curriculum, standards, and textbook constraints (Coffin, 2020). As Coffin (2020) and Hanjani & Li (2014) discussed, students' CW outcomes vary from group to group, depending on how active and involved students were expected to be. Students in a poor learning environment with less teaching-learning interaction and more non-structured peer interaction resulted in less successful CW outcomes (Hanjani & Li, 2014; Coffin, 2020; Chen & Li, 2022). In accordance with these findings, teachers considered CW goals to be inaccessible for some lower proficiency students. Other limitations were in the perceived fairness of assessment or the limitations of studies that only measure student outcomes instead of evaluating the whole process. Teachers and students argued that regardless of effort both students will receive the same score. From the students'

perspective, teachers are a key factor on motivation and implicate them in the CW process (Coffin, 2020; Doboa, 2012, Storch, 2005; Chen & Li, 2022); so teachers need to be mindful of these variables and challenges in implementing CW.

From my own personal teaching experience, and in researching this paper, I can recognize areas needed for further teacher training. Again, being aware of pairing choices including personalities and proficiency levels is key to maximize effectiveness in collaborative dialogues and LREs. It is also important to create and implement two different rubrics: one for the CW process to evaluate students' roles and another one for students' writing compositions (Bueno-Alastuey, 2022, Vasseur & Elola, 2022; Hanjani & Li, 2014). Stronger rubrics that provide clear expectations and specific foci in form, lexical, vocabulary, and complexity, encourage students not to only rely on prior knowledge, as seen in Bueno-Alastuey (2022). Another result is the order of collaboration, as also mentioned by Bueno-Alastuey (2022); the implementation of peer feedback before CW has shown a positive effect on learner outcomes, in a higher education context. In addition, we can take into account students' individual writing self-assessments as a more equitable, inclusive form of evaluation and as an indicator of what students may do on their own, as measured in some of the posttest results in these studies (Watanabe & Swain, 2007; Storch, 2005; Coffin, 2020; Chen & Li, 2022).

Teaching Reflection

The research above has helped me think more critically about the use of CW in the DLI classroom. Below I discuss how I have applied some of this research. I offer reflections on three CW lessons that I have used in my own classroom. I describe each activity, offer reflections on what worked well and how I could improve, and relate each to the research.

In the reflections below I present the learning objectives, title of the reading stories, duration and the prompted task from examples in my own classroom of CW. I incorporate The Four Square Writing Method in the CW process to support learners on how to write clear and well-structured paragraphs. The "Four Square Writing Method" is a writing strategy developed by Gould & Gould (2010). It is an effective teaching strategy that helps to organize L1 and L2 learners' writing ideas into four parts: an introduction, two supporting paragraphs, and a conclusion. This framework facilitates the use of students' topic statement based on the main idea of the reading text, promotes progression in the writing process while adding more details every time students reread the text, and helps to identify writing patterns due to the repetitions in modeling (Gould & Gould, 2010). As Gould & Gould (2010, p.7) claimed, we need to implement this early on, because "Introducing the Four Square early in writing instruction can help your students to be confident in using this tool as they build fluency in their writing. This will become a friendly and familiar tool for organization and classification."

The three following reflections will show a summary of the applications of CW process in my second and third grade DLI classrooms.

Reflection 1

The DLI school's background will be shown in table 1.

Table 1.

Language	Spanish
Proficiency levels	Second term, 3rd grade (according to ACTFL proficiency guidelines, 2012; 8 I1, 15 N4, 20 N3, 7 N2, and 4 N1)
Native Speakers	1 Spanish native speaker

Size of class	54 students: two classes of 28 students each
Duration	6-lesson CW project to elaborate an collaborative informative essay
Textbook	*Adelante, 3rd grade level*
Reading Genre	*"El pingüino emperador"/* "The Emperor Penguin." Informational text

Components of the lesson with details presented in table 2.

Table 2

Number of lessons	**Objectives**	**Activities**
Lesson 1.	1. To understand new vocabulary and biology content and to identify the genre patterns of the informational essay.	Introduction to the theme: in a whole class instruction, science vocabulary is included in a real-life sentence, the teacher will read the sentence with gestures and students will repeat it.
Lesson 2	2. Learners will be able to understand the conventions of the	I introduced the authentic readings about Emperor Penguins in the Antarctic included in the student's textbooks and

	informational genre to produce their own informational essay.	we gathered the main idea and three supporting details on the graphic organizer through 4 squares-writing methodology.
Lesson 3	3. Learners will be able to understand the biology content and add more vocabulary and content from the visual support.	Students needed to expand the information in their graphic organizers by watching a video in the L2 “Emperor Penguins in the Antarctic,” which contained new vocabulary and content about these penguins.
Lesson 4	4. Learners will be able to write a CW informational essay.	I modeled for them how to write an introduction paragraph with the information that was collected in the graphic organizer. Then students with their peers wrote their first attempt at an introduction paragraph in a four-square writing organizer.
Lesson 5	5. Learners will be able to write a CW informational essay.	I showed them how to write a supporting paragraph, then students wrote three more paragraphs in the

		collaborative practice in their four-square organizer.
Lesson 6	6. Learners will be able to clearly articulate and present their writing orally to other classmates.	Students used Google Docs to complete the informational essay. Finally, they presented their writing orally to other partners in the classroom.

Areas of success

Though this is a self-observation and teaching reflection and not a formal study, I was able to notice some linguistic benefits upon completion of this CW task. Learners demonstrated longer time on task compared to when they wrote another informational essay individually. Novice learners showed an improvement in the reading fluency and accuracy, as students interacted and reread the text to find their main ideas. They also appeared to pay more attention to details in the text and used specific vocabulary to explain their own ideas to their peers. Some novice students also transferred that knowledge and applied it later, while creating their own word math problems. Overall, the CW compositions tended to be more lexically accurate and showed more complexity, and longer sentences, than my students' prior individual compositions.

Areas of improvement

What I could have improved was to implement brief explicit grammar instruction in lesson 2, to avoid some of the repetitive common grammar mistakes such singular and plural transformations. Although students used most of the sentence frames that I provided during the demonstration part of the process (and expanded each frame with more information, making

longer sentences) most of the compositions seemed similar and repetitive, and there were a lot of grammar mistakes. I also used one of the writing rubrics suggested by the textbook and gave them to the students just before their presentation to other classmates to evaluate each other. That was poor management on my part, I should have distributed the rubric earlier, so that students could refer to it while writing and preparing for presentations. Furthermore, I should have trained students on how to use the rubric effectively first, because only a few were able to. Additionally, due to my own lack of experience on teaching CW, I did not sufficiently explain learners' specific roles, therefore it was difficult to measure fairness in the workload during the CW process (a challenge addressed in some of the research reviewed above on pairing strategies, proficiency, personalities, and workloads).

Research Implications

This first CW activity in my class gave positive results related to some of the studies presented above. Students working in a CW task showed better results in multicomponent of the language by improving reading and writing simultaneously, and in comprehending content knowledge extrapolating to other contexts (Teng, 2020). Research suggests that L2 learners will also demonstrate longer engagement time on the task in CW (Storch, 2005; Hanjani & Lili, 2014) and that they will develop higher complexity and lexical accuracy and more complex sentences (Storch, 2005; Hanjani and Lili, 2014; Dobao, 2012; Teng, 2020; Bueno-Alstuey, Vasseur & Elola, 2022). Similarly to the studies cited above, both time on task and writing complexity seemed to increase (in the anecdotal evidence of my own class observation).

Furthermore, modeling proved to be useful in my process, as suggested by the research. When teachers properly model CW and display learning expectations, students show more engagement and time spent during the CW learning process; this was the case in this observation,

in part because teachers' CW instructional strategies correlate with student outcomes (Coffin, 2020). However, pairing students by proficiency levels has been a controversial point for CW research. Wantabe and Swain (2007); Chen & Lee (2022); Dobao (2012); and Coffin (2020) found that proficiency level pairing has an effect on student CW interactions. They also noted personalities and pair dynamics as key variables. The findings about peer pairing reviewed above made me reflect on my next CW assignment in my classroom and how I could implement more equitable and productive pairings.

Some additional strategies that I observed in my own teaching included: (1) I intentionally walked around the classroom and asked comprehension and opinion questions about the topic to each student in each lesson, equitably, with no exceptions, as suggested in Coffin, 2020, to boost engagement and alleviate boredom; (2) students were asked to communicate to other partners, different from their CW peer, what new information they learned at the end of each lesson to promote the use of all language skills daily, because it is necessary to keep promoting the use of oral output in interaction indicated by Swain, 2006; (3) I presented the linguistic and content goals in a Can-do statement format to make sure students are aware of what they are accountable for and to increase their agency; (4) All the lessons were grounded in the CLT approach and the inquiry model. They used gallery walk, an activity rich in visual comprehensible input, incorporating both oral and writing production; (5) Over the six CW lessons, I was mindful of using scaffolding to co-construct meaning, with learners working together (as suggested by Swain, 2006).

Reflection 2

Given the benefits and challenges that I encountered in the first CW activity, I decided to plan the second CW activity by putting into practice more lessons learned from the research. Areas for improvement included: pairing strategies, explicit grammar instruction, and training students in using the rubric. This time, the same third-grade students were asked to choose their own partner in a more student-centered way. The classroom teaching strategies were replicated in this second CW task. The number of lessons increased to a ten-lesson CW process, because I included: two explicit grammar lessons about comparative and superlative adverbs, two more lessons for the understanding of a writing rubric with linguistic and content objectives, and the application of the rubric in the editing process.

The demographics are shown in table 3.

Table 3.

Language	Spanish
Proficiency levels	Second term, 3rd grade (according to ACTFL proficiency guidelines, 2012; 8 I1, 15 N4, 20 N3, 7 N2, and 4 N1)
Native Speakers	1 Spanish native speaker
Size of class	54 students: two classes of 28 students each
Duration	10-lesson CW project to write three fiction journal entries
Textbook	*Adelante, 3rd grade level*

Reading Genre	(1) version of the "Cinderella" story, (2) "The bunny and the coyote", and (3) "Is the bunny guilty or innocent?" Three Fictional texts

Students were asked to write a fiction journal based on three readings, all literary adaptations from the same textbook: (1) a version of the Cinderella story, which contained different points of view of the story according to Cinderella, the step-mother, and the step-sisters; (2) a version of "The bunny and the coyote" story, with both characters' point of view; (3) an original text, "Is the bunny guilty or innocent?" that incorporated other characters' arguments in favor of or against the bunny.

Components of the lesson with details presented in table 4.

Table 4

Number of lessons	**Objectives**	**Activities**
Lesson 1.	1. Learners will understand the linguistic patterns of the fiction journal genre.	I included an example of a fiction journal entry and explored the patterns in the genre.
Lesson 2	2. Learners will be able to understand the conventions of the fiction journal genre to produce three fiction journal entries in a CW practice.	Students read the Cinderella text and added main details and expressions to a journal graphic organizer through the 4-squares methodology.

Lesson 3	3. Learners will be able to use comparative and superlative adverbs accurately.	I focused on comparative and superlative adverbs instruction. Here I used a counterbalance approach, now common in immersion education, which is in an implicit way to invite students to notice, pay attention to, and use the form (on the counterbalance approach and its benefits, see (Lyster & Mori, 2008).
Lesson 4	4. Learners will be able to collaboratively write a fiction journal entry.	Students wrote their first journal entry based on the point of view of the character of their choice in "Cinderella".
Lesson 5	5. Learners will be able to implement the textbook rubric as a way to monitor their own progress.	Training on how to implement formative assessment and peer feedback with the use of the rubric, which contained the patterns of the genre and some linguistics aspects (such as comparative and superlative adverbs).

Lesson 6	6. Learners will be able to use comparative and superlative adverbs accurately.	A follow-up lesson on the use of comparative and superlative adverbs, scaffolding on what was presented.
Lesson 7	7. Learners will be able to collaboratively write a fiction journal entry.	Students added one more journal entry based on the second reading “The bunny and the coyote”.
Lesson 8	8. Learners will be able to implement the textbook rubric as a way to monitor their own progress.	Students used the rubric to guide editing and peer feedback.
Lesson 9	9. Learners will be able to collaboratively write a fiction journal entry.	Students wrote a new journal entry using the rubric about the “Is the bunny guilty or innocent?” story.
Lesson 10	10. Learners will be able to present their writing results orally to other classmates.	A jigsaw activity in which each student read their last journal entry from their point of view of their own assigned character, giving a full picture when combined.

Areas of success

In this self-observation, what appeared to have a substantial impact on students' outcomes was the explicit instruction on grammar lessons and the discussion of how to use the rubric. The comparative and superlative adverbs appeared in the textbook with the frequent use of them by the characters in the texts. In the CW, most of the pairs showed a higher number of accurate uses of the form in the context of their journal entries. Another improvement was how well learners understood and used the genre patterns; this might be related to the three repetitions but also to the extended editing time I gave them, supported by the rubric. In addition, the progression in the second entry showed in most of the students an increased use of the lexical, more accurate and cohesive and short but complex composition even higher than their first informational essay. The third entry was most students' best CW composition, but I decided not to include the students' outcomes (due to some students using English during this lesson). Additionally, students also reported more positive engagement with the CW project because of being able to select their partners.

Areas of improvement

Despite positive student perceptions and outcomes, I also identified some areas for improvement. Notably, there were inconsistencies in some of the peer collaboration carrying out the CW tasks. In giving students the choice in pairing, some novice students chose to partner with another novice student, resulting in less progress in lexical, form, or complexity in their first or even the second journal entry. Consequently, I had to implement Tier II instructional strategies (working with a small group or individualized instruction to help struggling students with comprehension) and rearranged some students to sit and work with me at the teacher's table. Because of this, I could not implement proper classroom management for the rest of the class,

such as walking around the classroom or asking comprehension or opinion questions; in addition, this became a behavioral issue and linguistic issue, because I could hear some students starting to use English during the CW task. Therefore, I was unable to measure whether the students' results were due to the use of the L1, which might have actually helped them to obtain better outcomes, or because this was their third time using CW learning strategies.

Research Implications

Once again, this CW project resulted in increased use of new vocabulary, more accurate grammar use of the form taught, and complexity in composition. This echoes what some CW research has confirmed, as discussed above (Storch, 2005; Hanjani & Lili, 2014). In regard to "flexible role-taking" (Chen & Lee, 2020), many students said they preferred to choose their partners. However, in my classroom, perhaps due to other variables such as age or proficiency levels, the results showed that novice learners might rely on other students with more initiative. This could be due to the lack of confidence in their language skills, repeating what was shown in Watanabe & Swain, 2007. One more perspective that I learned from this CW teaching experience corroborated what Bueno-Alastuey, Vasseur, & Elola (2022) showed about novice learners in lower grades, who tend to have limitations in their capacity to self-regulate during peer collaboration, because they might feel self conscious in giving peer feedback. It is important to remember that DLI learners in third grade are still learning the process of writing in their L1. Therefore, they cannot draw on prior writing background knowledge (in sharp contrast with the university students that have L1 writing experience in the studies reviewed above). Partner preference pairing might be better implemented later, after students have had more practice with CW or with writing in general in the L1 and L2. This CW practice in my classroom aligns with Teng's (2020) findings on how teaching a structured genre might influence linguistic

effectiveness, because writing genre patterns could predict reading comprehension. Finally, I observed that structured teaching is key for students in their CW learning process, as suggested by Coffin (2020); furthermore, inadequate classroom management might produce unexpected or lower learning outcomes.

Reflection 3

This school year, 2022-23, I made the decision to move to the second grade in a DLI school in the Jordan School District. DLI students in this grade have very little experience with the L2, and very little L1 writing experience, which means CW might be a big challenge for them. However, because of the many benefits offered by CW at any level, I tried to adapt the practice for this lower grade level.

The demographics will be disclosed in table 5.

Table 5.

Language	Spanish
Proficiency levels	Second term, 2nd grade (according to ACTFL proficiency guidelines, 2012; all students were among novice 2 or 3 proficiency level)
Native Speakers	2 Spanish heritage speakers
Size of class	54 students: two classes of 28 students each
Duration	10-lesson CW project to write three fiction journal entries
Textbook	*Adelante, 2nd grade level*

	same content, same genres, and same prescribed readings as the second reflections.
Reading Genre	(1) Blind Men and an Elephant, (2) Cucu lost her Colors, and (3) Stone Soup

Components of the lesson with details presented in table 6.

Table 6

Number of lessons	**Objectives**	**Activities**
Lesson 1.	1. Learners will understand the linguistic patterns of the fiction journal genre.	I included an example of a fiction journal entry and explored the patterns in the genre.
Lesson 2	2. Learners will be able to understand the conventions of the fiction journal genre to produce three fiction journal entries in a CW practice.	Students read the "Blind men and an Elephant" text and added main details and expressions to a journal graphic organizer through the 4-squares methodology.
Lesson 3	3. Learners will be able to use "Yo podría/I could" accurately.	I focused on comparative and superlative adverbs teaching. Here I used a counterbalance approach, now common in immersion education,

		which is in an implicit way to invite students to notice, pay attention to, and use the form (on the counterbalance approach and its benefits, see Lyster & Mori, 2008).
Lesson 4	4. Learners will be able to collaboratively write a fiction journal entry.	Students wrote their first journal entry based on the point of view of the character of their choice in "The Blind Men and an Elephant".
Lesson 5	5. Learners will be able to implement the rubric adapted by the teacher as a way to monitor their own progress and provide peer feedback.	Training on how to implement formative assessment and peer feedback with the use of the rubric, which contained the patterns of the genre and some linguistics aspects (*Yo podría/ I could*).
Lesson 6	6. Learners will be able to use "Yo podría/I could" accurately.	A follow-up lesson on the use of *Yo podría/ I could*, scaffolding on what was presented.
Lesson 7	7. Learners will be able to collaboratively write a fiction journal entry.	Students added one more journal entry based on the second reading "Cucu lost her Colors".

Lesson 8	8. Learners will be able to implement the rubric adapted by the teacher as a way to monitor their own progress and provide peer feedback.	Students used the rubric to guide editing and peer feedback.
Lesson 9	9. Learners will be able to collaboratively write a fiction journal entry.	Students wrote a new journal entry using the rubric about the "Stone Soup?" story.
Lesson 10	10. Learners will be able to present their writing results orally to other classmates by recording an individual Flipgrid video.	Flipgrid video: students record themselves reading the last entry of their fiction journal and later, all learners will have access to watch all the stories from their classmates.

Before and after the CW task, students were prompted to write an individual pre- and post-test in order to observe growth. Relying on the research on pairing, I paired students by proficiency levels and personality. Additionally, learners were trained for 2 weeks on how to interact with their partners by utilizing the expression "I agree with you because…/I disagree with you because…" and self-regulated strategies development (SRSD). They practiced taking turns in representing different CW roles, for instance: scribing and textbook research/dictation. This CW project followed the same 10-lesson structured plan as in the CW project 2 above: learners were exposed to a fiction journal sample, authentic readings, topic videos, 2 grammar

lessons, a rubric lesson and application of the rubric for editing and feedback. I added the Flipgrid video to present their writing compositions (because Flipgrid helps with time management and offers more opportunities for student interaction, including re-watching presentations or commenting).

Areas of success

What I observed by walking around the classroom was that students provided more feedback than in the previous CW attempts, because they had learned the expression "I agree/I disagree" and how to express their opinions. Moreover, some of the students used that as a metatalk in collaboration to debate when and how to use "*Yo podría*." Some of the stress of lacking language skills seemed to be reduced due to the training in SRSD and taking turns in roles (being the scribe or researcher). Considering the research on roles, perhaps being able to act as the "expert" student in certain moments and the "novice" student during different moments of the collaboration led to better outcomes. What I could observe from the pre-test and the post-test, was: most learners easily noticed and adopted fiction journal patterns; a higher number used the grammatical expression "*Yo podría*;" peer corrections was successful, the students made use of the rubric in their editing lesson emphasizing in both micro and macro linguistics aspects.

Areas of improvement

What I should improve for the next CW project is the use of rubric as a self-evaluation. Although students used the rubric to identify their peer mistakes, they did not always integrate it into talking about their own mistakes when it was their turn to write or talk. Another point to better develop was the implementation time. Due to the previous 2 weeks training for CW roles and SRSD, pre- and post-test, the CW project was lengthy and spanned 6 weeks.

Research implications

These CW practices recalled the study by Hanjani & Lili (2014), confirming that learners with low proficiency need longer time to complete CW tasks and that by incorporating micro and macro feedback, learners may enrich accuracy and complexity. When pairing L2 learners, Dobao (2013), Chen and Lee (2022), and Watanabe & Swain (2007) emphasized that a successful CW interaction is related to both proficiency levels and learner personalities. Moreover, learners might have different personalities; however, they can be trained with SRSD to increase individual learning benefits despite the possible failing interactions as suggested by Teng (2020), and as observed in my own classroom with effective SRSD training for students.

The body of CW research synthesized above will be useful for me in the future, in both theory and practice. I learned some useful best practices in facilitating collaborative writing and student interaction based on the literature. These ideas from the research will continue to make an impact in my classroom, as they have already in the examples I describe in the teaching reflections above. In addition, I intend to help other DLI teachers learn the many benefits and affordances of collaborative writing strategies gained from my review of scholarship and from my own classroom experiences.

According to the research mentioned above, the CW process resulted in large linguistic implications for the improvement of L2 learners' proficiency levels (Storch, 2005; Watanabe & Swain, 2007; Dobao, 2013; Coffin, 2020; Chen & Lee, 2022). From my own reflections, it is important to anticipate how to apply a solid structured CW process in the DLI classroom and provide teachers with professional development based on: (1) the benefits and challenges of the CW implementation, (Storch, 2005; Coffin, 2020), (2) how to plan pairing students by personality concordance and proficiency levels, (Dobao, 2012 & 2013; Chen & Li, 2022, Olovson, 2023), (3) train L2 learners in the use of metatalk and feedback through rubrics including micro and macro linguistic categories (Hanjani & Li, 2014; Ishikawa, 2018;

Bueno-Alastuey, Vasseur & Elola, 2022), and (4) avoid student conflicts through teachers' proper classroom management, and training/modeling self-regulation strategies (Teng, 2020; Ishikawa, 2018). Consequently, when all the CW strategies above are effectively implemented, the L2 learners' affective filter will be reduced and students will be more confident (Krashen, 1982; Coffin, 2020). In this way, DLI teachers will be able to incorporate the CW process implementation so students take control (and feel more responsibility, accountability, and agency) of their own CW process in any type of interaction in order to better develop their linguistic proficiency levels.

Statement of Future Goals

Looking forward, I intend to continue teaching in the DLI program in Utah implementing the tremendous theoretical knowledge and practical methods and techniques acquired during pursuing the MSLT program. When I first started as a DLI teacher in Cache County School District, I thought I knew everything there was to being a SL teacher. But I know now that I can still learn a lot everyday from my colleagues, my students, and current research in the scholarship of teaching and learning. My own experience has proved to me that just being a native speaker of Spanish is not enough to instruct 56 L2 Spanish learners. Even with my years of classroom experience and the exposure to a broad range of approaches to teaching that I have gained in the MSLT program, I know that I also need to continue to further my understanding of SLA and recent advances in approaches to L2 teaching to accomplish my future goals in teaching. For this reason, I would like to keep learning through a doctoral program in education eventually.

Student academic achievement is in part based on their teachers and DLI teachers have great responsibilities and opportunities to help their students succeed. New DLI teachers face many challenges in acquiring the strategies and content for the DLI program. Many are not fully aware of SLA theories or approaches to second language teaching that help them be more effective DLI teachers. In order to help current and future DLI teachers and to continue to build and strengthen the program, my intention is to hopefully become a DLI coordinator for the Jordan School District, my recent employer. In such a position, I would be able to help facilitate awareness of effective methods and approaches among fellow DLI teachers and better support them in their own journeys to become better teachers. I hope to take what I have learned and pay it forward to help other K-12 DLI teachers in the state and beyond.

For the time being, I will continue collaborating with the Utah State Board of Education Spanish team in adapting Spanish curriculum and presenting with them more future Professional Development opportunities for DLI teachers (including participating in workshops and engaging with my colleagues in reflective peer observations). In addition, I plan to continue keeping up with reading the latest research in L2 teaching and will continue attending local, regional, or national conferences and PD workshops, as well as participating in online remote webinars on topics such as L2 teaching, student engagement, inclusion, and more, offered by publishers or other institutions. Through the MSLT program and my time in the classroom, I have learned that being a highly effective teacher and enhancing student success in language learning is a long journey that will be a lifelong process, and I look forward to continuing to learn, to improving my teaching abilities, and to uplifting my students.

REFERENCES

ACTFL. (2017). Performance Descriptors for Language Learners. https://www.actfl.org/uploads/files/general/Resources-Publications/Can-Do-Introduction-2020.pdf

Blanco, J. & Donley, P. (2021). *Adelante: An invitation to Spanish.* 3 volumes. Vista.

Brown, H. (2014). *Language, learning and teaching*. Pearson.

Bridge Program. https://l2trec.utah.edu/bridge-program/bridge-program-introduction/

Bueno-Alstuey, M., Vasseur, R. & Elola, I. (2022). Effects of collaborative writing and peer feedback on Spanish as a foreign language writing performance. *ACTFL Language Connects*, 517-539. 10.1111/flan.12611

Canagarajah, S. (2002). *Critical academic writing and multilingual students*. University of Michigan Press.

Collier, V. & Thomas, W. (2004). "The astounding effectiveness of dual immersion programs for all." *NABE Journal of Research and Practice*, *2*(1), 1-20.

Coffin, P. (2020). Implementing collaborative writing in EFL classrooms: Teachers and students' perspectives. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, *13*(1), 178-194. https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/LEARN/article/view/237844

Chen, W. & Lee, Y. (2022). Revisiting proficiency pairing in collaborative writing form and equity theory perspective: Voices from high-proficiency EFL learners. *SAGE Open*, *12*(2), 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221087267

Cheung, Y. (2016). Teaching writing. In W. Renandya & H. Widodo (Eds.), *English language teaching today: Linking theory and practice* (179-194). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-38834-2_13

Dobao, A. (2012). Collaborative writing tasks in the L2 classroom: comparing group, pair, and individual work. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *21*(1), 40-58. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2011.12.002

Dobao, A. (2013). Collaborative writing in pairs and small groups: Learners' attitudes and perceptions. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *41*(2), 365-378. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.02.002

Fortune, T. (2013). *Dual language and immersion education: Immersion 101 for alphabetic languages* [Conference presentation]. Center for Introduction to Dual Language Immersion 13 Advanced Research on Language Acquisition Summer Institute. Minneapolis.

Feng Teng, M. (2020). Young learners' reading and writing performance: Exploring collaborative modeling of text structure as an additional component of self-regulated strategy development. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, *65*(100870), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2020.100870

Gass, S. & Mackey, A. (2020). Input, interaction, and output in L2 Acquisition. In B. VanPatten, G. Keating & S. Wulff (Eds.), *Theories in second language acquisition: An introduction* (192-22). Routledge.

Gould, J. & Gould, E. (2010). *Four Square Writing Method: A Unique Approach to Teaching Basic Writing Skills for Grades 4-6.* Teaching and Learning Company.

Hanjani, A. & Li, L. (2014). Exploring L2 writers' collaborative revision interactions and their writing performance, *System*, *44*, 101-114. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.03.004

Ishikawa, M. & Blum, A. (2018). Written languaging, learners' proficiency levels and L2 grammar learning, *System*, *74*, 50-61. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.02.017 0346-251X

Lantolf, J., Poehner, M. & Thorne, S. (2020). Sociocultural theory and L2 development. In B. VanPatten, G. Keating, & S. Wulff (Eds.), *Theories in second language acquisition: An introduction* (223-247). Routledge.

Lee, J. & VanPatten, B. (2003). *Making communicative teaching happen*. McGraw-Hill.

Lyster, R. & Mori, H. (2008). Instructional counterbalance in immersion pedagogy. In Fortune, T. & D. Tedick (Eds.), *Pathways to multilingualism: Evolving perspectives on immersion Education*. (133-151). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847690371-010

Lomb, K. (2008). *Polyglot: How I Learn Languages*. TESL-EJ.

Long, M. (1996). The Role of the Linguistic Environment in Second Language Acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of Language Acquisition* (413–468). Academic Press.

López-Sánchez, A. (2015). *Redesigning the intermediate level of the Spanish curriculum through the multiliteracies lens.* Routledge.

Kennedy, B. (2018). Teacher preparation for Dual-Language classrooms. In M. Arias & M. Fee, (Eds.), *Profiles of Dual Language Education in the 21st Century*. Multilingual Matters.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition.* Pergamon.

Spicer-Escalante, M. (2011). Revising our curriculum/empowering students: Teachers' preparation and perceptions about bilingual writing. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *1*(11), 1453-1458. doi:10.4304/tpls.1.11.1453-1458

Spicer-Escalante, M. (2015). Exploración de las narrativas bilingües orales y escritas en Español e Inglés/Exploring oral and written bilingual narratives in Spanish and English. *Zona Próxima: Revista del Instituto de Estudios en Educación, Universidad del Norte. 23.* https://rcientificas.uninorte.edu.co/index.php/zona/article/view/5832/6879

Spicer-Escalante, M. (2017). Introduction to Dual Language Immersion: Utah's experience. In K. deJonge-Kannan, M. Spicer-Escalante, E. Abell & A. Salgado (Eds.), *Perspectives on Effective Teaching in DLI and Foreign Language Classrooms: Selected Papers from the John Lackstrom Linguistics Symposium*, *2*, 3-15. https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1370&context=lpsc_facpub

Spicer-Escalante, M. & Martín García, L. (2020). *Escritura colaborativa y los cuatro cuadrados: lecciones del aula de inmersión* [Conference presentation]. Jornada Pedagógica Internacional para la Educación Multilingüe. Los Angeles.

Spicer-Escalante, M. & González, K. (2022). Preparing Spanish Bridge Teachers: Lessons from Trainers and Practitioners [Conference presentation]. The 55th Conference of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). Boston.

Shum, J.& Glisan, E. (2016). Understanding language learning through Second Language Acquisition theory and research. In Shum, J.& Glisan, E. (Eds). *Teacher's Handbook: Contextualized Language Instruction* (5th ed.). 11-69. Heinle & Heinle.

Storch, N. (2019). Collaborative writing. *Research Timeline, 52*(1), 40-59. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444818000320

Storch, N. (2007). Investigating the merits of pair work on a text editing task in ESL classes. Language Teaching Research, *11*(2), 143-159. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168807074600

Storch, N. (2005). Collaborative writing: Product, process, and students' reflections. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 14*(3), 153-173. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2005.05.002

Storch, N. (2002). Patterns of interaction in ESL pair work. *Language Learning*, *52*(1), 119–158. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.00179

Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honour of H.G. Widdowson* (125–144). Oxford University Press.

Swain, M. (1998). Focus on form through conscious reflection. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (64-81). Cambridge University Press.

Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In J. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (97–114). Oxford University Press.

Swain, M. (2006). Languaging, agency and collaboration in advanced second language proficiency. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Advanced language learning: The contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky* (95-108). Continuum. 10.5040/9781474212113.ch-004

Utah Common Core. (2019). Utah Dual Language Immersion Assurances. https://www.utahdli.org/assurances.html

VanPatten, B., Keating, G. & Wulff, S. (2020). *Theories in second language acquisition: An introduction*. Routledge.

VanPatten, B. (2017). While We're on the Topic: BVP on Language, Acquisition, and Classroom Practice. ACTFL.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

Watanabe, Y. & Swain, M. (2007). Effects of Proficiency differences and patterns of pair interaction on second language learning: collaborative dialogue between adult ESL learners. *Language Teaching Research*, *11*(2), 121-142. https://doi.org/10.1177/136216880607074599

Webb, N. (1997). *Criteria for alignment of expectations and assessments on mathematics and science education.* CCSSO.

Wigglesworth, G. & Storch, N. (2012). What role for collaboration in writing and writing feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *21*(4), 364-374. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.09.005