



Young EFL Learners Collaboratively Writing a Dialogue During a Regular Classroom Lesson

TOMÁŠ KOS*

Humboldt University of Berlin (Germany)

Received: 14/02/2022. Accepted: 18/10/2022

ABSTRACT

A growing body of research has explored collaborative writing (CW) among young learners. Nevertheless, studies have mainly focused on tasks such as the dictogloss, which is rather uncommon in regular classroom teaching and has neglected activities that are more common. In addition, research has focused on language-related episodes (LREs) without considering other important episodes including those that involve the teacher. Finally, only one study has explored to what extent the decisions made within LREs transfer into the written product. With these research gaps in mind, the present study examined CW of 12 pairs composed of 10 to 11-year-old learners of English as a foreign language (EFL) who jointly wrote a role-play. Drawing on audio recordings of pair work interactions and documentary analysis of students' written work, the study has found that in addition to LREs, students frequently engaged in content-related and activity-related episodes with the teacher's involvement being rather limited. Despite the teacher's presence, a high proportion of LREs was resolved incorrectly or left unresolved. Nearly all correctly and incorrectly resolved LREs were also incorporated into the jointly written role-play. Students focused predominantly on the language targeted by the activity (lexical phrases) and attended to other language aspects minimally.

KEYWORDS

Collaborative Writing; Young Learners; Peer Interaction; Classroom-based Study; English as a Foreign Language.

1. INTRODUCTION

Connecting speaking with writing, collaborative writing (CW) has attracted much attention from teachers, instructors, and researchers (Shehadeh, 2011; Storch, 2005). Storch (2011)

**Address for correspondence*: Department of English and American Studies, Humboldt University of Berlin, Unter den Linden 6, 10117 Berlin, Germany; e-mail: tomas.kos@hu.berlin.de

defined CW as the co-construction or co-authorship of a text by two or more writers. Storch (2016, 2021) highlighted the distinguishing traits of the CW activity in terms of process, product, and the notion of text ownership. CW as a process refers to the substantial interaction between the co-authors throughout the writing process (Storch, 2016). CW as a product relates to the result of the process in the creation of a single text which cannot be easily reduced to the contribution of each author (Storch, 2016). The notion of joint ownership refers to “a sense of a shared responsibility and ownership of the text and hence substantive involvement of all co-authors in all the stages in the production of the text” (Storch, 2021:14).

This characteristic of joint ownership distinguishes CW from other cooperative learning group activities which are based on carefully-structured groups and students’ well-defined roles such as in a jigsaw task in which students work on one piece of the learning content which needs to “flow” into the final pair or group’s outcome. While cooperative learning involves interdependence, individual contribution, and a strong sense of accountability (Slavin, 1996), CW involves shared responsibility for a written text which is co-constructed by both authors. Learners engage in CW have a common goal in the form of a joint text to achieve, they depend on each other, help each other, and have to work closely while pooling their resources and ideas. They have “to negotiate and agree on what ideas to include, how to organize these ideas, and how best to express these ideas” (Storch, 2021: 14).

Research has shown various benefits of CW for second language (L2) learning (Calzada & Garcia Mayo, 2020a; Hidalgo & Lázaro-Ibarrola, 2020; Storch, 2021). In the process of creating a joint text, learners discuss and resolve language-related issues thus drawing attention to language form (Storch, 2021). In other words, they engage in language-related episodes (LREs) defined by Swain and Lapkin (1998: 326) as, “regard where language learners talk about the language they are producing, question their language use, or correct themselves or others.” Certainly, to what extent this process affords L2 learning may depend on a variety of factors including students’ age, proficiency, attitudes, social relationships, or the task selected by the teacher. For example, if a task is selected that affords students with opportunities to develop their ideas, decide on the language they need to express them, and collaborate in organizing them into a coherent written text, this can positively influence the writing process and the final product (Lee, 2016).

With regard to young learners (YLS), research has shown the benefits of peer interaction for L2 development in both ESL settings and EFL settings (Calzada & Garcia-Mayo, 2021; Oliver, 2002). For example, we know that YLS of low foreign language proficiency can interact and negotiate meaning (García Mayo & Lázaro Ibarrola, 2015). YLS can pool their linguistic resources in order to guide each other through complex linguistic problem solving which neither child would be able to resolve alone (Davín & Donato, 2013; Pinter, 2007). In relation to CW, more research is needed as most studies have investigated

adult and young adult students (Shehadeh, 2011; Storch, 2013, 2016). What is more, research on CW among YLs has mainly focused on the dictogloss which refers to a task in which learners jointly reconstruct a text which had been read to them (Wajnryb, 1990). The dictogloss is not a particularly authentic classroom language task, in contrast to other joint activities such as writing a dialogue, composing a shopping list, a narrative text based on pictures, writing a letter, or translating a text from their L1. In other words, the tasks used by the researchers to elicit a particular linguistic behavior do not seem to mirror the activities that YLs perform during regular lessons. In addition, research has mainly focused on LREs and has paid less attention to episodes during which students negotiate their goals, their roles such as the role of a scribe, and procedural aspects of the task. Such episodes appear to be inextricably connected to LREs (Toth & Gil-Berrio, 2022).

With these research gaps in mind, this exploratory study contributes to the available body of EFL pedagogy by providing a picture of an authentic collaborative writing activity in which students were asked to jointly write a dialogue, and present it to the class. The pedagogical rationale for selecting this activity was to allow students to experiment with, consolidate, and use the language they had previously learned for a communicative purpose. Therefore, this investigation is important from the pedagogical perspective because language teachers need to know whether there is a pedagogical value in implementing CW activities in their teaching. They need to gain a better understanding of how and to what degree students deal with language issues they encounter, what language they focus on, and, to what extent they incorporate their resolutions into the jointly written text. The current study investigated how and to what extent YLs engage with and resolve LREs during a collaborative writing activity, what language aspects they focus on, and to what extent their decisions reached translate into their written production. Utilizing audio recordings and students' written work, this study examined interactions and text compositions of 12 pairs composed of 10 to 11 old learners of English as a foreign language (EFL).

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Why Collaborative Writing?

CW has been shown advantageous for L2 learning among young and adult learners by various research studies (Calzada & Garcia Mayo, 2020a; Hidalgo & Lázaro-Ibarrola, 2020; Shehadeh, 2011; Storch, 2005, 2011, 2013, 2016, 2021). For example, research has indicated that implementing tasks that combine writing with speaking, rather than speaking tasks alone, increases focus on language form while learners' attention is directed to meaning (Alegria de la Colina & García Mayo, 2007, 2009; Calzada & Garcia Mayo, 2020a; Storch, 2021). Focus on form can be interpreted as “a set of techniques deployed in a communicative context by the

teacher and/or the learners to draw attention implicitly or explicitly and often briefly to linguistic forms that are problematic for the learners” (Ellis, 2016: 411). In a similar vein, CW promotes the occurrence of LREs (Swain & Lapkin, 2001; Qin, 2008; Fortune, 2009; Storch, 2008). This is important because LREs may evolve into a collaborative dialogue in which learners are engaged in problem-solving and knowledge-building (Chen, 2020). Research has found that such peer collaborative dialogue has the potential to mediate the construction of linguistic knowledge because while attempting to solve a linguistic problem, learners jointly construct and analyze particular linguistic forms, which makes it possible for them to learn a new language or knowledge about language, and subsequently improve their language use (Swain, 1998, 2000, 2010).

Furthermore, the rationale for CW is that it may integrate the benefits of writing and speaking. This is because while writing activity is characterized by a slow pace or visible output, speaking involves the availability of an audience and immediate feedback (Storch, 2021: 14; Williams, 2012). Thus, CW may be beneficial to YLs because writing is characterized by a slow pace and visible output (Williams, 2012) and can, therefore, cater for a deeper engagement with language (Hidalgo & Lázaro-Ibarrola, 2020) and negotiation of meaning (García Mayo & Lázaro-Ibarrola, 2015). Likewise, provided that writers can see their text when writing; and as such writing is less spontaneous and immediate than speaking, students feel less anxious than during oral communication only (Tavakoli, 2014). Perhaps this can be one of the reasons why CW encourages students to use language structures that may not be commonly used in oral communication (Williams, 2012). However, as the written mode requires a more accurate use of language and errors are less tolerated than in the written mode (Schoonen, Snellings, Stevenson & van Gelderen, 2009), CW can cause anxiety to some students.

2.2. What Tasks are Effective to Promote Collaborative Writing?

One of the most important issues which need to be considered by language teachers to enhance CW is the selection of tasks and activities that would elicit collaborative behavior. Studies have investigated CW tasks and their effect on various language aspects. For example, research has indicated that tasks that combine writing and speaking, rather than speaking tasks alone, are more likely to increase students’ attention to form (Alegria de la Colina & García Mayo, 2007, 2009; Storch, 2008; Calzada & Garcia Mayo, 2020a). In contrast, when working on tasks that focus on speaking and that lack a written component, learners are less likely to engage in LREs and simply make random choices (Adams & Ross-Feldman, 2008; Chen, 2020). Furthermore, CW tasks promote engagement with each other’s contributions (Storch, 2016, 2021). This is because CW tasks have the potential to engage students in a process of co-construction of a text which may be attributed to their inherent characteristic to evoke a sense of co-authorship of the text written (Storch, 2016).

Studies have also looked at the impact of task type on the occurrence and the nature of LREs in learner-learner interaction. Research with adult learners has shown that the most commonly used tasks to generate LREs are *jigsaw tasks* (Swain & Lapkin, 2001), dictogloss tasks (Basterrechea & Garcia Mayo, 2013; Swain & Lapkin, 2001; Qin, 2008; Fortune, 2009), and *text-reconstruction tasks* (García Mayo, 2002; Alegria de la Colina & García Mayo, 2007; Storch, 2008). The text-reconstruction task is a task in which learners are required to complete linguistic items which had been deleted by the researcher, to produce an accurate text (Alegria de la Colina & García Mayo, 2007). Research has also investigated the impact of task complexity on the occurrence of LREs (Révész, 2011; Robinson, 2005, 2007). For example, Révész, (2011) found that tasks with greater cognitive demands elicited more LREs than less cognitively demanding tasks.

Finally, it has to be mentioned that the effect of task type on the occurrence and nature of LREs is mediated by a variety of individual and social factors such as age, proficiency (Leeser, 2004; Kim & McDonough, 2008; Suzuki & Itagaki, 2007), level of engagement (Storch, 2008), learner type, pair/group dynamics (Watanabe & Swain, 2007), and learners' orientation to the task and their attitudes (Alegria de la Colina & Mayo, 2007; Shak & Gardener, 2008) and certainly by the teacher's role. In other words, it would be simplistic to say that mere implementation of a collaborative task or an activity will ensure collaborative behavior among students. Peer interactions are far more complex to be able to predict the impact of aspects of task design (see also Samuda & Bygate 2008).

2.3. Collaborative Writing Among YLs

Research has informed us that children in the age range of 7 to 11 are in the midst of rapid cognitive and metalinguistic development which helps them to “focus on and manipulate language form, to treat language as an object of inspection and analysis and to make comparisons between languages” (Tellier & Roehr-Brackin, 2017: 24). What is more, they are able to resolve difficulties with certain linguistic forms if supported by the use of these forms in meaningful contexts (Berman, 2004; Philp, Iwashita & Adams, 2014). Certainly, because their metalinguistic awareness is not fully developed, they may have difficulties focusing on form-related problems, articulating them, and reflecting upon them (Berman, 2004; Philp et al., 2014). Nevertheless, the development of metalinguistic awareness is particularly effective when exposure to a foreign language goes in hand with a focus on form (Tellier & Roehr-Brackin, 2017), and together with increasingly developed written literacy, this metalinguistic awareness appears to be crucial for the successful implementation of CW which draws learners' attention to language form.

While the large bulk of studies on CW has investigated adult and young adult students (Shehadeh, 2011; Storch, 2013, 2016), studies with secondary and high school learners

(Villarreal & Gil-Sarratea, 2019) as well as with YLs are needed (Calzada & García Mayo, 2021, 2020a, b; Hidalgo & Lázaro-Ibarrola, 2020; Shak, 2006). Studies with YLs have investigated the role of feedback in CW (Coyle & Roca de Larios, 2014), the effect of task repetition on complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF) of a written text, and on LREs (Hidalgo & Lázaro-Ibarrola, 2020). They have also explored problem-solving strategies used during CW (García Hernández, Roca de Larios & Coyle, 2017), learners' attitudes toward CW tasks (Calzada & García Mayo, 2020b; Shak, 2006; Shak & Gardner, 2008), patterns of interaction (Azkarai & Kopinska, 2020), learners' engagement in LREs and their relationship to written production (Calzada & Garcia Mayo, 2021), or the effects of CW tasks on grammar development (Calzada & Garcia Mayo, 2020b).

For example, Coyle and Roca de Larios (2014) explored the role of feedback in YL's L2 acquisition. In particular, this study looked at how error correction and model texts impacted 10- and 12-year-old EFL learners' noticing and correcting written output. Researchers found that error correction led to higher linguistic acceptability and comprehensibility of their revised texts. Error correction promoted noticing of grammar which was later incorporated into their revisions. Nevertheless, rather than focusing on grammatical features, YLs in this study mainly integrated lexical features into their output. Researchers concluded that explicit correction and models linked learners' attention to different language aspects. In another study, García Hernández, Roca de Larios and Coyle (2017) explored problem-solving strategies used by young EFL learners when engaged in composing picture-based narrative texts and the reformulations made to the texts after having received feedback. The findings suggest a potential relationship between feedback and changes made to texts. For example, reformulation made to the texts led to greater opportunities for learning than merely repeating the task. Surprisingly, however, children who received reformulation only, seemed to have learned more than children who received reformulation and instruction. In other words, they did not benefit from instruction as expected. Researchers attributed this to inadequate or insufficient instruction as well as to learner-internal factors such as difficulties in following the guidelines (García Hernández, Roca de Larios & Coyle, 2017: 217). Learners' proficiency played an important role as high-proficiency students used a higher rate of upgrading strategies after receiving feedback. Another recent study by Roca de Larios, Hernández and Coyle (2021) explored formulation strategies in CW used within 30 pairs in primary school EFL classrooms while writing two narrative picture-story texts. The researchers reconceptualized LREs as problem spaces and relabeled them as joint problem-solving strategy clusters. They found that within these clusters the children often combined strategies that are common to all LREs (task management, using knowledge sources, interactional strategies, monitoring) with strategies concerning specific linguistic concerns (orthographic, morphological, lexical, and syntactic strategies). The researchers identified five main types of such problem-solving clusters:

spelling, morphological lexical, restructuring and decomposition, and translation. A particular strength of this study was its focus on the moment-by-moment conscious mental actions that students employed when transforming their ideas into written language.

Focusing on 10 pairs aged 12 in an EFL classroom, Hidalgo and Lázaro-Ibarrola, (2020) examined two written texts in response to the same picture prompt three times over three weeks. In their study on the effects of task repetition on complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF) of the drafts and, on the number, nature, and resolution of LREs, the researchers found that even though task repetition led to more accurate texts, complexity and fluency remained unchanged. However, a more holistic analysis going beyond CAF has shown that learners produced better compositions in terms of content, structure, and task fulfillment. In addition, learners were able to generate and resolve a high number of form-focused and meaning-focused LREs.

Based on my knowledge, only one study has investigated to what extent LREs generated during YLs' interactions transfer to the written product. Calzada and Garcia Mayo (2020a) investigated the pair work of Spanish EFL learners. Although the dictogloss was effective at focusing the children's attention on grammar and mechanics, students did not necessarily focus on the targeted feature (the 3rd person singular morpheme *-s*). In other words, the number of LREs targeting this feature was very low in comparison to other linguistic aspects. Researchers argue that it is impossible to predict the topics of discussions during collaborative tasks as students set their own agendas. In addition, the fact that lexical LREs tended to be lengthier than mechanical LREs (concerning spelling and punctuation), raised the question of whether a more active engagement in the case of lexical LREs leads to more solid linguistic gains than mechanical LREs (Calzada & Garcia Mayo, 2020a: 11). Nevertheless, the fact that significantly more LREs were correctly resolved than unresolved or resolved incorrectly led researchers to suggest that "learners, regardless of age, always need to satisfy their linguistic needs, even if sometimes they arrive at non-target-like solutions" (Calzada & Garcia Mayo, 2020a: 11). Importantly, children's oral resolutions were consistently incorporated into their writing, with only less than 20% of resolved LREs being left out of their jointly written texts. However, because the study was conducted outside of students' familiar environment, researchers have called for studies in a regular classroom and/or with a particular focus on low-proficiency learners.

In summary, studies have reported the positive role of CW in YLs' language learning. Studies have underlined the benefits of feedback, explicit correction, text reformulation, and repetition in CW as well as the importance of taking learners' proficiency into account. Furthermore, although learners seem to focus on grammatical form, it may not be the form targeted by the task. Moreover, they are more likely to be actively engaged with lexical than other LRE types. In addition, YL seem to incorporate their resolutions made during language-

related episodes into their written product. Finally, YLs generally report positive attitudes towards collaboration, collaborative writing tasks such as the dictogloss, or other tasks that focus on form (Calzada & Garcia Mayo, 2020b; Shak & Gardener, 2008). This is particularly advantageous in EFL settings because CW tasks provide unique opportunities for the production of oral and written L2 output which are limited outside the EFL (Calzada & Garcia Mayo, 2020b). Nevertheless, the task employed in the current study differs dramatically from tasks such as the dictogloss as learners are not asked to recreate a text but rather to use language creatively. This, of course, may have a crucial impact on LREs. The study attempts to answer the following questions:

RQ1) To what extent and in what ways do children (aged 10-11) engage in and resolve language-related episodes while collaboratively writing a dialog during a regular EFL lesson?

RQ2) What aspects of language do they focus on?

RQ3) To what extent do they incorporate their resolutions made during language-related episodes into their written product?

3. METHODS

3.1. Context and Participants

This study took place during regular foreign language lessons in two grade 5 M-A EFL classrooms at a comprehensive school (*Gesamtschule*) which combines two school types (primary and middle). Comprehensive schools are public or private schools, which have a special curriculum, offering a more flexible program of study than traditional schools. One of the school's main aims is to implement an individualized and learner-centered approach to teaching and learning. Consequently, students are encouraged to accomplish tasks either individually, with a partner, in small study groups, or with the teacher's help, depending on their needs and abilities. Similarly, the English teacher of this class recognized the benefits of peer interaction to learning and often created opportunities for students to accomplish tasks with a partner or in a small group. The students' English curriculum at the school involved three lessons a week and students have learned English since grade three. In this study, twenty-four ($N=24$) students aged between 10 and 11 were organized into twelve pairs, out of which six were of different relative proficiency and six were of similar relative proficiency. Unfortunately, learners' language proficiency could not be assessed independently of school-based assessment involving several classroom achievement tests which aimed to assess learners' listening and reading skills, grammatical knowledge and vocabulary. Only one

speaking test was conducted. Students' relative proficiency ranged between moderate and low. When matched against the levels of the Common European Framework of Reference, students, the estimation would be A1 level as they were basic users who could only *interact in a simple way, ask and answer simple questions about themselves such as where they live, people they know, and things they have* (Council of Europe, 2020). To preserve ecological validity, the pairs were selected by the teacher which is the usual classroom practice. The composition of pairs was based on students' ability to work well with each other (compatible personalities) and students' relative proficiency. Consequently, students had no objections concerning their partners. Table 1 below provides information about the participants.

Table 1. Participants.

Pair	Name	Gender	RP
Pair 1	Zikmund - Fabian	M-M	M-L
Pair 2	Vanesa - Rika	F-F	M-L
Pair 3	Lea - Rita	F-F	M-L
Pair 4	Feli-Nena	F-F	M-L
Pair 5	Sara - Lena	F-F	M-A
Pair 6	Katja - Jane	F-F	M-A
Pair 7	Paula - Daniel	F-M	M-L
Pair 8	Lily - Gabi	F-F	M-L
Pair 9	Erik-Thomas	M-M	M-A
Pair 10	Karl-Lars	M-M	M-A
Pair 11	Karin-Eva	F-F	M-A
Pair 12	Anne - Lucy	F-F	M-A

RP: Relative Proficiency, H – high, M – moderate, L: Low

3.2. Ethical Considerations

Prior to the study, the students and their parents were asked for their permission to conduct the research. Both children and parents were given a consent form that explained the research and the children's participation in it. Both forms were translated into German. Children were told that they were free to withdraw from the study at any time. They were assured that at every stage, their names would remain confidential and pseudonyms are used. The procedures ensured that individuals could not be identified indirectly. The parents of three students did not consent for their children to be audio-recorded and these students were removed from the study. They were, however, present during the lessons to which the parents agreed.

3.3. Instruments and Procedure

The data collection methods involved audio recordings of pair work interactions (12 in total), and documentary analysis of student written work. Each learner interacted with one classmate on several classroom activities and exercises during two regular lessons. The researcher was present during both lessons. The first lesson involved a teacher's introduction to the topic, a short video showing two conversations at a shop, and two pair-work exercises related to the video. The video and the pair work exercises targeted lexical phrases such as *I'd like a .../Would you like a...?/Is that everything? /I'll take them. /They're 4.99£. /Thanks anyway.*). Most of these lexical phrases cannot be directly translated into students' L1 and as such could have posed difficulty to them. The first exercise required students to match the question and the answer. The second exercise was a reordering exercise asking students to write the words in the correct order to make questions and sentences. The outcomes of these exercises were then compared in the plenum. The second lesson consisted of a recap of the language encountered in the first lesson and a dialogue writing from which the findings in this article are reported. Students were told that they could write a similar dialogue to the conversations that they were shown during the first lesson. They were told that they had to write it and present it to the class. They were also informed that their written dialogues were to be submitted. Prior to the dialogue writing activity, the teacher prepared the resources needed by the students and provided task instructions. Several cue cards including pictures and English words of different shops (sports shop, shoe shop, clothes shop, etc.) were placed on the blackboard. As mentioned above, the role taken by the teacher mirrored common classroom practices and he offered support only when requested by the students. The activity took about twenty-five minutes to complete.

4. DATA ANALYSIS

The approach to analysis follows Mercer's suggestion of a complementary use of qualitative and quantitative approaches. The analysis implemented a micro-genetic approach (i.e., close study) of the talk as it develops utterance by utterance (Donato, 1994; Lazureton & Davis, 2008; Ohta, 2000). The process of analysis began by listening to some tapes in order to obtain a general sense of the data. Later, the talk during peer interaction, accounting for 4 hours and 57 minutes of recording, was transcribed using a transcription software f4. Only on-task talk was further analyzed as the off-task talk was minimal and did not seem to impact students' engagement with each other and the task. It became evident during the process of analysis that students talked about the task procedure, the content, and the language. Therefore, the on-task talk was further segmented into activity-related episodes (AREs), content-related Episodes (CREs) and language-related episodes (LREs). Episodes involving the teacher (TE) were included. These categories were then imposed back on the data and

further analyzed. Excerpt 1 provides an example of an ARE. Sara asks Lara if she wants to take on the role of shopkeeper which Lara refuses. Sara acknowledges and offers to have Lara write. Lara expresses her wish to do so and Sara agrees. AREs are episodes in which learners talk about how to go about completing the task at hand, negotiate or assign roles, and announce or negotiate the next stage in the task (Storch, 2001). AREs are important for language learning because they provide crucial space for learners to share aspects of the given situation, allowing thus for a collaborative definition of a goal of the task and for a mutual understanding and collaborative undertaking of the task at hand (Antón & DiCamilla, 1999; Wertsch, 1985). They set the stage for meaning-making and learning (Toth & Gil-Berrio, 2022). The utterances made in students' L1 German were translated into English and appear in brackets (see Appendix for transcription conventions).

(1) Activity-related episode (ARE)

S: *Willst du die Verkäuferin werden?* (Do you want to be the shopkeeper?)

L: *Nein, nicht wirklich.* (No, not really.)

S: *Ok. Dann bist du die Kundin. Soll ich schreiben oder willst du?* (Then you are the customer. Shall I write or do you want to?) (offering an opportunity to write)

L: *Darf ich schreiben?* (May I write?)

S: *Gut.* (All right.)

CREs refer to episodes in which students talked about other task-related content such as the main characters or events, read parts of the text or practiced the dialogue. Excerpt 2 provides an example of a CRE. Paula begins by saying that Daniel's purchase will cost fifty pounds, but Daniel objects that this is too expensive. Paula disagrees which helps Daniel notice that Paula meant the total amount.

(2) Content-related episode

P: fifty pounds.

D: *Das ist doch zu teuer.* (That is too expensive.)

P: *Nein.* (No.)

D: *Ach insgesamt?* (Oh, in total?)

P: *Hm.*

D: *Ach so, ich dachte die Fußballschuhe.* (I see, I thought the football shoes.)

LREs are episodes, during which learners talked about language use and their choices (Swain & Lapkin, 1998) (see section 2.1. for definition). In addition to the actual number of LREs, the LRE/turns ratio was also used as a measure of comparison to assess the depth of

engagement with LREs. The same procedure was followed for AREs, TREs and TEs. A turn in this study refers to a completed utterance of one learner. When one learner started speaking before the turn of the other learner has finished – that is when overlap (interruption) occurred, both turns were included in the word count. However, when both learners started speaking at the same time, and it was not clear who started talking first, the turns were not included in the word count. LREs were further categorized according to target (lexical chunks) vs. non-target LREs and their resolution. With regards to LRE resolution, LREs were coded as correctly resolved, incorrectly resolved, and unresolved. The non-target LREs were further coded as 1) lexis-focused LREs (L) which involved students searching for, discussing, and deciding on appropriate vocabulary, 2) mechanical LREs (M) during which students were concerned with spelling and punctuation and 3) grammar-focused LREs (F) during which students' attention was drawn to grammatical issues. Excerpt 3 below provides an example of a target language-focused LREs. Lucy proposes a non-target like *Let see* and Anne writes it down. As Lucy reads it, she notices that this is incorrect. Although Anne insists, Lucy provides the target-like *Let me see* which is repeated, translated and written down by Anne.

(3) Target LRE (correctly resolved)

L: Let see. Let see. (suggestion)

A: [writing]

L: Let see. *Warte, nicht* let see. (Wait, not let see.)

A: *Doch.* (Yes.)

L: Let me see.

A: Let me see. *Lass mich schauen.* Let me see. (writing) (incorporated into text)

The following is an example of an incorrectly resolved LRE focusing on the lexical phrase *What colour would you like?* In response to Nena's suggestion to write *In what color would you like it?* Feli uses her resources to propose the question in L2. Neli disagrees and proposes a non-target like *what color do you like?* Feli accepts and writes it down.

(4) Target LRE (incorrectly resolved)

N: *Oder wir schreiben in welcher Farbe möchten Sie es haben?* (Or we write in what color would you like it.)

F: Ok. Have you got a favorite color?

N: No, what color do you like?

F: Ok. [writing down] (incorporated into text)

The following excerpts (5,6) provide examples of non-target LRE as the focus is not on lexical phrases but on other language aspects. Example 5 is an unresolved lexical LRE as Paula does not provide the answer sought by Daniel.

(5) Non-target, lexical LRE, unresolved)

D: *Was sind* rubber boots? (What are rubber boots?)

P: *Wir müssen ja keine Schuhe nehmen.* (We don't need to take shoes.)

Example 6 refers to a grammar-focused LRE. Lily's target-like suggestion is opposed by Gabi. Lily corrects her utterance as well as her error in writing.

(6) Non-target, grammar-focused LRE (resolved correctly)

L: That's two pounds.

G: Nein (No), one pound.

L: One pound.

G: [writing]

L: Not one pounds, one pound. (incorporated into text)

Finally, episodes involving the teacher (TE) refer to instances during which the students sought the teacher's help and were provided with the teacher's explanation, feedback, or comment. It has to be mentioned that in addition to language-related aspects, these episodes involved issues concerning task procedure, content, and so on. They have, therefore, been coded and counted separately from other episodes. Example 7 shows a TE. As Lara does not know the answer to Sara's request for information, Lara asks the teacher. The teacher gives students three hints which finally prompts Sara to provide the target-like form and incorporate the phrase into the text.

(7) Teacher involving episode (TE)

S: Was heißt noch mal bis zum nächsten Mal? (*What's bis zum nächsten Mal again?*)

L: *Keine Ahung.* (No idea.) Mr. Müller, can you help, please?

T: *Bis zum nächsten mal?* (See you next time?)

S. *Ja.* (Yes.)

T: It begins with "see."

L: *Das hatten wir schon mal, aber ich hab's wieder vergessen.* (We had that once but I have forgotten.)

T: See you...

S: See you later?

T: Not later but next...

S: See you next time. (writing) (incorporated into the text)

The final stage in the analysis was to examine to what extent students' decisions were incorporated into the jointly written text. In order to do that, the 12 texts written by the students were analyzed. Each resolved LRE was traced back to the written text in order to examine whether the resolution had been incorporated or not (Calzada & Garcia Mayo, 2021: 10). All data were run through the IBM SPSS Statistics program and a paired-samples t-test was run to compare different data sets. The researcher and his research assistant independently reviewed 50% of the transcripts for the occurrence of LREs, TREs, AREs, and TEs and resolution of LREs, the aspects of language students focus on (mechanics, lexis, grammar). Our disagreements were mainly related to the overlaps between the episodes. We discussed differences and similarities concerning any episodes which remained unresolved and reached an agreement. The inter-rater reliability using Cronbach's alpha was .92.

5. FINDINGS

5.1. LRES Engagement and Resolution

The first research question asked to what extent and in what ways students engage in and resolve LREs while engaged in collaboratively writing a dialogue. I will first provide findings of quantitative analysis to illustrate the occurrence of LREs in relation to other episodes as well as the extent of correct or incorrect LRE resolution. A qualitative analysis of three examples from the data will then illustrate in what ways and to what extent students engaged in and resolved LREs. Importantly, these examples aim to show that LREs should not be regarded as occurring independently of one another and in isolation, but as inextricably connected to other episodes occurring during an interaction.

5.1.2. Findings of the quantitative analysis

Table 2 below demonstrates the occurrence of AREs, CRES, and LREs in addition to the number of turns across AREs, CREs, TEs, and LREs. Finally, it displays the number of correctly resolved LREs, incorrectly resolved LREs, unresolved LREs, and language-related episodes involving the teacher. The table shows that LREs constituted 51% of all episodes excluding those involving the teacher. LREs were followed by AREs (28%) and CREs (21%) with statistically significant differences between LREs and CREs ($p=.001$) as well as between LREs and AREs ($p=.008$). Also, when looking at the distribution of episodes across pairs, the majority of pairs engaged in more LREs than in AREs and CREs. Likewise, nearly half of all turns were produced within LREs. In other words, the majority of pairs discussed linguistic

issues more frequently than issues related to activity procedure and content. Table 1 also indicates that the majority of pairs engaged in more AREs than CREs and produced more turns within AREs than CREs with the statistical difference being significant for both CREs ($p=.003$) and for AREs ($p=.004$). In other words, learners seemed to have been more concerned about the procedural issues than the content. Furthermore, table 1 reveals variations in the LREs produced across pairs ranging from 5 to 17, and the median (M) being 8.7. With regards to the resolution of LREs, the table shows that across pairs 62% of LREs were resolved correctly, 19% incorrectly and 19% were left unresolved. The paired-sample t-test revealed that significantly more LREs were resolved correctly than incorrectly ($p=.002$) and unresolved ($p=.002$) if measured separately. There were, however, large variations across pairs in terms of the correct resolution of LREs (Range: 1-11). Episodes involving the teacher were relatively rare ranging between 1 and 3 and 71% of these episodes concerning language.

Table 2. Occurrence, resolutions and turns within CREs, AREs, LREs, TEs across pairs.

Pair	ARE	CRE	LRE	ARE turns	CRE turns	TE turns	LRE turns	C	I	U	TE	TL
1	6	5	11	31	46	0	74	5	4	2	1	1
2	5	4	5	33	30	2	17	1	1	3	1	0
3	2	0	9	20	0	0	72	3	3	3	1	1
4	2	9	6	9	57	11	36	3	2	1	1	1
5	1	0	12	10	0	8	70	10	0	2	1	1
6	6	4	17	26	10	0	90	11	3	3	1	1
7	6	7	10	39	13	14	61	9	1	0	0	0
8	6	2	5	41	14	4	36	3	2	0	1	1
9	5	2	6	13	23	6	44	4	1	1	2	0
10	12	5	7	60	33	22	68	5	2	0	3	2
11	2	2	9	16	11	7	53	5	0	4	3	2
12	4	2	7	30	13	8	42	5	1	1	2	2
N	57	42	104	328	250	82	639	64	20	20	17	12
	28%	21%	51%	25%	19%	6%	49%	62%	19%	19%	100%	71%
R	1-12	0-7	5-17	9-60	0-57	0-22	17-90	1-11	0-3	0-4	0-3	0-1
Mdn	5	3	8	28	13.5	6.5	57	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1
SD	2.96	2.71	3.5	14.1	17.7	6.56	23.21	3.08	1.23	1.37	0.9	0.74

ARE – Activity-related episode, CRE – Content-related episode, TE – Episodes involving teacher, LRE – Language-related episode, C – correctly resolved LREs, I – incorrectly resolved LREs, U – unresolved LREs, TL – language-related episodes involving the teacher

5.1.3. Findings of the qualitative analysis

Example 1: Pair 7 (Daniel and Paula)

The first example to illustrate in what ways and to what extent learners engaged in and resolved language-related episodes comes from an interaction between Paula (moderate relative proficiency) and Daniel (low relative proficiency). Although this pair did not produce the highest number of LREs, it resolved nearly all LREs correctly (9 out of 10) while relying only on their own linguistic resources and without any involvement of the teacher. As the excerpt shows, following the teacher's explanation of the task (1-5), both students engage in an ARE. They negotiate and establish an agreement with regards to the object of their dialogue (6-10), roles to be taken (11-14), and how to begin (15-17). Without any negotiation, the role of a scribe is taken by Paula (22). The ARE is followed by an LRE (18-27), which begins with Paula suggesting the first phrase of the dialogue (*Hello! What can I do for you?*). This is followed by a moment of silence in which Daniel appears to be thinking about the meaning of this phrase. As he signals non-understanding, Paula provides the German translation (19). Having understood the meaning, Daniel thinks about what to say next and requests the English word for "suchen" (*look for*) (20). Interestingly, Paula provides another word (*need*) (21) which, however, is unnoticed by Daniel. Instead, he repeats *I need* while attempting to add the word *rubber boots* (22). As he struggles to do this, Paula provides the solution (*I need rubber boots.*) and writes the sentence down (23). However, noticing that the word *need* does not correspond to the word "suchen" (*to look for*) that he requested, Daniel asks for a clarification (24) which prompts Paula to consult a dictionary and replace the phrase *I need rubber boots* with *I am looking for rubber boots* in the text.

1. T: Now, do you remember the conversations that you watched at a shop. You also have the text with the conversations, right? You are now going to write a similar; not the same dialog with your partner. Ok? It can be a different shop, for example, a fruit and vegetable shop, a sports shop etc. One of you is a customer...buyer and the other one is a shopkeeper, the seller. Ok? You may use some words and phrases from this text. Ok?
2. Class: Yes.
3. T: So, you are going to write it and then present to the class. Do you understand what to do?
4. Class: Yes. *Wieviel Zeit haben wir denn? How much time do we have?*
5. T: Thirty minutes. Ok. Great. You may start, now.
6. D: *So, what do we want to buy?*
7. P: *Schuhe (Shoes).*

Silence

8. P: Schuhe *are* shoes.
9. D: *But there are different shoes and that's why I would like to choose.*
10. P: Normal Schuhe *are* shoes *and* Turnschuhe *are* trainers. He said. It is also in Duden.
Look! (pointing to the dictionary).
11. D: *Yes...So... Who is what? Are you A and then I am B.* (laughter)
12. P: *Ok. It's up to you.*
13. D: *I am the customer.*
14. P: *Ok, so I am the shopkeeper so I am A. Ok?*
15. D: *Hm.*
Silence
16. D: *Actually, I would have to come in and say hello.*
17. P: *Or I say hello and then was kann ich für Sie tun?* (What can I do for you?)
Silence
18. P: *I say first hello.* What can I do for you? (inviting P. to continue)
(P. thinking)
19. P: *Was kann ich für dich tun?* (What can I do for you?) (translating the sentence for him)
20. D: *Hi...hm* (thinking)... *What was "suchen" again?* (laughter)
21. P: *Hi I need...*
22. D: *Hi I need rubber blab la bla...*
23. P: *I need rubber boots* (writing)
24. D: *But need means "brauchen" (need), right?*
25. P: *Yes, rightWhat was „suchen“ again?*
26. D: *No idea.*
27. P: (looking up the word) ...*look for...I am looking for rubber boots* (writing).
28. D: *Very good.*

The example indicates that Paula plays the role of an expert and provides the necessary language. Nevertheless, she involves Daniel by making suggestions, marked with rising intonation (17, 18) or by requesting information from him (25). In fact, the discourse is rich in suggestions, questions, and repetitions and contains instances of laughter (10). Moreover, it seems that by taking on a role of a scribe Paula allows him to contribute to the task the task and think about language which appears to be above his level. Both learners seem to listen to each other and take an interest in each other's utterances. Disagreements occur (9) but there is a willingness to resolve them and agreement is achieved (10, 14, 24, 27). Although assistance is given predominantly by Paula, Daniel values her assistance and accepts it (10, 22, 27). For example, as Daniel struggles to provide the target word (25), Paula consults a dictionary (26) and Daniel praises her (27). Nevertheless, despite Daniel's engagement, the

analysis has shown that it was Paula who resolved all LREs. Daniel's contribution seemed to have been in the realm of initiating the LREs by requesting the necessary information (5, 10, 18), by building upon Paula's suggestions (21) or by seeking clarification (23). Finally, that LREs were rather short (ca. 6 turns per LRE) without any elaborate discussions about language taking place.

Example 2: Pair 12 (Anne and Lucy)

The next excerpt exemplifies what can be regarded as a representative case of a collaborative writing in this study. It comes from an interaction between Anne (moderate relative proficiency) and Lucy (low relative proficiency). As demonstrated in the following example, the teacher's explanation of a task (1-5, see above) is followed by an ARE (6-15) in which Anne first confirms with her partner Lucy whether they should write the dialogue right now (6). What follows is a discussion of the procedural aspects of the activity, assigning roles, and negotiation of the object of their dialogue (8-15). Similar to example 1, this appears to be important for the formation of joint attention and for setting the stage for students' engagement with an LRE (16-22). As the excerpt below shows, Lucy suggests beginning the dialog with (*How can I help you?*) (16). Anne provides a correction and writes the corrected version down (17). Not knowing how to proceed, Lucy asks Anne what she is supposed to write (18). Anne proposes (*I need a blue T-Shirt.*) which she writes down without consulting her. However, while self-repeating this phrase she proposes a different idea in German (19). But because she does not know how to say this in English, she asks Lucy (19) who provides her with a target-like question (20). Anna writes it down (21) while self-repeating the phrase. As if looking for confirmation, Lucy asks the teacher to confirm that their choice is correct (22). Thanks to the teacher's hint, the word please is added and incorporated into the text.

6. A: *Shall we do the dialogue now? Shall we do it right now?*
7. L: *Yes.*
8. A: *What do you want?* (writes A and B on the dialogue sheet)
9. L: *I don't care.*
10. A: *I would prefer to be the shopkeeper.*
11. L: *Ok.*
12. A: *What shall we buy?*
13. L: *Don't know. A candle?*
14. A: *A T-Shirt?*
15. L: *Hm. Silence*
16. L: *How can I help you?*
17. A: *Hi. Hello, can I help you?* (stress is on "hi") (incorporated into the text).

18. L: And what do I write?
19. A: Yes, Yes, I need ...I need a blue T-Shirt. I need a blue T-Shirt (repeating while writing) *or* yes...no wait ...ja, kann ich dieses ...grüner T-Shirt haben? ...Can I ...*wait* ...what means “kann ich haben?” (Can I have?)
20. L: Can I have?
21. A: Can I have a T-Shirt? (incorporated in the text)
22. L: Yes. Is it correct? (asking the teacher)
23. T: Yes, but you need one more word.
24. A: Uhm...(sounding as if she did not understand.)
25. L: Please.
26. T: That’s right.

In spite of the correct resolution of this LRE, this pair only produced 7 LREs which were rather simple, short with the LREs/conversational turn ratio being (7/42) accounting only for 6 turns per LRE. In addition, 5 out of 7 LREs were correctly resolved but 2 required the teacher’s assistance.

Example 3: Pair 2 (Vanessa and Rika)

The following example demonstrates a pair that produced the lowest number of LREs ($N=5$) and resolved only one correctly. Following the teacher’s explanation of the task (see example 1 above), both students engage in an ARE while negotiating their roles. In a bored tone of voice, Vanessa asks Rika which role she would like to take (6). Rika expresses her indifference (7) and Vanessa takes a similar position (8). Although Vanessa offers Rika to select her role (9), Rika only asks for the easier option (10). This ARE is rather lengthy and is only resolved when Vanessa takes the initiative to begin the dialogue by proposing the first sentence (*Hi, can I help you?*) (17). What follows is an LRE which begins with Rika suggesting the non-target-like (*I can help you*) (18), Vanessa accepts it and incorporates into the text (19). While writing, Vanessa asks for confirmation with regard to the spelling of the word *can* (19) and Rika confirms (20).

6. V: *Do you want to be A or B?* (sounding bored)
7. R: *I don’t care.* (sounding indifferent)
8. V: *Me, too. You can choose. A oder B* (sounding as if she did not care)
(V. singing and being disengaged)
9. V. *Do you want to be the shopkeeper or the customer?* (in a bored tone)
10. R: *Which is more difficult?*

11. V: *I don't know. It depends.*
12. R: Hm. (thinking)
13. V: *Hard to tell.*
14. R: *Ok. Then I am...No...you say first what do you want to be!* (sounding upset)
15. V: *I don't care* (expressing indifference).
16. R: *Me, too.* (in a bored tone).
17. V: *Then I am* A. Hi, can I help you?
18. R: Eh? thinking...yes, I can help you....ok. *or?* (suggestion, CC)
19. V: *Wait ...yes...yes.* (writing). *Can comes with a C, or?*
20. R: *Yes.*

This example shows that none of the learners are willing to share one's own ideas or engage fully with each other's ideas. They seem to be indifferent to the activity and to each other. Their interaction does not contain any traces of sharing personal goals, perceptions of their collaborative work or valuing each other's contribution. None of the learners seem to feel responsible for supporting one another. Although they occasionally negotiate agreement, their negotiation is rather superficial and lacks responsiveness. Throughout the whole activity, they are disengaged and their participation is only peripheral. Moreover, the fashion in which the students approach the activity is rather unorganized and unsystematic with their discussion about the task being limited to exchanges about what to do. This is visible in their engagement with LREs which are rare, short, simple, and either unresolved or resolved incorrectly.

5.2. Language Factors

The second research question inquired into the aspects of language that children focused on while being engaged in a CW activity. As Table 3 below shows, students' focus was mainly on the target form accounting for 59% of all LREs. However, the difference between target LREs and non-target LREs did not reach statistical significance ($p=.113$). Also, within the non-target LREs, the focus was mainly on lexis (L) (63%). Mechanical aspects (M) such as spelling and punctuation were much less common (12%) and the focus on grammatical aspects (G) was minimal (9%). The difference between L and F ($p=.001$) as well as L and M ($p=.036$) was statistically significant. It also has to be mentioned that students appeared to have been focused on language aspects not only during LREs but also during CREs. Nevertheless, it was not possible to determine to which language aspect they attended to.

Table 3: Language focus during LREs.

	N	Mdn	SD
LREs target	61 (59%)	5.5	2.91
LREs others	43 (41%)	3.3	2.23
G	4 (9%)	0	0.39
L	27 (63%)	2	1.81
M	12 (28%)	1	1.35
Total	104	2	0.99

5.3. Resolution Incorporation into Text

The third research question explored to what extent were the resolutions reached during students' deliberations about language incorporated into their written product. Table 4 below shows that learners incorporated nearly all LREs (95%) ($p < .001$) in which they discussed the target language and 85% of LREs related to other language aspects. However, learners also incorporated 16 out of 18 (88%) incorrectly resolved LREs. What is more, 3 correctly resolved LREs have been incorporated incorrectly into the text. Finally, 10 out of 12 resolutions reached with the teacher's help were incorporated.

Table 4: LRE resolutions incorporated into text.

	Incorporated			Non-incorporated		
	N	Mdn	SD	N	Mdn	SD
LREs target	54 (95%)	6	2.54	3 (5%)	0	0.62
LREs others	23 (85%)	1	2.26	4 (15%)	0	0.49
G	1 (100%)	0	0.29	0 (0%)	0	0
L	12 (75%)	1	1.04	4 (25%)	0	0.49
M	8 (100%)	1	0.6	0 (0%)	0	0
TLs	10 (83%)	1	0.67	2(17%)	0	0.39
Total	77 (92%)	1	22	7 (8%)	0	0.71

G- grammar, L-lexis, M-mechanics, TL – language-episodes involving the teacher

6. DISCUSSION

The first research question inquired into the ways and the extent YLs engaged in and resolved LREs. The findings have shown that nearly half of all episodes were indeed LREs. This is a positive finding because LREs are important learning opportunities for generating knowledge about language which mediates language use. One possible explanation is that the high occurrence of LREs in relation to other episodes may be attributed to the CW activity, which by its nature elicits LREs (Alegria de la Colina & García Mayo, 2007; Storch, 2008; Calzada & Garcia Mayo, 2020a). In other words, combining speaking and writing modes is more likely to trigger LREs than speaking tasks or activities alone (Alegria de la Colina &

García Mayo, 2007). It has to be, however, mentioned that in contrast to more form-focused tasks such as the dictogloss or the text-reconstruction that were used by previous research, the activity used in this study was meaning-focused (Storch, 2016), was less structured, and allowed for more open and creative use of language. Therefore, frequent engagement with LREs is positive. Nevertheless, despite their frequent engagement with LREs, only 62% were resolved correctly, while nearly 40% were left unresolved or were resolved incorrectly. Surprisingly, this occurred despite the fact that the teacher's support was available throughout the whole activity and that the language targeted by the activity was not grammar (Calzada & Garcia Mayo, 2020a) but lexical phrases. This is also in contrast to the findings of previous studies with children and adults (Calzada & Garcia Mayo, 2020a; Garcia Mayo & Azkarai, 2016) which have suggested that students, regardless of age leave only a small proportion of LREs unresolved. In addition, there were large variations across pairs in terms of engagement and the correct resolution of LREs. Moreover, provided that learners tended not to request the teacher's assistance, although they were not able to resolve the LREs, could be partially attributed to the learner-centered teaching practices which also include encouraging students to obtain help from their peers before asking the teacher.

Nevertheless, the data shows that there were differences among students in terms of their inclinations to rely on their own or their partner's linguistic resources during the CW activity. The differences among pairs were further illustrated using a qualitative analysis of three pairs. In the first example (pair 7), Paula took the role of an expert and was responsible for the resolution of all LREs and for writing the dialogue, Daniel's role was mainly to initiate the LREs by requesting the necessary language, by building upon Paula's suggestions or by seeking clarification. This is positive as YLs tend to avoid linguistic items that they do not know or ask clarification questions (Pinter, 2006). Moreover, Daniel was involved in all the stages of the production of the text and both learners seemed to have a sense of shared responsibility and ownership of the text (Storch, 2021). Although they did not depend on each other, they had a common goal in the form of a joint text to achieve. This suggests that despite differing language abilities and one student taking the lead in the activity, students can feel responsible for the text and work closely while negotiating and agreeing on language issues and ideas to include (Storch, 2021). In contrast to Daniel and Paula, in the second example (Anne and Lucy), both students seemed to have faced difficulty with the task at hand and language and could not do without negotiating and co-constructing ideas with one another. In other words, they depended on each other to complete the task. Although Anne slightly dominated during the LREs and did not seem to be willing to involve Lucy in the writing process, both students seemed to have a common goal which provided space for negotiation and agreement on ideas while composing the text. They engaged with each other's contributions, offered and discussed issues, and looked for resolutions that were acceptable to both of them. In addition, when looking across the data, both learners took

turns in initiating and resolving LREs them. Overall, this case suggests that students may take different roles within the LREs and beyond, but they may complement each other and pool their linguistic resources to arrive at appropriate lexical items or phrases needed for writing the dialog. The third example (Pair 2, Vanessa and Rika) has indicated that if students lack the willingness to engage with the task and with each other's contributions and lack responsiveness to each other's utterances, this will impact the level of engagement with LREs and their resolution.

The qualitative analysis has also indicated that episodes during which students discuss the procedural aspects of the activity and assign roles influence how students engage with LREs and the activity in general. As Toth and Gil-Berrio (2022) put it, such episodes are crucial spaces for the establishment of joint attention and mutual understanding (intersubjectivity) which sets the stage for meaning-making and learning (Toth & Gil-Berrio, 2022). We have seen that pairs 7 and 12 were able to set the stage for further work, but pair 2 (Vanessa and Rika) failed to do so. This seemed to have negatively influenced their further interactive work including their engagement with LREs which were not only rare but also short, simple, and either unresolved or resolved incorrectly. As Toth and Gil-Berrio (2022) have pointed out, any collaborative interaction arises from a network of interwoven factors which include each participant's personal goals, their perceptions of the goals of others, and their perceptions of the available means for achieving them. Arguably, it is during AREs that students' perceptions of the goals and means are negotiated and agreed on. In contrast, if this mutual understanding of learners' goals and the means for accomplishing them is not established, learners are unlikely to engage fully with each other's ideas which will hinder their collaborative work. It can also be contended that establishing mutual understanding is all the more important in peer CW among YLs because students have to speak and listen to one another in order to help each other to produce a text which may be beyond their individual abilities. This requires high attentional resources and abilities to resolve difficulties which some YLs may still lack developmentally. In a similar vein, if mutual understanding is not established, LREs may not promote the kind of collaborative dialogue in which learners solve problems and build knowledge (Chen, 2020).

The RQ2 inquired into what aspects of language students focus on. The fact that students attended to language form confirms research on CW which has suggested that combining writing with speaking tasks increases the amount of engagement with language form while attending to meaning (Alegria de la Colina & García Mayo, 2007). The findings also indicate that students' focus was predominantly on lexical phrases targeted by the lessons and the activity. Also, within non-target LREs, students' attention was drawn to lexical aspects of language. These findings are different from those of Calzada and Garcia-Mayo's (2020b) study in which students' focus was much more on grammatical forms than

on lexical ones. Nevertheless, the focal point, as well as the activities employed, differed considerably from the current study. One possible explanation for students' prevailing attention to lexical aspects is that students did not perceive the dialogue as a full-fledged writing activity as it involved a dialog that is spoken in nature. In a similar vein, the completion of the activity (writing and presenting it) might not have prompted learners to focus on the grammatical accuracy of the text but on creating a meaningful dialogue for which the selection and discussion of relevant lexis are essential. It is likely that repeating the activity in a different context while explicitly linking students' attention to grammatical form would lead to a generation of more grammar-focused LREs and greater attention to grammatical form (Hidalgo & Lázaro-Ibarrola, 2020).

Nevertheless, the findings are in line with previous research with adult students which has shown that learners focus on lexis regardless of proficiency (Kim & McDonough, 2008; Leeser, 2004; Williams, 1999). Moreover, as proficiency within a pair/group increases, learners tend to attend to form more often (Leeser, 2004; Williams, 1999). In other words, high-proficiency learners are more likely to contemplate language form and resolve linguistic problems than low-proficiency learners. It is perhaps not surprising that moderate and low proficiency YLs in this study contemplated lexical aspects more than grammatical ones. This is also because the lexical aspects (lexical phrases) were crucial for the completion of the activity. In a similar vein, it may not have been necessary for them to attend to lexis and grammar. It also needs to be mentioned that while students' focus in Calzada and Garcia-Mayo's (2020a) study was not necessarily on the targeted feature, students' focus in the current study was predominantly on the language targeted by the activity. This was in spite of being engaged in a less controlled and structured activity (dialogue), in which students may not use the target form that the teacher expects them to use (Doff, 1990). On the other hand, it has to be pointed out that even in structured tasks such as the dictogloss, cloze text, or text-reconstruction tasks, students may focus on another language than targeted by the tasks (Storch, 2013). It seems that in this case, the use of the target form (lexical phrases) was essential to communicate meaning and develop the dialogue. Last but not least, factors such as mutual respect, trust, social relationships (e.g., face-saving), or perceived proficiency (see Philp, Walter & Basturkmen's (2010) could have influenced the students' focus on language during their interactions.

The third question explored to what extent students incorporated their resolutions made into their written product. In line with Calzada and Garcia Mayo (2021), learners incorporated nearly all resolutions made within LREs. Most of the resolutions reached within the episodes involving the teacher were also integrated into the text. However, students also incorporated most of the incorrectly resolved LREs and some correctly resolved LREs. Similar to what was mentioned in relation to RQ1, the findings point to the importance of striking the balance between allowing students space to grapple with language issues

autonomously on the one hand and monitoring and providing immediate feedback in order to assure more accurate texts on the other. In line with Coyle and Roca de Larios (2014) implementing error correction or model texts could have enhanced learners' noticing of grammatical issues and their incorporation in their written output. Nevertheless, as shown by Coyle and Roca de Larios (2014), despite error correction, YLs may still incorporate more lexical than grammatical features into their output. Therefore, adequate and sufficient instruction, as well as students' ability to follow the guidelines seem to be more important than mere error correction or providing model texts (García Hernández, Roca de Larios & Coyle, 2017). Certainly, whether and how students integrate their deliberations will be mediated by a variety of individual and social factors such as age, proficiency, pair/group dynamics as well as learners' orientation to the task (Alegria de la Colina & Mayo, 2007; Dobao, 2012, Shak, 2006; Shak & Gardner, 2008).

7. PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

The findings also raise questions with regard to the teacher's role during YLs' CW activities. The relatively high number of unresolved and incorrectly resolved LREs may suggest that a complete reliance on students' own language resources and readiness to ask the teacher for support if necessary is not a viable option with YLs of moderate or low proficiency. However, asking students, regardless of their proficiency, to write a dialogue can provide them with a valuable opportunity to try out a new language and to consolidate, and use the language they had previously learned during a communicative activity. This may be particularly important for low proficiency EFL students such as Daniel and Lucy who may experience a feeling of authentic use of language for a communicative purpose which in turn helps them to build their confidence (see also Doff, 1990). In a similar vein, developing their own dialogue offers them a unique opportunity to draw on a variety of language competencies and to bridge the gap between what is taught in the classroom and the world outside (see also Doff, 1990). Although the teacher may occasionally provide prompts or help where needed (Richard-Amato, 1996), it is preferable to encourage students to closely work together while helping each other and pooling their resources and ideas (Storch, 2021). In other words, it is desirable to allow students more autonomy and capacity to work without the need for the teacher to constantly monitor and provide feedback (Calzada & Garcia Mayo, 2020a). To push students to engage in and resolve a higher number of LREs and to improve pair dynamics, teachers could consider having the students repeat the task (García Mayo & Agirre, 2016; Hidalgo & Lázaro-Ibarrola, 2020).

8. CONCLUSIVE REMARKS

This study contributes to the available body of EFL research by providing a genuine picture of peer interaction during a common classroom CW activity assigned by the teacher and involving the teacher. Such studies on peer interactions in foreign language (FL) classrooms are urgently needed. The study also sheds some light on how a CW activity relates to learners' production of and resolution of LREs as has been shown by some studies involving high school learners and adults (Storch, 2008; Watanabe & Swain, 2007). Future studies could explore other classroom tasks that allow for more creative use of language such as writing a letter, a role-play, or a short story based on picture prompts. Future studies could inquire into how the interplay between the teacher's activity, students' motivation to write, and pair dynamics influences the process of CW and its product. Particularly interesting would be to investigate how both learners negotiate shared responsibility and ownership of the text and how this negotiation translates into the writing process. Future studies could conduct a pedagogical intervention directed at improving the quality of peer CW in intact language classrooms. The study has some limitations. The fact that the participants were mostly female obscures a genuine picture of classroom interactions including both genders. In addition, the small number of participants impacts the validity of the quantitative analysis. Finally, despite the ecological validity of the classroom-based approach, the generalizability and interpretation of the results to other contexts is limited.

REFERENCES

- Adams, R., & Oliver, R. (2019). *Teaching through peer interaction*. New York: Routledge.
- Adams, R., & Ross-Feldman, L. (2008). Does writing influence learner attention to form? In D. Belcher, & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *The oral-literary connection: Perspectives on L2 speaking, writing, and other media interactions* (pp. 243–266). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Ahmadian, M., & Tajabadi, A. (2017). Patterns of interaction in young EFL learners' pair work: the relationship between pair dynamics and vocabulary acquisition. *3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 22(3), 98–114. <https://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2017-2301-08>
- Alegría de la Colina, A., García Mayo, M.P. (2009). Oral interaction in task-based EFL learning: The use of the L1 as a cognitive tool. *IRAL: International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 47(3), 325–345. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.2009.014>
- Alegría de la Colina, A., & García Mayo, M.P. (2007). Attention to form across collaborative tasks by low-proficiency learners in an EFL setting. In García Mayo, M.P. (Eds.), *Investigating tasks in formal language learning* (pp. 91–116). London: Multilingual Matters.

- Antón, M., & Dicamilla, F. J. (1999). Socio-Cognitive Functions of L1 Collaborative Interaction in the L2 Classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 83(2), 233–247.
- Azkarai, A. & Imaz Agirre, A. (2016). Negotiation of Meaning Strategies in Child EFL Mainstream and CLIL Settings. *TESOL Q*, 50(4), 844–870. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.249>
- Azkarai, A., & Kopinska, M. (2020). Young EFL learners and collaborative writing: A study on patterns of interaction, engagement in LREs, and task motivation. *System*, 94(1), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102338>
- Berman, R. A. (2004). Language Development across Childhood and Adolescence. *Trends in Language Acquisition Research Series*, 28(3). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Basterrechea, M., & Garcia Mayo, M. P. (2013). Language-related episodes during collaborative tasks: A comparison of CLIL and EFL learners. In K. McDonough & A. Mackey (Eds.), *Second language interaction in diverse educational contexts* (pp. 25–43). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Calzada Lizarraga, A. (2017). Collaborative work among primary school children: Dictogloss and focus on form. Unpublished MA thesis, University of the Basque Country, Spain.
- Calzada, A., & García Mayo, M. P. (2021). Child learners' reflections about EFL grammar in a collaborative writing task: when form is not at odds with communication, *Language Awareness*, 30(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2020.1751178>
- Calzada, A., & García Mayo, M. P. (2020a). L2 grammar learning through a collaborative writing task. In W. Suzuki & N. Storch (Eds.), *Languaging in language learning and teaching* (pp. 20–39). John Benjamins.
- Calzada, A., & García Mayo, M. del P. (2020b). Child EFL learners' attitudes towards a collaborative writing task. *Language Teaching for Young Learners*, 2(1), 52–72. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ltyl.19008.cal>
- Council of Europe (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. *Companion volume, Council of Europe Publishing, Strasbourg*. <https://rm.coe.int/common-european-framework-of-reference-for-languages-learning-teaching/16809ea0d4>
- Coyle, Y., & Roca de Larios, J. (2014). Exploring the Role Played by Error Correction and Models on Children's Reported Noticing and Output Production in a L2 Writing Task. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 36(3), 451–485. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263113000612>
- Chen, W. (2020). Disagreement in peer interaction: Its effect on learner task performance, *System*, 88, 1–11). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.102179>
- Davin, J. K., & Donato, R. (2013). Student collaboration and teacher-directed classroom dynamic assessment: A complementary pairing. *Foreign Language Annals*, 46(1), 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12012>
- Doff, A. (1990) *Teach English: A Training Course for Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, Press in Association with the British Council.

- Ellis, R. (2016). Focus on form: A critical review. *Language Teaching Research*, 20(3), 405–428. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168816628627>
- Fortune, A. (2005). Learners' use of metalanguage in collaborative form-focused L2 output tasks. *Language Awareness*, 14(1), 21–38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658410508668818>
- García Mayo, M. P. (2017). *Learning Foreign Languages in Primary School: Research Insights*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- García Mayo, M. P., & Agirre, A. I. (2016). Task repetition and its impact on EFL children's negotiation of meaning strategies and pair dynamics: an exploratory study. *The Language Learning Journal*, 44(4), 451–466. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2016.1185799>
- García Mayo, M. P., & Lázaro Ibarrola, L. (2015). Do children negotiate for meaning in task-based interaction? Evidence from CLIL and EFL settings. *System: An International Journal of Educational Technology and Applied Linguistics*, 54(1), 40–54. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.12.001>
- Hidalgo, M. Ángeles, & Lázaro-Ibarrola, A. (2020). Task repetition and collaborative writing by EFL children: Beyond CAF measures. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 10(3), 501–522. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2020.10.3.5>
- Hernández, F., Larios, J. & Coyle, Y. (2017). Reformulation as a Problem-Solving Space for Young EFL Writers: A Longitudinal Study of Language Learning Strategies. In M. García Mayo (Eds.), *Learning Foreign Languages in Primary School: Research Insights* (pp. 193–222). Bristol, Blue Ridge Summit: Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783098118-012>
- Kim, Y. & McDonough, K. (2008). The effect of interlocutor proficiency on the collaborative Dialogue between Korean as a second language learners. *Language Teaching Research*, 12, 211–34. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1362168807086288>
- Lázaro Ibarrola, A., & Hidalgo, M. (2017). Benefits and Limitations of Conversational Interactions among Young Learners of English in a CLIL Context. In M. García Mayo (Eds.), *Learning Foreign Languages in Primary School* (pp. 86–102). Bristol, Blue Ridge Summit: Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783098118-007>
- Leeser, M. (2004). Learner proficiency and focus on form during collaborative dialogue. *Language Teaching Research*, 8(1), 55–81. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168804lr134oa>
- Oliver, R. (2002). The Patterns of Negotiation for Meaning in Child Interactions. *The Modern Language Journal*, 86(1), 97–111. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-4781.00138>
- Ortega, L. (2009). Chapter 9. Studying Writing Across EFL Contexts: Looking Back and Moving Forward. In R. Manchón (Eds.), *Writing in Foreign Language Contexts: Learning, Teaching, and Research* (pp. 232–255). Bristol, Blue Ridge Summit: Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691859-013>
- Philp, J., Adams, R., & Iwashita, N. (2014). *Peer interaction and second language learning*. New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Philp, J., Walter, S., & Basturkmen, H. (2010). Peer interaction in the foreign language classroom: what factors foster a focus on form? *Language Awareness*, 19(4), 261–279. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2010.516831>

- Pinter, A. (2007). *Some benefits of peer-peer interaction: 10-year-old children practising with a communication task*. *Language Teaching Research*, 11(2), 189–207. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168807074604>
- Qin, J. (2008). The Effect of Processing Instruction and Dictogloss Tasks on Acquisition of the English Passive Voice. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(1), 61–82. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168807084494>
- Révész, A. (2011), Task Complexity, Focus on L2 Constructions, and Individual Differences: A Classroom-Based Study. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(1), 162–181. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01241.x>
- Richard-Amato, P. (1996) *Making It Happen: Interaction in the Second Language Classroom, from Practice to Theory*. White Plains, NY: Addison-Wesley.
- Robinson, P. (2005). Cognitive Complexity and Task Sequencing: Studies in a Componential Framework for Second Language Task Design, 43(1), 1–32. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.2005.43.1.1>
- Robinson, P. (2007). Task complexity, theory of mind, and intentional reasoning: Effects on L2 speech production, interaction, uptake and perceptions of task difficulty: Studies in a Componential Framework for Second Language Task Design, 45(3), 193–213. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.2007.009>
- Roca de Larios, J., & Hernández, F., & Coyle, Y. (2021). A theoretically-grounded classification of EFL children's formulation strategies in collaborative writing. *Language Teaching for Young Learners*, 3(2), 300-336. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ltyl.20008.roc>
- Samuda V., & Bygate M. (2008). *Tasks in Second Language Learning*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schoonen, R., Snellings, P., Stevenson, M., & van Gelderen, A. (2009). Towards a blueprint of the foreign language writer: The linguistic and cognitive demands of foreign language writing. In R. Manchón (Eds.), *Writing in foreign language contexts: Learning, teaching, and research* (pp. 77–101). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Shak, J. (2006). Children using dictogloss to focus on form. *Reflection on English language teaching*, 5, 47–62.
- Shak J., & Gardner S. (2008). Young learner perspectives on four focus-on-form tasks. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(3), 387–408. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168808089923>
- Storch, N. (2021). Collaborative writing: Promoting languaging among language learners. In María del Pilar García Mayo (Eds), *Working Collaboratively in Second/Foreign Language Learning* (pp. 13–34). Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501511318-002>
- Storch, N. (2016). Collaborative writing. In R. Manchón & P. Matsuda (Eds.), *Handbook of Second and Foreign Language Writing* (pp. 387-406). Boston, MA/Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Storch, N. (2013). *Collaborative Writing in L2 Classrooms*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Storch, N. (2011). Collaborative Writing in L2 Contexts: Processes, Outcomes, and Future Directions. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 275–288. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190511000079>

- Storch, N. (2008). Metatalk in a pair work activity: Level of engagement and implications for language development. *Language Awareness*, 17, 95–114. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658410802146644>
- Storch, N. (2001). *An investigation into the nature of pair work in an ESL classroom and its effect on grammatical development*. PhD thesis, Department of Linguistics and Applied Linguistics, The University of Melbourne.
- Suzuki, W. & Itagaki, N. (2007). Learner metalinguistic reflections following output-oriented and reflective activity. *Language Awareness*, 16, 131–46. <https://doi.org/10.2167/la392.0>
- Swain, M. (1998). Focus on form through conscious reflection. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 64–81). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Swain, M. & Lapkin, S. (2001). Focus on form through collaborative dialogue: Exploring task effects. In M. Bygate, P. Skehan, & M. Swain (Eds.), *Researching pedagogic tasks: Second language learning, teaching and testing* (pp. 99–118). Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Tavakoli, P. (2014). Storyline complexity and syntactic complexity in writing and speaking tasks. In H. Byrnes & R. M. Manchón (Eds.), *Task-based language learning: Insights from and for L2 writing* (pp. 217–236). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Tellier, A., & Roehr-Brackin, K. (2017). Raising children’s metalinguistic awareness to enhance classroom second language learning. In M.P. Garcia Mayo (Eds.), *Learning foreign languages in primary school: Research insights* (pp. 22–48). Multilingual Matters.
- Toth, P.D., & Gil-Berrio, Y. (2022). Exploring “Intersubjectivity Negotiation Episodes” and “Language Related Episodes” in Second-Language Peer Interaction. *Language Learning*, 72, 275–313. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12484>
- Villarreal, I., & Gil-Sarratea, N. (2020). The effect of collaborative writing in an EFL secondary setting. *Language Teaching Research*, 24(6), 874–897. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168819829017>
- Wajnryb, R. (1990). *Grammar dictation*. Oxford, England: Oxford 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 students. *Language Teaching Research*, 11, 121–142. <https://doi.org/10.1177/136216880607074599>
- Wertsch, J. (1991). *Voices of the mind: a sociocultural approach to mediated action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard.
- Williams, J. (1999). Learner-generated attention to form. *Language Learning*, 49(4), 583–625.
- Williams, J. N. (2001). The effectiveness of spontaneous attention to form. *System*, 29(1), 325–40.
- Williams, J. N. (2012). Working memory and SLA. In S. Gass & A. Mackey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition*. London: Routledge.

APPENDIX

Transcription Conventions

italics translation of utterance in German

() comments about a support strategy which cannot be deduced from the context, the tone of voice, mood, gesture, facial expression, eye gaze, body, posture

? rising intonation at end of a sentence

! increased volume and excitement

. falling intonation

. . . pause less than 3 seconds