



저작자표시-비영리-변경금지 2.0 대한민국

이용자는 아래의 조건을 따르는 경우에 한하여 자유롭게

- 이 저작물을 복제, 배포, 전송, 전시, 공연 및 방송할 수 있습니다.

다음과 같은 조건을 따라야 합니다:



저작자표시. 귀하는 원저작자를 표시하여야 합니다.



비영리. 귀하는 이 저작물을 영리 목적으로 이용할 수 없습니다.



변경금지. 귀하는 이 저작물을 개작, 변형 또는 가공할 수 없습니다.

- 귀하는, 이 저작물의 재이용이나 배포의 경우, 이 저작물에 적용된 이용허락조건을 명확하게 나타내어야 합니다.
- 저작권자로부터 별도의 허가를 받으면 이러한 조건들은 적용되지 않습니다.

저작권법에 따른 이용자의 권리는 위의 내용에 의하여 영향을 받지 않습니다.

이것은 [이용허락규약\(Legal Code\)](#)을 이해하기 쉽게 요약한 것입니다.

[Disclaimer](#)

교육학석사학위논문

**Collaborative Dialogues of  
Korean High School EFL Learners  
in Pair Writing**

짝지어 영작문 쓰기 과업에서  
한국 고등학생들의 협력적 대화

2015년 8월

서울대학교 대학원  
외국어교육과 영어전공  
이진영



Collaborative Dialogues of  
Korean High School EFL Learners  
in Pair Writing

by  
Jin-Young Lee

A Thesis Submitted to  
the Department of Foreign Language Education  
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Degree of Master of Arts in Education

At the  
Graduate School of Seoul National University

August 2015



# Collaborative Dialogues of Korean High School EFL Learners in Pair Writing

짝지어 영작문 쓰기 과업에서  
한국 고등학생들의 협력적 대화

지도교수 김진완

이 논문을 교육학 석사 학위논문으로 제출함

2015년 4월

서울대학교 대학원  
외국어교육과 영어전공  
이진영

이진영의 석사학위논문을 인준함

2015년 6월

위원장 \_\_\_\_\_

부위원장 \_\_\_\_\_

위원 \_\_\_\_\_



Collaborative Dialogues of  
Korean High School EFL Learners  
in Pair Writing

APPROVED BY THESIS COMMITTEE:

---

BYUNGMIN LEE, COMMITTEE CHAIR

---

YOONHEE CHOE

---

JINWAN KIM





## ABSTRACT

This study explores how four Korean high school learners of English interact with each other in L2 pair writing and how collaborative dialogues affect their pair writing and L2 learning. For this purpose, the general patterns of interaction of the Korean EFL learners, and the functions and dynamics of collaborative dialogues in their L2 pair writing were investigated in detail.

Four female Korean students in the 10<sup>th</sup> grade volunteered to a four-week collaborative pair writing program as an extracurricular class (dyad A and B). Self-selected pairs formed a heterogeneous group, and they participated in the collaborative process writing of planning, drafting and revising. Peer interaction was video-taped and analyzed microgenetically, and individual interviews were conducted at the end of the program. The analysis of the data revealed the followings as to the research questions addressed.

First, dyad A displayed a collaborative interaction pattern consistently in EFL pair writing, while dyad B showed a transition in the interaction pattern: from dominant/passive to collaborative interaction. Though dyad B engaged in a dominant/passive interaction at the beginning due to a relatively large L2 proficiency difference, their interaction pattern changed over time, as the lower-level participant as well as the higher-level partner actively engaged in the writing process and negotiated mediation. Collaborative peer interaction facilitated the learners to complete the L2 composition task and gain a sense of confidence in L2 writing.

Second, the L1 collaborative dialogue functioned as a crucial cognitive and social

tool for L2 learning and writing of the EFL students. L1 collaborative dialogues promoted the learners to maintain focus on the task, provide affective support with one another and deepen their understanding of the target language. Mutual scaffolding and private speech in L1 collaborative dialogues helped the learners to regulate their cognitive process of strategic L2 writing and L2 reflection. In addition, L1 collaborative dialogues served social functions of mediating communication and establishing intersubjectivity.

Third, collaborative dialogues in the Language-Related Episodes demonstrated that a high level of mutual scaffolding and mutual engagement facilitated the learners to consciously reflect on the L2 and co-construct L2 composition beyond their individual language competence. Both higher-level and lower-level participants actively initiated the discussion over linguistic problems and the peer interlocutors provided appropriate assistance attuned to the needs of their partner. The students mostly provided explicit forms of assistance, and negotiated the mediation offered by their peer interlocutors.

Lastly, lack of the learners' L2 linguistic knowledge and limited engagement of the pairs affected unsuccessfully resolved LREs. Proper use of other resources, the teacher and the dictionary, helped the students to resolve linguistic challenges outside their ZPDs during collaborative writing.

In conclusion, L1 collaborative dialogues of the Korean students in L2 pair writing created a cognitive and social space where the peer interlocutors mutually provided scaffolding with one another and actively engaged in writing process and L2 learning. This study suggests that collaborative dialogues in the shared L1 function as an integral mediating tool in the Korean learners' L2 pair writing. Thus, L2 pair writing tasks can

be an effective complement to the English writing courses in Korean high schools, when teachers unfasten the restrictions on the exclusive L2 use and create a collaborative learning environment while providing proper resources.

Key Words: collaborative dialogue, collective scaffolding, collaborative writing, peer interaction, Language-Related Episodes (LREs)

Student Number: 2010-21468



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                                                                                   |             |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| <b>ABSTRACT .....</b>                                                                             | <b>i</b>    |
| <b>TABLE OF CONTENTS .....</b>                                                                    | <b>v</b>    |
| <b>LIST OF TABLES .....</b>                                                                       | <b>viii</b> |
| <br>                                                                                              |             |
| <b>CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION .....</b>                                                               | <b>1</b>    |
| 1.1 The Purpose of the Study .....                                                                | 1           |
| 1.2 Research Questions .....                                                                      | 5           |
| 1.3 Organization of the Thesis .....                                                              | 6           |
| <br>                                                                                              |             |
| <b>CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW .....</b>                                                          | <b>7</b>    |
| 2.1 Pair Writing in Second/Foreign Language Learning .....                                        | 7           |
| 2.1.1 Definitions of Pair Writing .....                                                           | 7           |
| 2.1.2 Effects of Pair Writing on Second/Foreign Language Learning .....                           | 8           |
| 2.1.3 Variables in Pair Writing: Proficiency Difference and Patterns of<br>Pair Interaction ..... | 11          |
| 2.2 Collaborative Dialogue in Second/Foreign Language Learning .....                              | 13          |
| 2.2.1 Definitions of Collaborative Dialogue .....                                                 | 13          |
| 2.2.2 Functions of Collaborative Dialogue in Second/Foreign<br>Language Learning .....            | 15          |
| 2.2.3 Effects of Collaborative Dialogue on Second/Foreign Language<br>Learning .....              | 18          |

|                                                                                                                                      |           |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| 2.2.4 Dynamics of Collaborative Dialogue in Second/Foreign Language Learning .....                                                   | 19        |
| <b>CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY .....</b>                                                                                                   | <b>23</b> |
| 3.1 Participants .....                                                                                                               | 23        |
| 3.2 Procedures .....                                                                                                                 | 25        |
| 3.3 Data Analysis .....                                                                                                              | 28        |
| 3.3.1 Data Analysis for Research Question 1: Dyadic Interaction Patterns .....                                                       | 28        |
| 3.3.2 Data Analysis for Research Question 2: Functions of Collaborative Dialogue.....                                                | 31        |
| 3.3.3 Data Analysis for Research Question 3: Dynamics of Peer Interaction in Pair Writing in Terms of Language-Related Episodes..... | 32        |
| <b>CHAPTER 4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION .....</b>                                                                                        | <b>36</b> |
| 4.1 Dyadic Interaction Patterns in Pair Writing .....                                                                                | 36        |
| 4.1.1 General Interaction Pattern: Focusing on Dyad A .....                                                                          | 37        |
| 4.1.2 Transition in Interaction Pattern: Focusing on Dyad B.....                                                                     | 44        |
| 4.2 Functions of Collaborative Dialogue in Pair Writing .....                                                                        | 55        |
| 4.2.1 Maintaining Focus on the Task.....                                                                                             | 55        |
| 4.2.2 Providing Affective Support to the Peer Interlocutor.....                                                                      | 60        |
| 4.2.3 Promoting Self-regulation .....                                                                                                | 65        |

|                                                                                                                  |            |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| 4.2.4 Discussion on Functions of Collaborative Dialogue.....                                                     | 70         |
| 4.3 Dynamics of Peer Interaction in Pair Writing in Terms of Language-<br>Related Episodes.....                  | 72         |
| 4.3.1 Successfully Resolved Language-Related Episodes: Dynamics of<br>Collaborative Dialogues .....              | 73         |
| 4.3.1.1 Requested Assistance .....                                                                               | 73         |
| 4.3.1.2 Unrequested Assistance: Corrective Feedback .....                                                        | 80         |
| 4.3.2 Unsuccessfully Resolved Language-Related Episodes.....                                                     | 84         |
| 4.3.2.1 What Brings about the Unsuccessfully Resolved LREs .....                                                 | 85         |
| 4.3.2.2 How the Learners Resolve the Unsuccessfully Resolved<br>LREs: Turning to Other Available Resources ..... | 90         |
| <b>CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION .....</b>                                                                                | <b>96</b>  |
| 5.1 Summary of the Major Findings .....                                                                          | 96         |
| 5.2 Pedagogical Implications .....                                                                               | 100        |
| 5.3 Limitations of the Present Study and Suggestions for Future<br>Research.....                                 | 102        |
| <b>REFERENCES .....</b>                                                                                          | <b>106</b> |
| <b>APPENDICES .....</b>                                                                                          | <b>118</b> |
| <b>ABSTRACT IN KOREAN .....</b>                                                                                  | <b>127</b> |



## LIST OF TABLES

|                                                                                                                                 |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| TABLE 3.1 Description of the Participants.....                                                                                  | 24 |
| TABLE 3.2 Overview of the Procedures.....                                                                                       | 26 |
| TABLE 3.3 Patterns of Dyadic Interaction (Storch, 2002) .....                                                                   | 29 |
| TABLE 3.4 The General Levels of Transition from Intermental to Intramental<br>Functioning (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994: 470)..... | 31 |
| TABLE 3.5 Some Methods of Assistance Occurring during Classroom Peer<br>Interaction (Ohta, 2001: 89, slightly adapted).....     | 33 |

# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

The present study investigates how Korean high school learners of English collaborate with each other in pair writing and how collaborative dialogues affect pair writing and their language development. This chapter introduces the purpose of the study and research questions. Lastly, the organization of the thesis is laid out.

### **1.1 The Purpose of the Study**

The fundamental purpose of foreign language education is to develop communicative competence and self-regulation in a foreign language. For this purpose, it is crucial to improve all areas of language in a balanced way: speaking, listening, reading and writing. Thus, Revised National English Curriculum of Korea (Ministry of Education, Science and Technology, 2009) made it clear to promote integrative language development, including both receptive and productive skills in spoken and written mode. However, English instruction in Korean English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context has predominantly focused on receptive skills, listening and reading, while instruction on productive skills has been rarely implemented in secondary schools. As a result, Korean students perceived their speaking and writing proficiency to be relatively lower than listening and reading competence (Jeon, Lee, & Kim, 2011). In particular, English writing competence of Korean students is reported markedly lower than that of Chinese

and Japanese, and Korean students feel high anxiety about writing (Kwon, Yoshida, Watanabe, Negishi, & Naganuma, 2004). Since writing instruction has been rarely offered in Korean secondary schools (Jeong, 2013; Yang & Son, 2009), there has been a growing demand for writing instructions in Korean context in order to foster integrative English language development (Lee et al, 2011). However, research has found that a negative washback effect of CSAT (College Scholastic Ability Test) and classes with a large number of students make it challenging for English teachers to teach writing in secondary schools (Park, 2007). In this context, collaborative L2 writing has recently received attention as a viable solution for teaching L2 writing in classes where a teacher has difficulty in providing feedback to a large number of students (Kang, 2013; Kim & Lee, 2012; Seong, 2006).

From a theoretical perspective, collaborative learning is supported as an ideal type of learning in the social constructivist framework where knowledge is to be constructed through the social interaction (Vygotsky, 1978; Lantolf & Pavlenko, 1995; Wertsch, 1991) in that it provides ample opportunities for learners to participate in the co-construction process of knowledge (Storch & Wigglesworth, 2007). Sociocultural Theory (SCT) maintained that development is “the transformation of innate capacities once they intertwine with socioculturally constructed mediational means” (Lantolf & Pavlenko, 1995, p.109). In other words, the knowledge is initially developed at an intermental level (on the social plane) and is subsequently taken over or appropriated at an intramental level (on the psychological plane) (Vygotsky, 1981, p. 163), and learning occurs through external mediation in the social interaction and internal mediation through private speech (Lantolf, 2000).

Research on Second Language Acquisition (SLA) has focused on the external mediation, “scaffolding” or “collaborative dialogue”, in the social interaction to assist language learning. Vygotsky (1978) explained that a child or a novice develops their cognitive skills including literacy skills through social interaction with a more capable learner or an expert in the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), which is defined as “the distance between the actual developmental level by which a learner can solve a problem independently and the potential developmental level by which he can under the guidance of adult or in collaboration with more capable peers (Vygotsky, p.86)”. He maintained that for learning to be effective the assistance from a more capable learner, which is referred to as “scaffolding”, is crucial.

Donato (1994) indicated that “collective scaffolding” occurred in novice-novice interaction as well. He showed that learners drew on their resources and helped each other, and solved language-related problem which none of the learners had known prior to the task. Swain (2000) also demonstrated the importance of external mediation, but with a different term “collaborative dialogue”, emphasizing the dynamic nature of the dialogic mediation.

“Collaborative dialogue”, dialogue in which learners are engaged in joint problem solving and knowledge building, plays a critical role in language learning (Storch, 2001, 2002; Storch & Aldosari, 2012; Swain, 2000; Swain & Lapkin, 2000, 2001; Watanabe & Swain, 2007; Watanabe, 2008). Swain (1998) explained that the production (especially pushed output) in collaborative language production tasks encourages learners to notice ‘gaps’ in their knowledge of the target language, and prompts them to engage in co-constructing their second language and reflecting on the linguistic

knowledge (metatalk). Through collaborative dialogue learners deepen their awareness of the target language, leading to generate new linguistic knowledge and consolidate existing knowledge (Swain & Lapkin, 2000, 2001).

However, empirical studies have identified that collaborative writing does not always afford language learning (LaPierre, 1994; Leki, 1990; Nelson & Murphy, 1992; Storch, 2002; Swain & Lapkin, 1998). Some researchers noted that inaccurate decisions in peer interactions can be transferred to learners' L2 knowledge (LaPierre, 1994; Storch, 2002; Swain & Lapkin, 1998). Furthermore, a few researchers questioned the value of peer feedback due to the students' lack of trust of their peer interlocutor's comments and their lack of knowledge and skills to offer effective feedback (Leki, 1990; Nelson & Murphy, 1992). Upon these challenges, recent studies have proposed that the level of collaboration in peer interaction afforded the quality of task performance and language learning (Storch, 2001, 2002; Storch & Aldosari, 2012; Watanabe & Swain, 2007; Watanabe, 2008).

In this view, a few researches explored that certain aspects of collaborative dialogue among Korean EFL learners afforded foreign language learning in collaborative writing processes from various perspectives: L1 use (Huh, 2000), general characteristics of collaborative writing (Lee, 2012), role assignment during peer interaction (Kang, 2013), and the focus of LREs (Kim, 2012; Seo & Kim, 2011). However, the previous studies did not go into details of how Korean EFL learners collaborated with the peer interlocutor in the actual moment-to-moment interactions during collaborative writing. Furthermore, considering Korean EFL context where learners share their L1, Korean, more research is needed to see how the frequent use of L1 as a means of mediation

affect completion of pair writing. Though Seo and Kim (2011) and Huh (2000) displayed L1 collaborative dialogues in the process of collaborative writing, their analysis was limited at the level of sentence-construction. Therefore, this study attempts to explore how collaborative dialogues among peers enhance L2 writing process and language learning. In the pedagogical point of view, it is of importance for teachers to be aware of how learners engage with each other in collaborative dialogue. Since teachers can promote peer collaboration by guided training (Berg, 1999; Choi, 2008; Min, 2005, 2006; Tang & Tithecott, 1999), understanding the dynamics of collaboration among Korean learners would be a starting point in creating a facilitative L2 learning experience. In this regard, the purpose of the present study is to examine how Korean high school learners of English interact in pair writing and how collaborative dialogues affect L2 pair writing and their foreign language development. The present study is expected to aid teachers in managing collaborative writing more effectively by leading learners to scaffold each other in pairs in a facilitative way, and broaden our insights into foreign language learning in the social interaction.

## **1.2 Research Questions**

The present study aims to investigate how four Korean high school learners of English collaborate with each other in pair writing and how collaborative dialogues affect L2 pair writing and their foreign language development. To this end, the following questions are addressed:

- 1) What are dyadic interaction patterns of Korean high school students in EFL pair writing?
- 2) What are the functions of collaborative dialogues in Korean high school students' EFL pair writing?
- 3) What are the dynamics of peer interaction in Korean high school students' EFL pair writing in terms of Language-Related Episodes (LREs)?

### **1.3 Organization of the Thesis**

In addressing these questions, the thesis is structured as follows: Chapter 1 introduces the purpose of present study and the research questions. Chapter 2 reviews previous studies on pair writing and collaborative dialogue in peer interaction. The methodology employed in the study is described in Chapter 3, and Chapter 4 reports results of the microgenetic analysis of dyadic interaction patterns and the collaborative dialogues of the students in pair writing and discussions regarding the research questions. Chapter 5 summarizes the major findings of the study and pedagogical implications, and concludes with limitations of the present study and suggestions for future research.

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

This chapter presents a review of the previous studies relevant to the present study. Section 2.1 discusses collaborative writing in second/foreign language learning, narrowing it down into pair interactions. Section 2.2 proposes collaborative dialogue as the key element to successful collaborative writing and explores issues of collaborative dialogue in second/foreign language learning.

#### **2.1 Pair Writing in Second/Foreign Language Learning**

From the Sociocultural Theory perspective, collaborative pair/group work is encouraged since it promotes learners to actively engage in co-constructing knowledge (Storch & Wigglesworth, 2007). Thus, this section reviews collaborative pair writing in second/foreign language learning. Section 2.1.1 introduces the definitions of pair writing, and section 2.1.2 demonstrates the effects of pair writing on language learning. Section 2.1.3 proposes variables which affect the quality of pair writing focusing on the proficiency difference and the patterns of interaction.

##### **2.1.1 Definitions of Pair Writing**

Previous studies on pair/group work have focused on the peer interaction in the



revision process in which Ede and Lunsford (1990) referred to as “a single author/group discussion” (Mendonca & Johnson, 1994; Paulus, 1999). Despite the positive influence of peer feedback on writing, it has restrictions; the focus of the peer revision is on the product rather than the process, and learners have limited ownership of the text (McCarthy & McMahon, 1992). Therefore, recent research on collaborative writing promoted “singular texts/plural authors” (Ede & Lunsford, 1990), where more than two individuals collaborate with each other, sharing joint responsibility and co-ownership of the text and contributing to the decision making on all aspects of writing, including content, structure and language, throughout the writing process of planning, writing, and revising (Wells, Chang, & Maher, 1990). In line with them, Fung (2006) suggested the term “co-writing”, emphasizing the active engagement in the interaction and shared responsibility in the decision-making throughout the writing process. The present study follows this perspective on collaborative writing, which is defined as the coauthoring of a text by two or more writers, of which writers share the joint ownership (Storch, 2011).

### **2.1.2 Effects of Pair Writing on Second/Foreign Language Learning**

Research has proved that pair writing has positive effects on language learning (Dale, 1994; Kowal & Swain, 1994; Storch, 2005; Yong, 2006; Lee, 2012; Watanabe, 2008). Dale (1994) pointed out collaborative writing provided learners for the opportunities to observe how other learners think and write, and model after their peers’ thinking

strategies and writing styles. In addition, while peers discuss linguistic features of their text, they raise awareness of grammatical and lexical knowledge, leading to language development (Kowal & Swain, 1994; Lee, 2012). Moreover, peer collaboration establishes a cooperative learning environment and fosters a sense of confidence (Yong, 2006).

A number of empirical studies on collaborative writing have proved its positive effect on second/foreign language learning across age groups: elementary school students (Choi, 2008), secondary school students (Kang, 2013; Kim, 2012; Kim & Lee, 2012; Seo & Kim, 2011; Swain & Lapkin, 1998), undergraduates (Donato, 1994; Lee, 2012; Seong, 2006; Storch, 2005; Pae, 2009), and adult (DiCamilla & Antón, 1997; Wigglesworth & Storch, 2009). In particular, the impact of peer collaboration on grammatical and linguistic features of writing has been widely discussed (Kim, 2012; Lee, 2012; Pae, 2009; Storch, 2005; Wigglesworth & Storch, 2009). Storch (2005) showed that ESL learners in pairs produced shorter, but grammatically accurate and linguistically complex text compared to the individual writers in the study on intermediate-level university students in Australia. In the following study, Wigglesworth and Storch (2009) reported similar, but slightly different results. They showed that learners produced more accurate composition while working in pairs compared to individual writing, but collaboration did not influence fluency and complexity of their production. In the Korean EFL context, Pae (2009) and Lee (2012) showed that college students in pairs wrote more accurate texts than individual writers, although those two studies presented contradictory results in terms of fluency and complexity. Choi (2008) showed that 67 fifth grade elementary school students improved fluency and the

accuracy of sentence writing in a small group activity and collaborative writing positively influenced their attitudes toward English after peer-tutoring and ‘scaffolder’ training. On the other hand, high school students produced more fluent, but less accurate texts in collaborative writing (Kim, 2012). In addition, research indicated that collaborative writing helped raise learners’ confidence and interest in writing and ease the burden of writing (Kang, 2013; Kim & Lee, 2012; Seo & Kim, 2011).

Some research addressed a more pertinent question: whether collaborative writing, and the LREs produced thereby, resulted in language learning (Brooks & Swain, 2009; Kim, 2008; Watanabe & Swain, 2007). Kim (2008) compared the L2 Korean vocabulary learning of individual and collaborative dictogloss tasks. She concluded that collaborative writing led to fewer incorrect LREs and better scores in the post-test. In the study by Watanabe and Swain (2007), ESL Japanese learners retained the reformulation feedback in a subsequent individual writing after collaborative writing. Moreover, Brooks and Swain (2009) revealed that collaborative writing facilitated learning and peer collaboration was the most effective source of expertise. Two pairs of ESL adults participated in the four sessions: coauthoring, noticing (comparing and discussing their version of the text and the reformulated one), stimulated recall and individual revision sessions. The result showed that a high proportion of the linguistic problems peers had discussed in the coauthoring session were maintained in the post-test. Applying the concept of the ZPD (Vygotsky, 1978), they explained that peers provided feedback more attuned to the peer interlocutor’s needs and developmental stage, whereas reformulation and assistance by the researcher were out of the learners’ ZPDs.

In sum, the previous studies suggest that that learners benefited from working in

collaboration with peers in pairs. While completing tasks requiring written output, learners not only felt affective support and heightened confidence in writing, but also attended to and cognitively focused on language, verbalizing and reflecting on it in peer interaction.

### **2.1.3 Variables in Pair Writing: Proficiency Difference and Patterns of Pair Interaction**

Many factors have been proposed to affect the language development in collaborative writing, among which L2 proficiency differences in pairs has been widely studied as a critical variable. Leiser (2004) maintained that learners engage in Language-Related Episodes (LREs) – ‘any part of a dialogue where students talk about the language they are producing, question their language use, or correct themselves or others’ (Swain & Lapkin, 1998, p.326) – more frequently and correctly, as the overall proficiency of pairs is higher. While Storch (2001) and Kim and McDonough (2008) proposed that pairs work more collaboratively with interlocutors from different proficiency levels, Kowal and Swain (1994) contradicted the finding, claiming that too much difference in proficiency might intimidate the lower-level participant. Ohta (1995) concluded that both the expert and novice in a heterogeneous peer can benefit from collaboration, as the individuals pool their respective strengths and weaknesses to solve the specific language problem.

However, recent research has argued that patterns of pair interaction, or dyadic relationship, rather than proficiency differences have a greater effect on task performance and language learning (Storch, 2001, 2002; Storch & Aldosari, 2012; Watanabe & Swain, 2007; Watanabe, 2008). Storch (2001) indicated characteristics of collaborative interactions in terms of linguistic features (predominance of first-person plural pronouns and directives), text co-construction and metatalk (the number of LREs, interactive responses, and evidence of scaffolding). She classified four patterns of dyadic interaction based upon equality and mutuality (Damon & Phelps, 1989): collaborative, expert/novice, dominant/dominant, and dominant/passive pattern (Storch, 2002). She concluded that collaborative and expert/novice pattern of interaction facilitated language learning. Watanabe and Swain (2007) investigated effects of proficiency difference and patterns of pair interaction on ESL learning of Japanese adults. In the study, core participants were paired with higher and lower proficiency non-core participants. The results showed that as the overall proficiency of the pair increased, the pair interacted more collaboratively (collaborative and expert/novice pattern). One interesting point was that proficiency differences facilitated L2 learning under the condition that the pairs engaged in a collaborative pattern of interaction. Watanabe (2008) and Storch and Aldosari (2012) showed similar results that the dyadic relationship, in which learners 'share more ideas', influenced the nature of peer assistance more significantly than proficiency pairing. In the study on Korean junior high school learners of English, Seo and Kim (2011) also found that patterns of pair interaction had a great effect on the frequency of LREs.

The previous studies demonstrate that the dynamics of peer interaction is a decisive

factor affecting language development in collaborative writing. Hence, the present study attempts to further examine how the dynamics of collaborative writing affect task performance and language learning.

## **2.2 Collaborative Dialogue in Second/Foreign Language**

### **Learning**

Probing into how peer interaction assists learning, this section reviews previous literatures with regard to collaborative dialogue. Section 2.2.1 offers definitions of collaborative dialogue, and section 2.2.2 shows functions of collaborative dialogue. Section 2.2.3 demonstrates empirical studies on the effects of collaborative dialogue on second/foreign language learning. Lastly, section 2.2.4 presents the dynamics of collaborative dialogue in second/foreign language learning.

### **2.2.1 Definitions of Collaborative Dialogue**

Studies on SLA from the sociocultural perspective claimed that the external mediation in the social interaction plays a key role in language learning under the terms “scaffolding” and “collaborative dialogue” (Vygotsky, 1978; Swain, 2000). Scaffolding has been defined by several researchers (Wood, Bruner & Ross, 1976; Donato, 1994). Wood, Bruner and Ross (1976) said it refers to ‘a process that enables a child or novice

to solve a problem, carry out a task, or achieve a goal which would be beyond his unassisted efforts (p.90).’ Donato (1994) stated that scaffolding means ‘a social interaction in which a knowledgeable participant can create, by means of speech, supportive conditions in which the novice can participate in, and extend current skills and knowledge to higher levels of competence (p.40).’

However, a number of studies have supported that scaffolding can occur in peer interactions (Donato, 1994; Kowal & Swain, 1994; Ohta, 1995; Seo & Kim, 2011; Swain & Lapkin, 1998; Watanabe, 2008). Swain and her co-researchers showed L2 French learners collectively decide language forms in dictogloss tasks (Kowal & Swain, 1994) and jigsaw writing (Swain & Lapkin, 1998). Ohta (1995) demonstrated that the role of the expert in pair work can be ‘fluid’ in Japanese FL role-play task, and both expert and novice could benefit from the interaction as the expert can also learn from teaching others (van Lier, 1996). In addition, Watanabe (2008) mentioned that both higher-level and lower-level counterparts provided opportunities for learning when collaboratively writing essays. In Korean EFL context, Seo and Kim (2011) presented that less proficient learners were also able to provide assistance in L2 as well as in L1 to more proficient counterparts during peer interaction.

In this context, recent research prefers the term “collaborative dialogue”. Ellis (2008) pointed out that the term scaffolding had lost the dynamic dialogic nature of interaction, treated as an apparatus (for example, the IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback) exchange) and that it was difficult to apply in peer-peer interaction. Collaborative dialogue is defined as ‘dialogue in which participants are engaged in problem solving and knowledge building’ (Swain, 2000, p.102). In second language learning, she put it as

'language use mediating language learning (p.97)'. To illustrate, collaborative dialogue occurs when learners use language, either the L1 or the L2, to draw attention to problems and consciously attend to the language they produced while they collaborated to achieve a task. This study is founded on the Swain's concept of collaborative dialogue which facilitates the appropriation of both strategic processes and linguistic knowledge (p.113).

## **2.2.2 Functions of Collaborative Dialogue in Second/ Foreign Language Learning**

Research has studied how assisted performance drives learning forward in the interaction (Guerrero & Villamil, 2000; Lidz, 1991; Wood, Bruner & Ross, 1976). Wood, Bruner and Ross (1976) identified the functions of scaffolding as follows. The tutor recruited the learner's interest in the task, and enabled the learners to simplify the task and maintain pursuit of the goal. By providing scaffolding, he marked critical features and discrepancies between what had been produced and the ideal solution, and demonstrated an idealized version of the act to be performed, controlling frustration during problem solving (p.98).

Drawing on the mechanisms of scaffolding from Wood, Bruner and Ross (1976) and Lidz's (1991) scale for measuring mediated instruction, Guerrero and Villamil (2000) microgenetically analyzed two intermediate ESL college learners, speakers of Spanish in two revision sessions. They stated that facilitative scaffolding displayed recruiting



interest in the task and marking critical aspects or discrepancies in the writer's text. Often, learners explicitly instructed on grammar and mechanics, and modeled the ideal expressions. Moreover, they pointed out that participants displayed certain characteristics during collaborative revision; Learners were willing to influence his partner's action, and attempted to make the task manageable to accomplish goals. They responded to the partner's cues accordingly and often elicited clarification or correction, and thought of themselves as a team 'we' and offered affective assistance (p. 64). Lantolf (2000) summarized the features of assisted performance as follows: (1) maintaining focus on the task, (2) providing affective support to the learner, and (3) promoting self-regulation.

Though the use of L1, learner's first language, has been suppressed based upon communicative language teaching approaches which underscore the importance of using L2 in foreign language learning, implicitly suggesting detrimental effects of L1 use on L2 learning (Kellerman, 1995; Shrum & Gilsan, 2005), researches within the sociocultural interactionist approach have shown that L1 collaborative dialogue mediates L2 learning in various language learning context: in EFL context (Antón & DiCamilla, 1998; Brooks & Donato, 1994; DiCamilla & Antón, 1997; Huh, 2000; Scott & de la Fuente, 2008), in immersion classrooms (Swain & Lapkin, 2000), and ESL context (Villamil & Guerrero, 1996; Mendoca & Johnson, 1994; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003). Analyzing pair dialogues of third-year high school learners of Spanish, Brooks and Donato (1994) mentioned that L1 use is a normal psycholinguistic process to gain control over language. DiCamilla and Antón (1997) presented adult learners of Spanish used repetition, either in the L1 or the L2, to scaffold each other. They further

investigated the effect of L1 use during collaboration, and concluded that the L1 served to provide scaffolded help to each other, establish and maintain intersubjectivity, and externalize their inner speech (Antón & DiCamilla, 1998). Scott and de la Fuente (2008) also noted that use of the L1 (English) encouraged intermediate-level learners of French and Spanish to reduce cognitive overload, sustain collaborative interaction and develop metalinguistic terminology during consciousness-raising, form-focused tasks. In Korean EFL context, Huh (2000) maintained that Korean high school students negotiated learning through their L1 in group composition. She revealed that learners use the L1, Korean, not only for social functions but also for cognitive functions, either to negotiate scaffolding or to utilize private or inner speech while co-constructing L2 writing.

Moreover, Swain and Lapkin (2000) showed that grade 8 students in a French immersion program used English (L1) in dictogloss and jigsaw tasks and their L1 use helped students to understand the requirements and content of the task, to focus attention on language form, vocabulary use and overall organization, and to establish the tone of collaboration. They also argued that L1 use facilitated L2 learning particularly for low-proficiency students and on complex tasks. In ESL context, though the status of L1 differs from those where the learners' L1 is the dominant language of the community, Mendoca and Johnson (1994) and Storch and Wigglesworth (2003) found that ESL college students' L1 use was beneficial to promote scaffolding in meaning-focused activities, such as peer revision in L2 writing and the joint composition task.

To summarize, the previous studies support that collaborative dialogues in L1 as well as in L2 served to enhance L2 learning. Thus, the present study investigates the functions of the Korean high school students' collaborative dialogues, in either the L1 or

the L2, in comparison with the previous studies.

### **2.2.3 Effects of Collaborative Dialogue on Second/ Foreign Language Learning**

Effects of collaborative dialogue on second/foreign language learning have been studied by several researchers (Villamil & Guerrero, 1998; Ohta, 2001; Davidson, 2000; Swain & Lapkin, 1998; Swain, Brooks, and Tocalli-Beller, 2002). Swain and Lapkin (1998) showed that L2 French learners collaborated to write a story based on a set of pictures, jointly constructing performance beyond individual learner's competence. They concluded that LREs provided opportunities for language learning, comparing the pre-test and post-test data. Davidson (2000) presented that L2 French junior high school students in peer-peer interaction showed significant progress of the target grammar *conditional*, and the gains maintained long after the course. Villamil and Guerrero (1998) also found out that the adult L2 Spanish learners incorporated what they had discussed during collaborative dialogue into their individual writing afterwards.

Although Swain, Brooks and Tocalli-Beller (2002) commented that 'few adverse effects of working collaboratively were noted (p.171)', there has been some concerns that inaccurate decisions in peer mediation might be transferred to learners' L2 competence. Though Ohta (2001) mentioned that contrary to the laboratory study, collaborative dialogue in the classroom induced low rates of erroneous incorporations, LaPierre (1994), Storch (2002) and Swain and Lapkin (1998) noted that learners

retained the negotiated solutions in LREs, both correct and incorrect ones. Hence, it is worth noting what aspects of collaborative dialogue lead learners to decide inaccurate linguistic choices and how they can resolve erroneous decisions during collaborative dialogue in this study.

## **2.2.4 Dynamics of Collaborative Dialogue in Second/ Foreign Language Learning**

Probing into the interaction process, researchers noticed that certain aspects of collaborative dialogue/scaffolding afforded second/foreign language learning in collaborative writing (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994; Gutiérrez, 2008; Kang, 2013; Kim, 2012; Lee, 2012; Ohta, 2000, 2001; Seo & Kim, 2011; Storch, 2005; Storch, 2008; Wigglesworth & Storch, 2009). The term *affordance* was defined by van Lier (2000) as ‘a particular property of the environment that is relevant to an active, perceiving organism in that environment. An affordance affords further action (but does not cause or trigger it) (p.252).’ Thus, this section reviews the previous studies on the dynamics of the linguistic environment during collaborative writing which encouraged participants to appropriate their linguistic knowledge.

Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994) investigated the interaction between ESL learners and a tutor during corrective feedback on essays, and identified that effective scaffolding was graduated (‘starting with help which is more implicit and gradually becomes specific until the appropriate level is reached’), contingent (‘offered only when it is needed, and

withdrawn as soon as the novice shows signs of self-control and ability to function independently'), and dialogic ('achieved through the medium of dialogue') (p. 468). Ohta (2000) extended their concept of scaffolding into peer-peer interaction. She studied two L2 university-level Japanese learners' collaborative dialogue during translation tasks. She found that peer assistance was not oriented to the error itself, but to the 'subtle interactional cues'. In other words, mutual sensitivity to their interlocutors' bid for help was a key to collaboration. Collaborative dialogue also resulted in greater independence of the lower-proficiency learner, beyond which provision of assistance was withheld.

Storch (2005) examined collaborative dialogues of twenty-three students in L2 pair writing in terms of seven focus areas: task clarification, generating ideas, LREs, structure, interpreting graphic prompt, reading/re-reading, and others. She concluded that learners mostly spent time on actual writing and generating ideas. She mentioned that learners mutually provided and received immediate feedback on language, and valued their peer interlocutor's comments, since they shared ownership of the text. Scrutinizing the collaborative text reconstruction task, Storch (2008) proposed that the depth of attention and engagement in the LREs influenced language learning, based upon the distinction between elaborate noticing and simple noticing suggested by Kuiken and Vedder (2002). She revealed that elaborated engagement, where learners deliberated over alternatives, questioned and explained their suggestions, led to better consolidation/learning in the subsequent individual text reconstruction task to both members of the pair rather than limited levels of engagement, where learners simply stated the linguistic item without further deliberation.

Some researchers have focused on the types of LREs in collaborative dialogue (Kim, 2012; Seo & Kim, 2011; Wigglesworth & Storch, 2009). Kim (2012) and Seo and Kim (2011) found that Lexis-LREs were most frequent, followed by Form-LREs and Mechanical-LREs in L1 collaborative dialogue of Korean secondary students. In the L2 context, Wigglesworth and Storch (2009) found similar results. They analyzed that pairs mostly discussed over idea generation and LREs, among which Lexis-LREs accounted for over a half of the total LREs, particularly regarding word choices.

In Korean EFL context, research has investigated aspects of L1 collaborative dialogue conducive to L2 learning (Kang, 2013; Lee, 2012). Based upon Schiffirin's (1994) classification of roles in group work, Kang (2013) demonstrated that learners shared and assumed various roles such as giving guidance, monitoring grammar and vocabulary, assuring understanding of the provided information, and supplying the relevant context. Lee (2012) stated six features of collaborative dialogue in Korean college students' pair writing. Collaborative dialogue enhanced their grammatical knowledge and activated lexical knowledge. While they co-constructed building blocks of sentences, they often informed alternative expressions to each other. Learners also offered on-the-spot revisions and helped each other with translation.

Ohta (2001) and Gutiérrez (2008) showed the mechanisms of assistance during collaborative dialogue by microgenetic analysis. In a longitudinal study of Japanese as a foreign language classroom, Ohta (2001) investigated how learners provided scaffolded help in role-play tasks. She found that they waited patiently until the peer interlocutor finished their utterances before intervention, and prompted the other to continue by repeating the partner's previous utterance, and co-constructed to the completion of the

utterances. The learner providing assistance as well as the one receiving it benefited from the collaborative dialogue, and learning was manifested by the increasing independence of the learners.

Gutiérrez (2008) analyzed the collaborative dialogue of three problem-solving tasks, half in paper-based and the other half computer-based, in the Spanish FL class for undergraduate students. She outlined the microgenesis phases and identified two types of microgenesis affordance: assistance and affordance. Overt assistance based on corrective feedback was presented in L1 reply, paraphrase followed by L1 reply and co-construction. The latter was co-constructed linguistic environment by the participants involved, when the learners approached the task differently to their advantage (interwoven consciousness) or when the peer matched up the structure produced by the other to his own knowledge (mapping knowledge).

The previous studies showed various aspects of collaborative dialogues which fostered language learning during pair writing. However, further research is needed to examine the moment-to moment unfolding of collaborative dialogues and how collaborative dialogues, mostly in L1 in the Korean EFL context, facilitate L2 language learning. Accordingly, the present study attempts to examine how Korean high school learners engage in the collaborative dialogue, requesting, providing and negotiating assistance to the peer interlocutor in pair composition tasks.

## **CHAPTER 3**

### **METHODOLOGY**

This chapter explains the methodology employed in the present study. Section 3.1 and 3.2 lay out the description of the participants and procedures. Then, section 3.3 provides the details of data coding and analysis method with regards to the research questions addressed.

#### **3.1 Participants**

The participants were four Korean students in the 10<sup>th</sup> grade at a high school in Gyeonggi Province in South Korea. They volunteered to take English writing course as an extracurricular class, and they showed high motivation in learning L2 writing. Their English proficiency was intermediate-low level in ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines (1986). However, they were novice in writing, as none of them had taken writing courses before, though one student (Kyungjin) had participated in the book review club where she wrote book reviews and received feedback from the native English teacher. The participants selected their own pairs and dyad A and dyad B formed a heterogeneous group respectively. Based on the English scores on a nationally administered mock CSAT, each pair consisted of a relatively higher-level L2 learner and a lower-level learner. Although CAST scores do not measure students' writing ability directly, they function as an indicator of learners' general English proficiency. The



pairing was in line with the previous studies (Kim & McDonough, 2008; Ohta, 1995; Storch, 2001) that a pair with L2 proficiency level difference is more conducive to language learning. All of the participants were female, which conformed to the findings that Korean students learned and interacted more in a group of the same gender (Lee & Yoo, 2003). The description of participants is listed under pseudonyms (Table 3.1).

**TABLE 3.1**  
**Description of the Participants**

|        | Participants | English score<br>scale in CAST | Year they started<br>learning English | Overseas<br>Experiences |
|--------|--------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Dyad A | Hyejung      | 1                              | 1 <sup>st</sup> grade                 | 2 months                |
|        | Kyungjin     | 2                              | 7 <sup>th</sup> grade                 | None                    |
| Dyad B | Hyunhwa      | 1                              | 1 <sup>st</sup> grade                 | None                    |
|        | Nayoung      | 4                              | 5 <sup>th</sup> grade                 | None                    |

Dyad A consisted of two close friends: Hyejung, higher-level participant (level 1 in CSAT<sup>1</sup>), and Kyungjin, lower-level one (level 2 in CSAT), but the L2 proficiency difference was relatively small compared with that of dyad B. The student language background survey (Appendix 1) responded before the writing program showed that the year when they started learning English also differed, as Hyejung began learning English in the 1<sup>th</sup> grade in the elementary school, while Kyungjin did in the 7<sup>th</sup> grade

---

<sup>1</sup> CAST test ranks the performance of students on a scale of 1 to 9, 1 being the highest and 9 the lowest on the percentile rank.

through tutoring. Among the four participants, only Hyejung had an opportunity to study English abroad, in the Philippines for two months, which might have affected her attitude toward learning English. While Kyungjin perceived learning English “difficult”, Hyejung thought of it as “always new”, and “need to study more.” Both participants of the dyad A were active learners with high motivation in L2 learning. They attempted to communicate in the L2 during collaborative writing and actively engaged in the writing process.

Dyad B was also composed of two good friends: Hyunhwa, higher-level participant (level 1 in CSAT), and Nayoung, lower-level one (level 4 in CSAT), and their L2 proficiency difference was quite large. Hyunhwa started learning English in the 1<sup>st</sup> grade with home-school materials, while Nayoung began in the 5<sup>th</sup> grade at the supplementary educational institute. There was a huge difference between their attitudes toward learning English as well. While Hyunhwa replied English as her favorite subject, Nayoung perceived it “hard and difficult.” In particular, Nayoung showed low self-esteem in learning English at the beginning of the program, which was manifested in her passive and reserved attitude during collaborative writing.

## **3.2 Procedures**

The students participated in collaborative writing for 4 weeks once a week for 90 minutes (or more) each class. Before the research began, they responded to the student English language background survey (Appendix 1) so that the researcher could

comprehend their background on previous English language learning and writing experiences. Orientation of the class was provided before the instruction started in order to have learners get to know each other and to help them understand the guidelines for the writing process and collaborative writing.

**TABLE 3.2**  
**Overview of the Procedures**

| Week | Guided writing activity      | Topics for collaborative writing           | Topic Sentences of the Dyadic writing (Dyad A (A)/ Dyad B (B))                                                               |
|------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1    | Writing topic sentences      | The main food/ drink in my country         | (A) Rice cake is eaten in three occasions in Korea.<br>(B) Food made with chili powder are hot, but delicious.               |
| 2    | Writing supporting sentences | A specialty/ delicacy in my country        | (A) The delicacy in our country is Samgyetang.<br>(B) Samgyetang is one of delicacy food in Korea.                           |
| 3    | Writing concluding sentences | An animal/ insect that is a problem        | (A) Many people dislike mosquitoes because of several reasons.<br>(B) A pigeon is harmful to people for several reasons.     |
| 4    | Organization                 | Advantages/ Disadvantages of biotechnology | (A) We think plant biotechnology has many disadvantages.<br>(B) There are some disadvantages of biotechnology for creatures. |

Table 3.2 outlines the overview of the procedures. Each class included two sessions. In the first session, learners analyzed a model essay with assistance of the teacher and worked on the guided writing exercises. Students practiced guided writing activities focusing on the process of writing step-by-step: writing topic sentences, writing supporting sentences, writing concluding sentences, and organization. The model essays and guided writing activities were extracted from the student study book, “Weaving it Together 2: Connecting Reading and Writing (Broukal, 2010)”, and guided writing activity was modified by the researcher to promote learners’ understanding. In the second session, the learners collaborated to plan, write the first draft, revise it, and complete the final draft in pairs about the topic provided by the researcher (refer to Appendix 2 for the example of the collaborative writing worksheet). Students participated in the process writing regarding various topics: the main food/drink in my country, a specialty/delicacy in my country, an animal/insect that is a problem, and advantages/disadvantages of biotechnology. The topics were related to the model essay in the first session, which helped participants to activate background knowledge and enhance vocabulary regarding the topic. They brainstormed together about the topics provided, wrote their own topic sentences and organized their ideas into a paragraph: three expository writings (week 1-3) and one argumentative writing (week 4). Pairs spent around 28 to 65 minutes to write a paragraph and produced a paragraph around 54 to 132 words. The students tended to spend more time and to produce longer texts with some improvements in vocabulary and grammar as the program progressed. They received a written feedback on their draft from the native English teacher the next week.

At the end of the course, individual student interviews were conducted to understand

their perception of collaborative writing. The interview centered around students' reflection on their peer interaction during pair writing and their attitude toward collaborative writing (refer to Appendix 3 for the individual interview questions).

### **3.3 Data Analysis**

Dyadic interaction during collaborative writing and individual student interviews was videotaped and audiotaped, and examined for a detailed analysis of the collaborative dialogue in pair writing. Learners mostly used their L1, Korean for discussion. Therefore, their dialogues were first transcribed in Korean and then translated into English. The utterances in L1 were transcribed in *italics* and detailed descriptions of the transcription conventions are laid out in Appendix 4. Transcriptions of the peer interaction were segmented into three phases of process writing: planning, drafting, and revising, and analyzed in detail with respect to each research question.

#### **3.3.1 Data Analysis for Research Question 1: Dyadic Interaction**

##### **Patterns**

First of all, patterns of dyadic interaction were determined based on equality (authority over the task) and mutuality (the level of engagement with each other's contribution) of the pair work following the framework suggested by Storch (2002) (see

Table 3.3). The pair interaction was classified as “collaborative interaction”, where participants showed high equality over the decision-making process on all parts of the task and exhibited moderate to high mutuality, actively offering suggestions and negotiating with each other. “Dominant/dominant interaction” showed moderate to high equality and low mutuality. In this pattern, students seemed to equally contribute to the task, but they were unwilling to engage with each other’s contribution, and consensus was rarely reached. When both equality and mutuality were considered moderate to low, the dyadic interaction was determined as “dominant/passive interaction”, where the dominant participant took control of the decision-making throughout the task while the passive one barely attempted to neither contribute nor negotiate. Lastly, “expert/novice interaction” displayed low equality and high mutuality, where expert participant guided the novice to take part in the task.

**TABLE 3.3**  
**Patterns of Dyadic Interaction (Storch, 2002)**

| Patterns          | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|-------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Collaborative     | Both learners work together on all parts of the task, and they are willing to offer ideas and engage with each other’s ideas, leading to resolutions that seem acceptable to both participants.                                              |
| Dominant/dominant | Both learners contribute to the task, but they have a high level of disagreement and are often unable to reach consensus.                                                                                                                    |
| Dominant/passive  | One learner takes an authoritarian stance while the other learner adopts a more passive, subservient role. There is little negotiation because the passive learner rarely contributes ideas or challenges the ideas of the dominant learner. |
| Expert/novice     | One learner takes control over the task by acting as an expert and encourages the other learner to participate in the task.                                                                                                                  |

Defining characteristics of collaborative interaction proposed by Storch (2001) also aided in categorizing interaction patterns. She suggested the collaborative nature of interaction in terms of three aspects: linguistic features, text construction behavior, and metatalk (LREs). This study utilized her measures in analyzing interaction patterns. Linguistically, when first-person plural pronouns “we” were predominant and directives were rare, the interaction was analyzed to display collaborative characteristics. Second, text co-construction behavior manifested high level of mutuality, equality and negotiations in collaborative interaction. Third, the dynamics of collaborative interaction in LREs displayed active initiation of LREs by participants, interactive and reciprocal responses by the peer interlocutor, and evidence of scaffolding. It should be noted that all three aspects of the characteristics were taken into comprehensive consideration to assess the nature of the interaction.

Based on the interaction pattern analysis, changes in the dyadic relationship over time were investigated. Microgenetic growth was determined when learners shifted from object-regulation (controlled by the objects in their environment) to other-regulation (controlled by others in their environment, namely a tutor or peers) and to self-regulation (gaining control over their own social and cognitive activities) (Frawley & Lantolf, 1985). For the analysis, “the general levels of transition from intermental to intramental functioning” proposed by Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994, p.470) were adopted, which classified the levels of regulation according to the need for intervention, the ability to notice the error, and the ability to correct it (see Table 3.4).

**TABLE 3.4**  
**The General Levels of Transition from Intermental  
to Intramental Functioning (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994: 470)**

| Level | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1     | The learner is not able to notice or correct the error, even with intervention from the tutor.                                                                                                                         |
| 2     | The learner is able to notice the error, but cannot correct it, even with intervention.                                                                                                                                |
| 3     | The learner is able to notice and correct the error, but only under other-regulation.                                                                                                                                  |
| 4     | The learner notices and corrects an error with minimal, or no obvious feedback from the tutor and begins to assume full responsibility for error correction.                                                           |
| 5     | The learner becomes more consistent in using the target structure correctly in all contexts. Noticing and correcting of error, when they arise, do not require intervention. Thus, the individual is fully integrated. |

### **3.3.2 Data Analysis for Research Question 2: Functions of Collaborative Dialogue**

For the second research question, the transcribed dialogues in collaborative interaction patterns were segmented into episodes. An episode was a single turn, or a number of turns, which embodied a focus on particular functions of collaborative dialogue. The episodes were categorized into three functions of assisted performance: (1) maintaining focus on the task, (2) providing affective support to the peer interlocutor,



and (3) promoting self-regulation (Lantolf, 2000), and studied in detail.

### **3.3.3 Data Analysis for Research Question 3: Dynamics of Peer Interaction in Pair Writing in Terms of Language-Related Episodes**

Regarding the third research question, dynamics of peer interaction in LREs were microgenetically analyzed (Wertsch, 1991) to reveal the sequential development of the pair dialogue and the moment-to-moment changes in behavior that signaled language development during peer interaction. The transcriptions concerning discussions over language were segmented into the episodes, and were divided into successfully and unsuccessfully resolved LREs depending on the accuracy of the linguistic decisions made by the pairs.

First, for successfully resolved LREs, the initiation, assistance provision, and negotiation during LREs were microgenetically analyzed in an attempt to show the dynamics of collaborative dialogues, adapting microgenesis phases by Gutiérrez (2008). The episodes were categorized into requested and unrequested assistance, based on the direction of the initiation of LREs. Requested assistance included LREs where the struggling participant initiated LREs in order to resolve the linguistic problem at hand, which were divided into direct and indirect request. Unrequested assistance was provided in the form of corrective feedback, when the peer interlocutor made an error.

**TABLE 3.5**  
**Some Methods of Assistance Occurring**  
**during Classroom Peer Interaction (Ohta, 2001: 89, slightly adapted)**

| Methods                                                                                                                                                     | Level of<br>Explicitness | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| (1) When the peer interlocutor is struggling                                                                                                                |                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| Waiting                                                                                                                                                     | 1                        | One partner gives the other, even when struggling, time to complete an utterance without making any contribution.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| Prompting                                                                                                                                                   | 2                        | Partner repeats the syllable or word just uttered, helping the interlocutor to continue.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| Co-<br>construction                                                                                                                                         | 2-3                      | Partner contributes a syllable, word, phrase, or grammatical particle that completes or works toward completion of the utterance. This includes prompts that occur in the absence of an error, when the learner stops speaking, or produces false starts.                                                                                                                                                             |
| Explaining                                                                                                                                                  | 4                        | Partner explains in native language.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| (2) When the peer interlocutor makes an error, partners use the above methods (waiting, co-construction and prompting) as well as the methods listed below. |                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| NTRI<br>(without<br>repair)                                                                                                                                 | 1-2                      | Partner indicates that the preceding utterance is somehow problematic (for example, by saying “huh?” or “what?”.) When the NTRI is in the form of a prompt, it more explicitly targets the error. The NTRI provides an opportunity for the interlocutor to consider the utterance and self-correct. This is the case even when the NTRI is triggered by comprehension difficulties rather than by a linguistic error. |
| NTRI<br>(provide)                                                                                                                                           | 3                        | Partner initiates and carries out repair (either fully or partially by providing a syllable, word, or phrase to the interlocutor. These may be in the form of recasts, which build semantically on the learner’s utterance but change or expand it.)                                                                                                                                                                  |
| Asking                                                                                                                                                      | 4                        | Peer partner notices their interlocutor’s error and asks the teacher about it.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |

Key: Level of Explicitness from least explicit (1) to most explicit (4)

NTRI = Next Turn Repair Initiator

Then dynamics of both types of assistance were examined, based on “methods of assistance during classroom peer interaction” proposed by Ohta (2001, p.89) (see Table 3.5). The table listed methods of assistance during peer interactions when the peer interlocutor was struggling and when she made an error. The level of explicitness was determined by how much information the assistance offered to the peer interlocutor, with level 1 indicating the least explicit and level 4 indicating the most explicit forms of assistance. When a learner showed signs of struggle, usually noted with signals, such as raising question intonation ([?]), elongating the final syllable of the last word ([:]), resorting to L1 private speech to gain control over the language or eye contact seeking assistance, the peer interlocutor may simply wait, repeat what their partner said to help her continue (prompting), make a contribution to complete the utterance started by the peer (co-construction), or provide explanation to one another (explaining). When a learner made a linguistic error, her partner may use one of the previously mentioned types of assistance, use next turn repair initiators (NTRI) specifically denoting there was something wrong with the utterance (NTRI (without repair)) or expanding it (NTRI (provide)), or request assistance to the teacher (asking).

Concerning unsuccessfully resolved LREs, in an attempt to figure out how interaction patterns affected the quality of peer dialogue, LREs were coded into elaborated (E) and limited engagement (L), based upon the study by Storch (2008). The LREs where learners deliberated over alternatives, questioned and explained their suggestions were coded as Elaborated engagement (E). Limited engagement was divided into two levels: the LREs where one learner made a suggestion and the other repeated or extended on it, showing both participants attending to the language were coded as (L+L), whereas the

LREs where one made a suggestion and the other responded with a phatic utterance or did not respond at all were coded as limited engagement (L) by one participant only (p. 101). Moreover, further analysis of the episodes where pairs were able to resolve the unsuccessfully resolved LREs with the help of other resources followed, which could supplement the limitations of peer collaborative writing.

## **CHAPTER 4**

### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

This chapter is divided into three sections where each research question is addressed. Section 4.1 examines patterns of dyadic interaction in the four Korean EFL learners' pair writing. Section 4.2 investigates functions of collaborative dialogues, mostly in L1, in Korean EFL learners' pair writing. Lastly, section 4.3 probes into the microgenetic analysis of the LREs during collaborative writing, attempting to find general dynamics of collaborative dialogues of the four Korean EFL learners and issues regarding the inaccurate linguistic decisions made in peer interaction.

#### **4.1 Dyadic Interaction Pattern in Pair Writing**

Based on the model of dyadic interaction (Storch, 2002), patterns of peer interaction of dyad A and B for 4 weeks (A total of 8 dyadic interaction) were determined. There was a general dyadic interaction pattern in the pair writing of the four Korean high school students, though dyad B had undergone a transition in the interaction patterns. Section 4.1.1 demonstrates the general interaction pattern focusing on dyad A, and section 4.1.2 probes into the transition in interaction pattern focusing on dyad B.

### 4.1.1 General Interaction Pattern: Focusing on Dyad A

Dyad A was consistently engaged in a collaborative interaction during dyadic writing from week 1 to 4. In Excerpt 1, Kyungjin (the lower-level participant) and Hyejung (the higher-level participant) gathered their ideas together to write about a Korean delicacy, samgyetang, chicken soup with ginseng. After they had agreed on the overall organization (topic sentence, supporting ideas and concluding sentence), they began to write their first draft.

EXCERPT 1. Peer Interaction of Dyad A at the beginning of the drafting phase in  
week 2

- 1 HJ *Let's write the topic sentence first.*<sup>2</sup>
- 2 K Okay. I'll write.
- 3 HJ Okay. (Kyungjin wrote down the topic sentence they had agreed on; "The delicacy in our country is Samgyetang.")
- 4 K *But we didn't put in any examples. Let's use quotations like "one student said I love Samgyetang." (with an acting gesture)=*
- 5 HJ *=You're right. Let's write the supporting sentence and add something like an example to support this. We eat Samgyetang(.) Let's copy this sentence (pointing to the supporting sentence 1) and write quotation or something.*
- 6 K We eat Samgyetang during the peak of summer. (Verbalizing the supporting sentence as she wrote it down.)
- 7 HJ *Something like a quotation (.) about this?*

---

<sup>2</sup> Transcription in *italics* means that the utterances were originally provided in L1, Korean, and translated into English by the researcher.

- 8 K *Let's take an example of my grandmother.*
- 9 HJ *Okay.*
- 10 K *One instance is my grandmother (.)*
- 11 HJ *Why don't you just write "My grandmother said that"?*
- 12 K *Everyone should eat Samgyetang. (accepting Hyejung's suggestion and extending on it; writing down the sentence)  
Done. (.) By the way, Why we eat Samgyetang is related to when we eat it, isn't it?*
- 13 HJ *So let's write why she told us like that. Because she think (.)*
- 14 K *No. Because we eat Samgyetang (.) to weaken the heat.*
- 15 HJ *No. Let's connect the reason we eat Samgyetang with what my grandmother had said.*
- 16 K *With this? (.) "She said like this because" and then link this with the reason. She might have said like that because.*
- 17 HJ *Because she think (.)*
- 18 K *Right. Because she thought? Thought (.) (Kyungjin looked at Hyejung asking for confirmation. Both of them nodded, agreeing on the past tense verb choice.) that (.) Samgyetang (.) to.*
- 19 HJ *But you need a verb. Is.*
- 20 K *Right. Samgyetang is to (.)*
- 21 HJ *is weakening (.) is to weaken (.)*
- 22 K *Samgyetang is the food (.) which is to weaken*
- 23 HJ *Just Samgyetang weaken (.)*
- 24 K *Ah, I know what you mean. (nodding)*
- 25 HJ *Weaken (.) s?*
- 26 K *No. (.) Ah, it is right to add -s at the end of the verb. But it seems awkward to me, doesn't it?*
- 27 HJ *Right.*
- 28 K *Weakens the heat. That's ok. We can learn from our mistakes. "Weakens the heat" (writing down)*

Kyungjin and Hyejung shared ideas and worked together on all parts of the writing including content, organization, and LREs. Hyejung took the initiative in drafting, asking to begin writing a topic sentence (line 1). Kyungjin pointed out that details such as an example should be added in order to back up their opinion (line 4). Hyejung consented to the suggestion and specified that the first supporting idea – when Samgyetang is usually eaten – could be supported with a quotation (line 5 and 7). Kyungjin made a proposition to take her grandmother as an example (line 8), and Hyejung built a sentence to convey the meaning (line 11), modifying Kyungjin’s rather awkward sentence (line 10). Sometimes, during drafting they discussed and changed their original plan on the spot (Lee, 2012). In line 12, Kyungjin made a suggestion that why we eat Samgyetang (originally the second supporting idea) could be related to when we eat it (originally the first supporting idea). Hyejung agreed and extended on it by linking the second supporting idea with the example of the first supporting idea (line 13). There were also several incidents of metatalk (Language-Related Episodes). In line 18, Kyungjin self-corrected the past tense verb and asked for confirmation, which were confirmed by her peer interlocutor. In addition, when Hyejung indicated the necessity of verb by providing metalinguistic terms (line 19) and self-corrected the subject-verb agreement (line 25), the errors were acknowledged by her partner (line 20 and 26) and they reached a consensus.

The text was co-constructed by two active participants, each adding and extending on text construction. Each participant took equal control over the task, willing to offer a suggestion and discuss each other’s contribution, which led to a resolution acceptable to both of them. In terms of linguistic features, it is evident that the first-person plural



pronouns were predominantly used, such as *Let's* and *we*, as shown in line 1, 4, 5, 8, 13, 15, and 28, which shows that the participants perceived the task of a joint problem-solving though spoken in L1.

The high level of mutuality and equality of dyad A during peer interaction demonstrated collaborative nature of dyadic interaction (Storch, 2002). Negotiating each other's suggestions for the completion of the task, they achieved "intersubjectivity", construction of a shared perspective of the task (Rommetveit, 1985). The excerpt exemplified what Donato (1994) termed "collective scaffolding" where peers collectively drew on their resources, provided guided support to each other and completed the task beyond their respective competence. Though no clearly identifiable expert was present, peer interlocutors pooled their knowledge and guided each other in pair writing. That is, peers were able to provide "mutual scaffolding" to each other in collaborative interaction (Donato, 1994; Kowal & Swain, 1994; Ohta, 1995; Seo & Kim, 2011; Swain & Lapkin, 1998; Watanabe, 2008). The participants valued their peer interlocutor's comments and negotiated peer feedback in collaboration so as to solve the joint problem of the task (Storch, 2005).

The collaborative interaction pattern of dyad A was consistent during the course (Storch, 2002). In Excerpt 2 in the fourth week, dyad A continued to co-construct the text negotiating with each other. In this excerpt, they had written down the first supporting sentence, "Breeding between genetically modified plants and unmodified plants is dangerous." Then they were discussing how to provide details to their first supporting idea.

EXCERPT 2. Peer Interaction of Dyad A while drafting the first supporting sentence in week 2

- 1 K *By the way, Genetically modification itself is against the nature. That's the way I see it. I believe going against the nature is bad.*
- 2 HJ *Your idea seems to be related to all the supporting ideas of our essay. I'd like to focus on our first idea in this section.*
- 3 K *Then, how can we write our supporting sentence?*
- 4 HJ *Mmm. (.) The cross-breeding might have negative effect on the ecosystem?*
- 5 K *Right. It is still at an early stage of development. And you know, it takes time to find out its effect on the nature. How can we put it into a sentence? (.) Plant biotechnology is (.) a young skill? (laughing) How can we write this in English?*
- 6 HJ *Not mature? Not mature?*
- 7 K *Not yet mature (.) (Hyejung writes down as Kyungjin says.) Hey! (suddenly reminding of the expression taught in the English class) Let's use the phrase, "so~ that..." So~ that... (.) So (.) that we don't know what will happen.*
- 8 HJ *(while writing down what Kyungjin dictates, what she perceived a better idea coming into her mind) Ah! Too ~ to... Let's use the phrase, "too~ to..." Too~ to... (smiling)*
- 9 K *Good. Good. We use many advanced grammatical expressions. (smiling, delighted and proud of the fact that they activated their linguistic knowledge taught in English classes) (.) Too (.) Let's change this word. (pointing to "mature") being at an early stage of development*
- 10 HJ *Too early? Too fast?*
- 11 K *No. it sounds awkward.*
- 12 HJ *A few times?*
- 13 K *We should put adjectives or adverbs in "so~ that" phrase.*

- 14 HJ *You're right.* Is too early? Undeveloped?  
15 K *Let's just write that way and think about it later. Okay?*  
16 HJ *Alright.*

Hyejung led Kyungjin to maintain focus on the first supporting idea (line 2), and succeeded in directing Kyungjin's attention to constructing the supporting sentence (line 3) (Guerrero & Villamil, 2000; Lantolf, 2000; Wood, Bruner & Ross, 1976). While co-constructing the sentence, they had difficulty choosing the appropriate expression for "being at an early stage of development", experimenting with various alternatives and providing feedbacks to each other's contribution (line 5, 6, 7, 9, 10-12, 14), until they reached strategic tentative agreement on the word, "undeveloped".<sup>3</sup> One interesting point in this excerpt is that participants in the collaborative interaction had become more engaged in the writing process, striving to activate grammatical and lexical knowledge to come up with better expressions (Kowal & Swain, 1994; Lee, 2012). In line 7 and 8, Hyejung and Kyungjin suggested colloquial phrases from their interlanguage, and they were contended with the fact that they could apply what they had learned in the class to their own composition (line 9). They also mentioned in the individual interview (Excerpt 3) that they had become interested in ESL writing and motivated to produce better composition experimenting with language in collaborative interaction (Kang, 2013; Kim & Lee, 2012; Seo & Kim, 2011; Yong, 2006).

---

<sup>3</sup> They decided to rewrite the sentence in the revision phase in the end, and the sentence they wrote in the final version is as follows: "Since, transformational plants have incompatible DNA with natural plant's DNA, nobody knows how it will affect offsprings."

EXCERPT 3. Individual interview of Dyad A at the end of the program

(Hyejung)

*I prefer writing in pairs to writing by myself. We shared ideas about the content and grammar, so it was easier to write. Though we sometimes had disagreements, we began to learn to work together. We actually quite enjoyed writing together, and tried to write longer with more complex expressions. After this course, I become not as much afraid of writing as I used to be.*

(Kyungjin)

*I didn't know what to do when I had to write in English before. Well, now I think I am able to begin writing. I like pair writing because we could help each other when we had difficulties. If I were really good at English, I might prefer individual writing. But as I'm not so good at it, I would like to write in pairs so that I can get help from my friend.*

In addition, compared with the interaction of dyad B, dyad A showed relatively higher proportion of L2 use during pair writing. In Excerpt 4, dyad A was trying to decide the topic for their composition. Kyungjin encouraged Hyejung to communicate in L2, English (line 1), and they attempted to use English as a tool for mediation. The result contrasted with Storch and Aldosari (2012) that the interaction pattern had no influence on the proportion of L2 use. However, considering the context of their study where L2 was the main medium of communication among college students, the result needs different interpretation. In this study, it might suffice to say that dyad A was highly motivated and attempted to use L2 as a means of interaction in collaborative dyadic relationship.

EXCERPT 4. Peer Interaction of Dyad A in the planning phase in week 1

- 1 K *Let's speak in English.* Let's speak in English.  
2 HJ Okay.  
3 K We should choose a topic.  
4 HJ Yes. Which one we'll do?  
5 K Kimchi? The main food in our country is Kimchi, I think.  
Samgyeopsal, *grilled pork belly*, and bokkeumbap, *fried rice*=  
6 HJ =Then, we'll do the first one? Kimchi?  
7 K Kimchi? Do you agree?  
8 HJ Okay. Kimchi.  
9 K Everyone is doing the same. I think our one's going to be more  
(.) creative.  
10 HJ How about gochujang, *red pepper paste*?  
11 K Food made with gochujang?

To summarize, dyad A manifested collaborative interaction in pair writing and showed evidences of collective scaffolding. Their collaborative dialogues were contingent and cohesive, as the suggestions made by a participant were incorporated or extended on by the peer interlocutor, leading to achieve coherence (van Lier, 1992). The interaction pattern was consistent over time and the students actively engaged in writing process and built confidence in L2 writing in collaborative dyadic interaction.

#### **4.1.2 Transition in Interaction Pattern: Focusing on Dyad B**

On the other hand, dyad B has shown an interesting transition over time. In the first week, dyad B needed teacher's help to write a topic sentence (other-regulation), and

Hyunhwa (the higher-level participant) dominated the interaction throughout the task. Excerpt 5 was the peer interaction in the planning phase when dyad B was trying to decide on the contents and to write a topic sentence.

EXCERPT 5. Peer Interaction of Dyad B in the planning phase in week 1

- 1 HH *First of all, How many food (.) we'll use (.) for example?  
Ah (.) First, teokboki (Stir-fried Rice Cake)?*
- 2 N (nodding)
- 3 HH *Kimchi?*
- 4 N (nodding)
- 5 HH *And let's just write three examples. Ah (.) (.) spicy food (.) (.) Mmm  
(.) Shall we do just two?*
- 6 N *Dak-bokkeum-tang (Braised spicy chicken) ((Hyunhwa wrote down  
Dak-bokkeum-tang.)) (.) (.)*
- 7 T ((seeing they are having trouble writing a topic sentence, the  
teacher approaches))  
*What is the topic of your writing?*
- 8 HH *Our topic is this. (pointing to the topic they had chosen: food made  
with chili powder)*
- 9 T *Then, what is your controlling idea of the topic?*
- 10 HH *uh (.) uh (.) There is three (.) Ah, what should we do? (.) (.) ((She  
looked at Nayoung for assistance, but couldn't get help from her))*
- 11 T *So, your topic is 'food made with chili powder', isn't it?*
- 12 HH *Yes.*
- 13 T *What do you want to write about your topic?*
- 14 HH *Uh, what do you want to write about? ((She looked at Nayoung for  
assistance, but again couldn't get help.)) These three kinds of food.*
- 15 T *What do they have in common?*
- 16 HH *They are hot.*
- 17 N *Koreans like them.*

- 18 T *Then you can put it into a sentence.*
- 19 HH *They are hot, so Koreans like them.* Food made with chili powder  
are (.) are [  
20 N [Shouldn't we attach -s?  
21 HH *No. we don't attach -s to food.*
- 22 N *Do we?* (pouting her lips)
- 23 HH *Are (.) hot (,) but (,) tasty. Ah. (erasing) Just say delicious.*

Hyunhwa took the initiative for brainstorming (line 1), and made two suggestions (line 1- 5) while Nayoung (the lower-level participant) just nodded giving implicit consent (line 2 and 4). Seeing they were having trouble writing a topic sentence, the teacher approached (line 7) and asked for clarification (line 7, 9, 11, 13, 15 and 18) to help them clarify their ideas and write a topic sentence on their own. Hyunhwa interacted with the teacher predominantly (line 7-19), and she wrote the topic sentence by herself (line 23). Nayoung occasionally attempted to offer ideas (line 6, 17, and 20), but the suggestions were made rather tentatively. In line 20, she questioned the grammaticality of her partner's utterance, but her suggestion was not accepted by her partner (line 21). Even though the subject-verb agreement should be corrected as Nayoung had suggested, she remained in a passive role with an unsatisfactory look (line 22).

After they had decided on the topic sentence in Excerpt 5, they started to write the first draft. This time, Nayoung volunteered to write, but her role still remained limited, as she had to write down what Hyunhwa said. Dominant/passive pattern is also evident in the drafting phase in Excerpt 6.

EXCERPT 6. Peer Interaction of Dyad B in the drafting phase in week 1

- 1 HH In conclusion, ah, Korean (,) in, in Korean (,) most of (,) most popular in Korean have (,) has?
- 2 N *Just write 'has' =*
- 3 HH *=Just write 'in Korea' as an adverb. In Korea.* (erasing what Nayoung had written)
- 4 N *Most popular in Korea?*
- 5 HH (taking the pen from Nayoung) *The most popular food in Korea is spicy food.*
- 6 N *How about writing as 'Korea has a popular spicy food'?*
- 7 HH *Then you have to delete 'in'. (.) Just this (.) no no (.) Don't write this.* (erasing what Nayoung had written)
- 8 HH Spicy food is (.) Y-y-y (.) is most popular (.) food in Korea.
- 9 N Spicy food is most popular food. *Should I write 'food' twice?*
- 10 HH (nodding) In Korea. *Done.*

When Hyunhwa and Nayoung had different ideas on how to construct a sentence (line 2 and 6), Hyunhwa neglected her partner's suggestions (line 3 and 7). She often intruded on Nayoung's role, taking her pen and erasing what Nayoung had written (line 3, 5, and 7), though both sentences had the same meaning to be conveyed. The limited engagement blocked what could have been an interesting discussion over stylistic choices on sentence construction. When asked how the first dyadic writing was at the end of the first class, Hyunhwa replied "It was fun to work with a partner," while Nayoung seemed discontented, pouting her lips. Directives were often used (line 2, 3 and 7) and there was little evidence of consultation. In the first week, it was obvious that Hyunhwa adopted an authoritarian stance and appropriated the task, while Nayoung took a subservient role with few contributions.



However, dyadic interaction pattern of dyad B had changed over time, as Nayoung began to participate more actively and Hyunhwa responded more interactively. The learners continued to try to work together, which seemed to be affected by their close friendship and motivation to produce a better composition. Despite her lower L2 proficiency level, Nayoung began to attempt to become more engaged in the joint composition process, and her active engagement was reinforced as Hyunhwa started to value Nayoung's opinion and negotiate her contributions during pair work. In other words, the learner reciprocity and the quality of mediation by both participants during pair writing afforded successful collaboration (Poehner, 2008; Stone, 1993). The pair learned to negotiate and work with each other class after class, which helped them to write an improved essay in the end. In Excerpt 7, dyad B wanted to give an example about the side effect of biotechnology in the drafting phase. They came up with the experiment where mice that had eaten GMO food ended up contracting cancer and dying, and attempted to describe the study as a supporting detail.

EXCERPT 7. Peer Interaction of Dyad B in the drafting phase in week 4

- 1 N Uh (.) That test (.) That test (.)  
 2 HH This (.) in (.) [In this test,  
 3 N [and (.) in that test, *that test*  
 4 HH *It is 'this'. In this. (.) Is 'in' correct? Or 'at'?*  
 At this test? In? in? in this test (talking to herself)  
 5 N *How about 'on'?*  
 6 HH in (.) at? *Shall we write 'at'?* (thinking)  
 Ah! (.) This test (,) uh (.) (.) conducted with (,) ah (,) This test  
 was conducted with (.)

- Uh (.) this and that (.) (looking at Nayoung) that is, this test was conducted (.) with this and that (referring to control group and experimental group)*
- Ah. Thus, in order to compare this and that.*
- 7 N *Okay. (thinking for a while)*  
*In this test, some mice (.) How about writing like this?*  
*In this test, some mice eat original food (.) (Hyunhwa wrote down as Nayoung said) some mice ate! (.) original food (.) and (.) others*
- 8 HH *Others [ate*
- 9 N *[ate*
- 10 HH *Food (,) which used (.) biotechnology (saying as she wrote)*  
 ...
- 11 HH *The experimental group ended up having cancer. Now look up the word for 'cancer' in the dictionary.*
- 12 N *Some kind of cell, I guess. (looking up to the dictionary)*
- 13 HH *Bad cell (laughing)*
- 14 N *Good. Write that. (laughing) Isn't it 'cancer'? (still looking up to the dictionary)*
- 15 HH/N *Cancer (They found the vocabulary they wanted to use in the dictionary and read it aloud together.)*
- 16 HH *Cancer and their life span (.) Uh, their life was (.)*
- 17 N *Doesn't it mean life itself?*
- 18 HH *Their life was short. (laughing)*
- 19 N *Life time (laughing) (looking up to the dictionary)*
- 20 HH *It seems right.*
- 21 N *Here it is.*
- 22 HH *Span, it's correct. It means a period.*
- 23 N *Average. The average span of life was (.) their (.) the average span of life was (picking up the collocational phrase in the example sentence of the word "span" )*
- 24 HH *the average (.) span of life (.) was? Were. (saying as she*

- wrote)
- 25 N *Then shouldn't we write 'life' in a plural form?*
- 26 HH *No, the average span is the subject. So it's 'was'. Was short.*
- 27 N Shorter (.) shorter than (.) uh (.) other mice?
- 28 HH Shorter than (.) other mice (saying as writing down)

In the fourth week, Hyunhwa and Nayoung jointly contributed to the task and engaged with each other's contribution. They constructed a sentence together, experimenting with a few alternatives (line 1 – 10). Nayoung offered an appropriate phrase 'some ~, others ...' to contrast the control and experimental group (line 7), which was accepted by her peer interlocutor. Confronting vocabulary challenges, they resorted to the dictionary. Nayoung who volunteered to look up the words not only found the necessary words for the meaning they intended to convey, but also took the lead in building a sentence, applying the example phrases to their own sentence (line 23). When Nayoung questioned the subject-verb agreement (line 25), Hyunhwa acknowledged her mistake and corrected it (line 26). Nayoung completed the sentence, extending on her partner's utterance (line 27). They seemed to enjoy working together, making jokes sometimes (line 12-14, 18-20). The language-related teasing and laughter, termed as "language play", led them to focus their attention on the language form in question, in this case the colloquial vocabulary use (Ohta, 2000).

It is worth noting that Nayoung had become more actively engaged in the interaction. Over the four weeks, Nayoung had deepened her understanding of the target language. She suggested proper expressions (line 7), self-corrected her errors (line 7) and provided corrective feedback to her partner (line 27). In other words, she was able to notice and

correct an error without feedback from her partner and began to assume more responsibility for error correction, which demonstrated that she had reached level 4 on the transition scale (refer to Table 3.4). In the individual interview (Excerpt 8), Nayoung told that she could gain confidence in writing while working with her friend. Collaborative writing helped her to lower anxiety and develop positive attitude toward L2 writing (Kang, 2013; Kim & Lee, 2012; Seo & Kim, 2011).

EXCERPT 8. Individual interview of Nayoung at the end of the program

*At first, I was worried, because I'm really poor at English. But working with my friend, I knew that she could give me a help, so I became less nervous. Especially she was good at grammar, which helped us write a lot. After this course, I learned that I can write in English even though I'm not very good at English. I mean, it's not like I'm really good at it, but I learned that I can write, using some basic common vocabularies that I already knew.*

Collaborative writing was not only beneficial for the lower-level participant, but also for the higher-level participant, because learner abilities are not fixed and each learner shows respective strengths and weaknesses which may be complementary (Ohta, 2001). Though her general English proficiency was higher, Hyunhwa had difficulty using subject-verb agreements (line 19 in Excerpt 5, and line 24 in Excerpt 7). In Excerpt 5, she was not able to notice or correct the error, even with her peer interlocutor's intervention ("Food made with chili powder are": line 20 and 21), which is level 1 on the transition scale (Table. 3.4). However, the transition in the interaction pattern opened opportunities for learning as to the grammar point. In Excerpt 7 she was ready to accept her partner's suggestion ("the average span of life were": line 24), and corrected the

error when questioned by her peer interlocutor (“*No, the average span is the subject. So it’s ‘was.’*”: line 26), which is level 3 on the transition scale. In the interview (Excerpt 9), Hyunhwa said that she felt her English was improved. She told that she was able to begin writing without fear and became more confident in writing. She also reported that she became more conscious about language use and came to reflect on the composition in a thorough and critical view in the collaborative writing. As Johnson and Johnson (1989), Speck (2002) and Storch (2002) pointed out, collaborative interaction promoted the students to think critically and learn effectively by sharing knowledge and negotiating ideas.

EXCERPT 9. Individual interview of Hyunhwa at the end of the program

*I preferred collaborative writing. I rarely write essays even in Korean, so writing in English individually might be quite stressful for me. I think my English has been improved, since now I feel I’m able to start writing without anxiety. Also, I tended to think whatever she said critically (laughing), so I thought over her suggestions and reflected on the essay more carefully.*

The results are similar with Storch (2002) in which she reported one out of four dyads displayed transition in the interaction pattern, becoming more collaborative over time. One way to look at the dynamic patterns of interaction might be to see the entire peer interaction during the program as the process where a group, in this case a group of two people, developed over time. In the light of group development (Tuckman, 1965), a group developed into “a team” through sequential stages of forming, storming, norming and performing. The interaction of dyad B showed dependency on the designated learner,

Hyunhwa, at the beginning (forming), counter-dependency and disagreement (storming), establishment of trust and negotiations about roles, organization and procedures (norming), until they finally showed signs of teamwork (performing). Probing into the group dynamics, the students had assumed various roles of group work during text co-construction process and the division of the roles promoted collaboration of dyad B, complementing each other's weak points (Kang, 2013). While Hyunhwa usually took on the roles of giving guidance, monitoring grammar, and assuring understanding of the provided information, Nayoung assumed those of monitoring vocabulary and supplying the relevant context. They shared the roles during interaction, and the fluid role allocation allowed both of the participants to control and contribute to the task equally. In the individual interview (Excerpt 10), they said that they learned to work together despite conflicts, complementing each other and contributing to the task in their respective strong points (Kang, 2013). Though conflicts were bound to happen in negotiation process, it enabled learners to think creatively and critically (Speck, 2002).

EXCERPT 10. Individual interview of Dyad B at the end of the program

(Nayoung)

*First, we almost had a serious dispute over which linking word should be used or how to organize our ideas in a paragraph. However, once we got used to each other, we could work together.*

(Hyunhwa)

*Though we had conflict over trivial things such as word choice at the beginning, we began to learn how to work together over time. She could supplement my weaknesses and I could do the same for her. Nayoung found*

*vocabulary in the dictionary super-quickly (laughing), and she had many good ideas. I usually translated our ideas into English. Moreover, it took less time because we divided our roles.*

The dominant/passive interaction pattern at the beginning of the program can be attributed to the relatively large proficiency difference of dyad B. As Kowal and Swain (1994) noted, though some degree of heterogeneity might be beneficial, extreme difference in L2 proficiency might intimidate the lower-level student, Nayoung. Since collaboration can occur under the condition where participants value each other's opinion and all of them are regarded as playing a legitimate role in the learning process (Stone, 1993), the authoritarian stance of Hyunhwa also affected their decision-making processes. As dyad B had changed into taking collaborative stances, where peers allowed each other opportunities to contribute and negotiate, they came to engage in the writing process more actively (Lockhart & Ng, 1995). Over the four weeks of the program, they showed improvement in linguistic knowledge and heightened confidence in EFL writing, which supported the previous studies that claimed collaborative interaction patterns have positive influence on language development (Storch, 2001, 2002; Storch & Aldosari, 2012; Watanabe & Swain, 2007; Watanabe, 2008).

In summary, dyad B had shown transition in interaction pattern: from dominant/passive into collaborative interaction. The dominant/passive interaction pattern can be attributed to relatively large L2 proficiency differences and participants' stances. As the group developed over time, the participants began to engage with each other's contribution and negotiate their suggestions. The dynamic patterns of interaction had a positive impact on co-construction of language and a sense of confidence in L2

writing.

## 4.2 Functions of Collaborative Dialogue in Pair Writing

This section demonstrates how collaborative dialogues served to facilitate strategic process of writing and language learning in pair writing. Common functions of appropriate scaffolding (Lantolf, 2000) prevailed in peer dialogues in collaborative interaction during pair writing.

### 4.2.1 Maintaining Focus on the Task

During collaborative writing, each participant offered scaffolding to the other participant in order to maintain focus on the task. In Excerpt 11, dyad A was brainstorming ideas to decide their topic sentence.

EXCERPT 11. Peer Interaction of Dyad A in the planning phase in week 1

- 1 HJ We're so (.) *Abstract*.
- 2 K ((She knocks her ball pen on her hand, as she suddenly comes up with an idea.)) How about *tteok (rice cake)*?  
Topic is *tteok*.
- 3 HJ So we again change (our topic)?
- 4 K Yes. I think it will be more easy. Topic (,) If our topic is (,) main food is *tteok* (,) *I mean, we eat Songpyeon, half-*



*moon-shaped rick cake in holidays (.) Chuseok (Korean Thanksgiving Day) with Songpyeon (,) and:: Tteokguk, (rice-cake soup) in Seoul, Lunar New Year's Day.*

- 5 HJ Yes
- 6 K Yes! Let's do: these two (,) two topics.
- 7 HJ Okay. We're topic is tteok (,)
- 8 K Why we eat tteok? (.) It's tradition=
- 9 HJ =And delicious
- 10 K We should write the topic sentence.
- 11 HJ Our topic sentence is (,) umm (.)
- 12 K This is too *broad*. Let's=
- 13 HJ =First we should choose what (aspect of the topic) we will write. (.) And then (,) we will make sentence.
- 14 K When!
- 15 HJ When. Okay. Then we'll write (.) there (.) when (,) tteok is (.) eaten? Ah (.) eaten
- 16 K Tteok is eaten (as writing down)
- 17 HJ Yes, eaten!
- 18 K Eaten
- 19 HJ Eaten. (.) But when?
- 20 K In (,) special (,) occasions?
- 21 HJ In three special occasions (,) in Korea

After coming up with several options for topic, Hyejung pointed out they needed to decide on the specific topic to deliberate on (line 1). Kyungjin attempted to make the task manageable (task regulation), by suggesting a probable topic (line 2) and explaining how to organize ideas about the topic (line 4). When her idea was accepted by her peer interlocutor, she guided her partner to begin the first step of writing, writing a topic sentence (line 10). In line 13, this time Hyejung tried to simplify the task, suggesting

Kyungjin to narrow down the topic. As Kyungjin determined the controlling idea (line 14), Hyejung tried to put them into a sentence (line 15). However, she was not sure of the passive verb form of “eat”, so she asked for help indirectly by raising intonation. As Kyungjin provided recast (line 16), Hyejung acknowledged the passive verb infection and repeated it with joy (line 17 and 19). Though Panova and Lyster (2002) proposed that repetition may occur out of a mechanical reaction with little attention to the language, in this case it displayed the evidence of uptake of the recast provided to Hyejung, as it seemed to remind her of the correct form of the passive participle (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Ohta, 2000). After they reached an agreement, they finally completed their topic sentence (line 21). In this excerpt, both of them interacted coherently, as they incorporated or extended on each other’s utterances. Their collaborative dialogues assisted in recruiting interest in the task (line 1), leading the strategic process of writing (line 10 and 13), making the task manageable by suggesting ideas (line 2 and 4) and providing corrective feedback (line 16).

Excerpts 12 and 13 show collaborative dialogues served to enhance coherence of the composition. After they had decided their topic sentence in Excerpt 11, they began drafting their first supporting idea in Excerpt 12. Kyungjin requested supporting contents and initiated an open discussion over supporting ideas (line 3). In line 9, Kyungjin indicated that Hyejung’s idea was off the point, so that they could maintain focus on the main idea of their composition.

#### EXCERPT 12. Peer Interaction of Dyad A in the drafting phase in week 1

1 K First (,) We eat tteokguk (.) in Seol (*Lunar New Year’s*

- Day).
- 2 HJ Seol (.) *How do we spell?*
- 3 K *Let's just write like this.* (writing down "Seol" on the  
 → paper) And (,) we should write (.) supporting sentence.  
 More (,) [more (,) our opinion
- 4 HJ [supporting sentence. Yes.
- 5 K How about explain tteokguk? (thinking) Tteokguk is hot  
 (,) we boil (,) [first, we boil,
- 6 HJ [how about (,) uh (,) the process? Of  
 making (,) [tteokguk?
- 7 K (nodding) [making?
- 8 HJ [The process of making,
- 9 K [But our (,) our main is the occasion (.) not the way (,) to  
 cook that (pointing to their topic sentence, "Rice cake is  
 eaten in three special occasions in Korea.")
- 10 HJ (nodding) okay.

Likewise, in Excerpt 13, when dyad A were discussing over their first supporting, "Many people dislike mosquitoes because mosquito bites are itchy and irritating.", Hyejung pointed out that they were going astray (line 6), and that they should remain focused on their main idea (line 8). Once they questioned the suitability of the ideas to the topic, their peer interlocutor willingly incorporated the suggestions (line 10 in Excerpt 12, and line 7 and 9 in Excerpt 13).

EXCERPT 13. Peer Interaction of Dyad A in the drafting phase in week 3

- 1 K *What else do we want to write about? We can write this*  
 'in summer'= (pointing to the supporting sentence they  
 had decided on)

- 2 HJ = in summer
- 3 K *Let's write first, and then we can modify later. They (mosquitoes) attack us (.) by biting (.) especially when we sweat. (reading what they had written down on the worksheet)*
- 4 HJ *When we sweat (as writing down) (.)*
- 5 K *Mmm. (.) Let's start from the first. (.) When we are bitten by mosquitoes, it is really itching (.) Mosquitoes breed in summer and bite us (.) Especially when we sweat (.) It is really itchy and makes us irritated*
- ... ((They co-construct the sentence.))
- 6 HJ *So this is what we want to write about 'itching', right? It is itchier when we sweat. Ah! It is about mosquitoes making us itchy. It should be about itchiness, [but we are talking about breeding and something else.*
- 7 K *[Don't you think it's off the topic?*
- 8 HJ *Yes. Breeding doesn't seem suitable for this supporting idea.*
- 9 K *You're right (.) Let's delete it.*

Excerpt 13 also displays internal mediation through private speech (Vygotsky, 1978), which is defined as 'audible speech not adapted to an addressee' (Ohta, 2001: p.16). In line 5 and 6, Kyungjin and Hyejung resorted to L1 private speech in order to gain control over language in the face of a cognitively challenging tasks. The utterances appeared communicative, but they were actually "thinking out aloud", using their L1 as a tool to direct their own attention to difficult task of sentence building. The use of private speech enabled Kyungjin to rehearse the language forms and construct a sentence (line 5), and helped Hyejung to organize ideas into a coherent paragraph (line

6).

These excerpts demonstrate that L1 collaborative dialogues served as a tool to regulate cognitive activity of strategic writing process (Huh, 2000; Speck, 2002; Storch, 2002; Swain & Lapkin, 2000). The participants provided scaffolding to each other to engage their partner's attention (intentionality), manipulate the task to facilitate problem solving (task regulation) and maintain goal orientation (maintaining pursuit of the goal) (Guerrero & Villamil, 2000; Lantolf, 2000). Often, private speeches emerged in an attempt to manipulate challenging tasks and assisted L2 learning (Huh, 2000; Ohta, 2001; Villamil & Guerrero, 1996). Mutual scaffolding and the inner speech in collaborative dialogues facilitated learner engagement and completion of coherent writing task.

#### **4.2.2 Providing Affective Support to the Peer Interlocutor**

The students provided affective support to each other, which created a collaborative learning atmosphere and facilitated collaborative writing. The three excerpts (Excerpt 14, 2, and 15) from dyad A's peer interaction in the week 2 show that the affective supports throughout the writing process culminated in the successful writing experience. Kyungjin and Hyejung encouraged each other to keep up the good work in collaborative interaction. In Excerpt 14, after they had determined general outlines of the paragraph, Kyungjin boosted up the energy of the peer interaction and this vitality made the pairs enjoy the writing process (line 3).

EXCERPT 14. Peer Interaction of Dyad A at the end of planning phase in week 2

- 1 K Yes! (clapping her hands) *How much time do we have?*  
2 HJ *We have 20 minutes to go.*  
→ 3 K *We can do it. We can do it!*

EXCERPT 2. Peer Interaction of Dyad A while drafting the first supporting sentence in week 2 (revisited)

- 7 K ... *Hey!* (suddenly reminding of the expression taught in the English class) *Let's use the phrase, "so~ that..." So~ that... (. ) So (. ) that we don't know what will happen.*  
8 HJ ... *Ah! Too ~ to...* *Let's use the phrase, "too~ to..." Too~ to... (smiling)*  
→ 9 K *Good. Good. We use many advanced grammatical expressions.* (Smiling, delighted and proud of the fact that they activated their linguistic knowledge taught in English classes) ...

EXCERPT 15. Peer Interaction of Dyad A at the end of drafting phase in week 2

- 1 K *We're working faster than the last week.*  
→ 2 HJ *Yes (. ) Yes (. ) We're doing very well.*  
→ 3 K *Indeed we are the ones going forward.*  
→ 4 HJ *We learn one thing, we know ten.* (laughing)  
→ 5 K *No. we know hundred.* (laughing)

In Excerpt 2, both participants were actively involved in co-constructing a sentence, retrieving alternative expressions from memory (line 7 and 8). When Hyejung suggested what they perceived to be ideal phrase in line 8, Kyungjin showed her support verbally and nonverbally, complimenting on their efforts (line 9). At the end of the drafting phase

(Excerpt 15), Kyungjin and Hyejung were satisfied with their writing process (line 1 and 2) and exchanged jokes (line 3-5), which allowed them to create enjoyable learning atmosphere.

Dyad B provided affective supports to their peer interlocutor as well. In Excerpt 16, after writing the concluding sentence, Hyunhwa complimented themselves on their progress in line 8. In Excerpt 17, Hyunhwa and Nayoung were satisfied with their progress over the course and gave praise to themselves (line 1-3), which helped them to enhance motivation and a sense of confidence in L2 writing.

EXCERPT 16. Peer Interaction of Dyad B at the end of planning phase in week 3

- 1 N *Done. Lastly=*  
 2 HH *=Which linking words do you want to use?*  
 3 N *So!*  
 4 HH *So (.)*  
 5 N *We (.) are (.) hate (.)*  
 6 HH *So (.)We (.) are (.) hate (.) pigeon (.)-s. (.) (as writing  
 down) for (.) these (.) several (.) [reasons. Whoa!  
 (clapping her hands)*  
 7 N *[reasons.*  
 → 8 HH *We've come a long way. (smiling)*  
 9 N *(smiling and nodding)*

EXCERPT 17. Peer Interaction of Dyad B at the end of revision phase in week 4

- 1 HH *We've made a great progress. (counting the words and  
 clapping her hands)*  
 → 2 N *At least 100 words, I guess. (contented)*

→ 3 HH *Remarkable progress, indeed.* (satisfied look on her face)

The frequent use of first-person plural ‘we’ in the Excerpts 14-17 also suggests that the pairs perceived themselves as a team and they were contended with the improvement ‘they’ had made over the course. The contingent supports aided them in constituting a social space where they shared the same perspectives on the task (intersubjectivity), and facilitated task completion.

In Excerpt 18, Kyungjin expressed her feelings confronting difficulties (line 1), which were promptly responded by Hyejung with empathy and encouragement (line 2). The collaborative dialogue enabled them to control frustration and to continue to write.

EXCERPT 18. Peer Interaction of Dyad A in the drafting phase in week 3

→ 1 K *Why is it so hard today? We did a very good job last week.*  
(looking at Hyejung)

→ 2 HJ *I think the topic is difficult.*(encouraging Kyungjin)

In the individual interview after the course, all the participants answered that they preferred collaborative writing to individual writing, since they felt ‘safer’, working with a partner who was ready to give a hand in trouble and shared responsibility of the task (Excerpt 19). The supportive atmosphere seemed to have allowed the students to lower anxiety, to boost motivation and to raise their self-esteem in writing in English.

EXCERPT 19. Excerpts from Individual interview (revisited)

(Hyejung)

*I prefer writing in pairs to writing by myself. We shared ideas about the*



*content and grammar, so it was easier to write. ... We actually **quite enjoyed** writing collaboratively, and **tried to write longer with more complex expressions**. After this course, I become **not as much afraid of writing as I used to be**.* (from Excerpt 3)

(Kyungjin)

*I **didn't know what to do** when I had to write in English before. Well, now I **think I am able to begin writing**. I like pair writing because we could help each other when we had difficulties. ...* (from Excerpt 3)

(Nayoung)

*At **first, I was worried**, because I'm really poor at English. But working with my friend, I knew that she could give me a help, so I **became less nervous**. ... After this course, I learned that I can write in English even though I'm not very good at English. I mean, it's not like I'm really good at it, but I learned that I can write, using some basic common vocabularies that I already knew.* (from Excerpt 8)

(Hyunhwa)

*I preferred collaborative writing. ... I **think my English has been improved**, since now I feel I'm able to start writing without anxiety. ...* (from Excerpt 11)

To summarize, L1 collaborative dialogues served social functions of providing affective support to the peer interlocutors. The participants praised each other about their progress and helped one another to control frustration, and the intersubjectivity established in the perception of “we” as a team facilitated collaborative writing. The results are in line with Guerrero and Villamil (2000) and Huh (2000), which also demonstrated praise/encouragement, affective involvement and frustration control

functions of collaborative dialogues. In the cooperative atmosphere, the participants lowered the anxiety, heightened motivation and raised their self-esteem in L2 writing as shown in the previous studies (Kang, 2013; Kim & Lee, 2012; Seo & Kim, 2011).

### 4.2.3 Promoting Self-regulation

Collaborative writing provided the learners with opportunities to use language and to reflect on it, eventually facilitating the self-regulation of the learners (Swain, 2000). Excerpt 20 displays how the pair came up with the expression for *develop/contract skin infections*.

EXCERPT 20. Peer Interaction of Dyad A in the drafting phase in week 3

- |      |    |                                                                                                                                   |
|------|----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1    | K  | <i>Second, Second (.) Skin infections (dermatitis)</i><br>Some people (.) <i>Only some people develop skin infections, right?</i> |
| 2    | HJ | (nodding)                                                                                                                         |
| → 3  | K  | Can be (,) can catch (,) catch?                                                                                                   |
| → 4  | HJ | Can have?                                                                                                                         |
| 5    | K  | <i>I mean, some people can develop skin infections.</i>                                                                           |
| → 6  | HJ | Can happen?                                                                                                                       |
| 7    | K  | 'Happen' <i>seems a little [Awkward?</i>                                                                                          |
| → 8  | HJ | [Ah! Can <i>suffer!</i> suffer (,) from                                                                                           |
| 9    | K  | Suffer (.) <i>Right.</i> Can be suffered from                                                                                     |
| → 10 | HJ | <i>But suffer is a (intransitive) verb.</i>                                                                                       |
| 11   | K  | <i>Ah. You're right. You're right.</i>                                                                                            |
| 12   | HJ | Can suffer from                                                                                                                   |

At first, both of the dyad A struggled to find a proper verb that collocates with skin infections (dermatitis). They blurted out words coming to their mind (line 3-6). They tried to ‘stretch’ their interlanguage to try out the verbs that they use with other diseases, for example, “catch” as in ‘catch a cold’ (line 3), and “have” in ‘have a headache’ (line 4). Suddenly a suitable alternative “suffer” came into Hyejung’s mind, and later she remembered “suffer” usually comes with “from” (line 8). Kyungjin agreed on the word choice and put it into a sentence, but she mistook that “suffer” is a transitive verb and suggested the passive structure (line 9). In the next turn, Hyejung pointed out Kyungjin’s error (line 10). Though Hyejung’s feedback might have been better with more precise explicit explanation, Kyungjin understood her partner’s point, and they finished co-constructing the sentence (line 12-13). While verbalizing the possibilities out loud, Hyejung was able to think of an appropriate expression with minimal feedback from her pair interlocutor (level 4 on the transition scale) (refer to Table 3.4), and Kyungjin could notice and correct the error under Hyejung’s assistance (level 3 on the transition scale).

In other words, when asked to produce pushed output (composition) in the writing task, the students noticed ‘a hole’ in their linguistic knowledge, which means they found out they did not know how to express the meaning they wanted to convey when attempting to produce it. Therefore, they focused their attention to the ‘hole’ (line 1) and tried to fill it by verbalizing alternative solutions in peer interaction (line 3-6). By externalizing their hypotheses in the social interaction, the students had a chance to

reflect on them and provide feedback to one another (line 7 and 10), until they finally succeeded in building a sentence (line 12-13). Here, their L1 collaborative dialogues in the social interaction served to mediate cognitive process of constructing language (Swain, 2000).

There were often incidents of self-correction during collaborative writing (refer to Appendix 5 for more incidents of self-correction in this study). In Excerpt 21, Hyunhwa realized the verb error and self-corrected the error (line 1), which in turn acknowledged by Nayoung who also supplemented metalinguistic explanation (line 2). Hyunhwa noticed and corrected the error without any intervention, which is level 4 on the transition scale. That is, ‘saying it out loud’ helped her to reflect on ‘what was said’, and solve the linguistic problem (Swain, 2000). The private speech mediated cognitive language learning activity, and self-correction signified that the pairs began to gain control over the target structure and headed toward self-regulation.

EXCERPT 21. Peer Interaction of Dyad B in the revision phase in week 3

- 1 HH (reading what they had written down) So we are hate (,)  
ah! *It should be just ‘we hate’, not ‘we are hate’.*
- 2 N *You’re right. There are two verbs.*

Excerpt 22 also demonstrates self-correction in collaborative dialogues. In this excerpt, dyad A had written their first supporting sentence, “First, if we are bitten by mosquitoes, it is really itching.”, and they wanted to add details to it. Kyungjin provided a suggestion (line 1), and self-corrected subject-verb agreement in line 3,

acknowledging the antecedent of the phrase “which bother me (line 1)” was the sentence before, which is considered singular. It is interesting that she changed “me” into “us”. Though the transition might be a matter of choice, not a grammatical issue, it demonstrates that she thought this composition as teamwork rather than an individual one. In line 4, Hyejung recast Kyungjin’s error, correcting subject-verb agreement in parallel structure. Regarding the complement form of “make”, Hyejung thought it over again, mapping it against her existing knowledge, and incorporated it (line 4 and 6).

EXCERPT 22. Peer Interaction of Dyad A in the drafting phase in week 3

- 1 K *How about just adding ‘which bother me’ at the end of the sentence?*
- 2 HJ (writing what Kyungjin said)
- 3 K *Bothers<sub>u</sub> us (.) bothers and annoying (.)*  
*Ah. Let’s just write down ‘make’ as well. Let’s just write down ‘make us annoying’ too. Wouldn’t it be okay?*
- 4 HJ *Bothers us and makes us annoying (as writing down) (.)*  
*annoying?*
- 5 K *Yes (.) annoying*
- 6 HJ *Okay, we can use ~ing form (with ‘make’ as well).*

Similarly, repetition often led to self-correction. In Excerpt 23, the pairs co-constructed the topic sentence, as Hyejung contributed the proper verb *dislike* (line 5) and Kyungjin incorporated it into a sentence (line 6). When they reread the sentence in line 7, they noticed the adjective-noun agreement error and corrected it at the same time. As DiCamilla and Antón (1997) noted, repetition aided in L2 learning, since verbalization objectified what they had produced and enabled them to scrutinize their L2

use.

EXCERPT 23. Peer Interaction of Dyad A in the planning phase in week 3

- 1 HJ Let's write a topic sentence. Mosquito (,) is (,)  
2 K Is an::  
3 HJ Uh (.) *dangerous* (.) dangerous?  
4 K *It's not really dangerous, is it? =*  
5 HJ *= Dislike? Ah (,) Dislike!*  
6 K Many people dislike mosquitoes (,) because of several  
reason. (Hyejung writes.) *How did you write?*  
→ 7 K/HJ Many people dislike mosquitoes, because of several  
reasons! (They laugh and Hyejung adds 's' to the script.)

In summary, L1 collaborative dialogues served to facilitate the learners to “regulate” (defined as “gain voluntary control over and transform” by Lantolf and Throne (2006, p.79)) each other's and their own L2 use. Verbalization helped them to become aware of their L2 problems and notice their linguistic needs, set goals for themselves, externalize and test hypotheses, monitor their own language, and co-construct the text. The students built their linguistic knowledge of the target language through ‘saying’ (using the L1 and the L2 to jointly address a problem) and responding to ‘what is said’ (consciously attending to the L2 forms that arise in the utterances they produce) (Swain, 2000). The active learner engagement in collaborative writing promoted self-regulation and drove them toward language internalization (Ohta, 2001; Swain, 2000). In other words, L1 collaborative dialogues guided the learners to shift from object-regulation to other-regulation, and ultimately to self-regulation, obtaining increasing independence and

control over the target language during L2 composition task (Donato, 1988; Huh, 2000).

#### **4.2.4 Discussion on Functions of Collaborative Dialogue**

This study has shown that collaborative dialogues of the four Korean high school students promoted learners to appropriate both strategic processes of writing task and linguistic knowledge (Swain, 2000). As Donato (1988) stated, their dialogues demonstrated collective cognitive activity which served as ‘a transitional mechanism from the social to internal planes of psychological function (p. 8)’. They served not only cognitive functions of facilitating engagement and focus on the task and internalization of the target language, but also social functions of mediating communication and providing affective support to each other (Antón & DiCamilla, 1998; Huh, 2000; Seo & Kim, 2011; Swain & Lapkin, 2000). In fact, the peer dialogues resembled “exploratory talk”, ‘where the participants used language for reasoning, engaging critically but constructively with each other’s suggestions (Mercer, 2000, p. 98)’. During collaborative dialogues, the students offered suggestions, jointly considered and often counter-challenged them with metalinguistic knowledge until they agreed on the final product. The series of process formed a basis for joint progress in the writing process and language learning (Ohta, 2001; Swain, 2000, 2006).

A highly controversial issue is the use of L1 during collaboration. As shown in the excerpts, the students mostly used L1, Korean, as a mediating tool during collaborative writing. This study suggests that the use of L1 in collaborative dialogues has beneficial

effect on L2 learning (Antón & DiCamilla, 1998; Brooks & Donato, 1994; DiCamilla & Antón, 1997; Villamil & Guerrero, 1996; Guerrero & Viallmail, 2000; Huh, 2000; Mendoca & Johnson, 1994; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003; Swain & Lapkin, 2000; Scott & de la Fuente, 2008; Seo & Kim, 2011). Use of the L1 is a natural psychological learning strategy which reduces cognitive overload and sustains collaborative interaction (Brooks & Donato, 1994; Scott & de la Fuente, 2008). During peer interaction, L1 served to provide each other with scaffolding help, to develop a shared perspective on the task, and to externalize inner speech during cognitively difficult activities of L2 composition (Antón and DiCamilla, 1998). The students used the L1 as a means of creating a social and cognitive space where they provided mutual scaffolding one another as well as a tool to generate content and to reflect on the their own product (Swain & Lapkin, 2000; Huh, 2000). On one hand, L1 use afforded cooperative learning environment with affective support by the peer interlocutor (Huh, 2000; Guerrero & Villamil, 2000). On the other hand, the shared L1 (Korean) was an essential cognitive tool for providing scaffolding (Mendoca & Johnson, 1994; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003) and externalizing private speech (Huh, 2000; Villamil & Guerrero, 1996). As Villamil and Guerrero (1996) mentioned, L1 use helped the learners to make meaning of the text, retrieve language from memory, explore and expand content, guide their action through the task, and maintain dialogue (p.60).

In summary, L1 collaborative dialogues served to regulate both the learners' own mental activities (intrapsychological planes) and the social interaction (interpsychological planes) during L2 pair writing. The use of the L1 shared by the learners is a normal psychological process which allows them to initiate and sustain



verbal interaction and to tackle problems emerging during the collaborative writing task. Thus, collaborative dialogues in the L1 function as an integral mediating tool in the Korean learners' L2 pair writing. However, I do not argue that L1 use should be encouraged in place of the L2 in L2 pair work. Rather, this study suggests that preventing the learners from using their L1 during L2 pair writing will deprive the learners of the powerful cognitive and social tool for collaborative learning and may impede the learners' strategic L2 writing process and L2 learning (Huh, 2000; Scott & de la Fuente, 2008). Therefore, I contend that we need to reevaluate the use of the L1 in L2 pair writing and unfasten the restrictions on the exclusive L2 use during peer collaborative dialogues in order to enhance L2 writing development.

### **4.3 Dynamics of Peer Interaction in Pair Writing in Terms of Language-Related Episodes**

This section details the dynamics of the peer interaction in Language-Related Episodes (LREs) during collaborative writing. The LREs were classified into two categories: successfully resolved and unsuccessfully resolved LREs depending on the accuracy of the linguistic decisions made by the pairs. Microgenetic analysis of the interaction between the dyad shows how the peer dialogues led to either successful or unsuccessful linguistic decisions during pair writing.

### **4.3.1 Successfully Resolved Language-Related Episodes: Dynamics of Collaborative Dialogues**

This section probes into the mechanisms of collaborative dialogue in the successfully resolved LREs: how learners use language as a mediational tool shifting towards self-regulation during collaborative writing. The LREs were divided into two categories: requested assistance, where learners request for help either in a direct or indirect way, and unrequested assistance in the form of corrective feedback.

#### **4.3.1.1 Requested Assistance**

The participants bid for help either in a direct question or in indirect ways. Often they explicitly formulated the question to their peer interlocutor asking for assistance, and their partner provided assistance by direct reply and direct reply with metalinguistic explanation.

Excerpts 24 and 25 are the examples where students' direct questions were responded with direct replies, in the form of Next Turn Repair Initiator (NTRI (provide)) in classification of methods of assistance (Ohta, 2001) (refer to Table 3.5). In Excerpt 24, when Hyunhwa was not sure of the plural form of 'mouse', she requested for confirmation (line 1). Promptly, Nayoung offered a short answer to her partner's

question (line 2).

EXCERPT 24. Peer Interaction of Dyad B in the planning phase in week 4

- 1 HH *Is 'mouse' is the plural form? Of 'mouse'?*  
2 N *Isn't it 'mice'?*  
3 HH *Look it up to the dictionary. I want to be precise.* (looking up  
to the dictionary)  
4 N *Mice, it is.*

Similarly, in Excerpt 25, Kyungjin was confused with the word order of the indirect interrogatives, and directly asked for confirmation to her partner (line 5). Hyejung confirmed it immediately in the form of NTRI (provide) (line 6).

EXCERPT 25. Peer Interaction of Dyad A in the drafting phase in week 2

- 1 K *It (Samgyetang) is (.) very (.) healthy food (.) (as writing  
down) because we put healthy ingredients like wild ginseng  
while we make it =*  
2 HJ *=Then let's explain the reason why it is healthy by explaining  
the way we make it.*  
3 K *Okay. Then how about asking a question?*  
*Why it is =*  
4 HJ *= Yes (.) ah (.) Do you know why it is healthy food?*  
5 K *(smiling) Do you (.) know (.) why it is (.) (as writing down)*  
*Is 'why is it' correct? No (shaking her head) [why it is*  
6 HJ *[Yes. Why it is*  
7 K *interrogative-subject-verb. interrogative-subject-verb*  
*(smiling)*  
8 HJ *Yes. interrogative-subject-verb (smiling)*

- 9 K *Uh? I don't think it's correct?*  
 10 HJ *It is correct (.) It's indirect interrogative sentence.*  
 11 K *Oh, is it?*  
 12 HJ *Ha ha ha (laughing)*  
 13 K *Okay. (laughing) why it is healthy? (as writing down)*

What is interesting in these excerpts is that both pairs questioned the reply given by the peer interlocutor, and attempted to ensure the vocabulary and grammar use (line 3 in Excerpt 24; line 9 and 11 in Excerpt 25). In Excerpt 24, the pair turned to the readily available resource, the dictionary (line 3). In Excerpt 25, Hyejung retrieved the metalinguistic knowledge and reminded Kyungjin that the indirect interrogative sentence word order should be interrogative-subject-verb (line 10). In other words, the direct reply to their requests for assistance resulted in an elaborated discussion over the language, when the linguistic item questioned was not internalized into one of the pairs' interlanguage. As Hyunhwa mentioned in her interview (Excerpt 9), the participants became critical about the utterances of the peer interlocutor, which made them reflect on the language use more thoroughly, promoting them to consolidate the existing knowledge and appropriate their interlanguage. (Johnson & Johnson, 1989; Speck, 2002; Storch, 2002)

EXCERPT 9. Individual interview of Hyunhwa at the end of the program  
 (revisited)

*... Also, I tended to think whatever she said critically (laughing), so I thought over her suggestions and reflected on the essay more carefully.*

On the other hand, the learners preferred to indirectly call for assistance, either by using verbal and nonverbal interactional cues or resorting to L1 private speech. The requests resulted in direct reply with metalinguistic explanation (NTRI (provide) with Explaining) and co-construction. In Excerpt 26, Nayoung requested for confirmation, looking at her peer interlocutor, raising intonation and stressing ‘s’ at the end of the sentence, because she was not sure of the plural form of bacterium (line 2). Hyunhwa promptly gave an answer with a metalinguistic term (line 3) which Nayoung accepted and extended on (line 4).

EXCERPT 26. Peer Interaction of Dyad B in the drafting phase in week 3

- 1 HH Lastly they (,) have (,) (as writing down)
- 2 N Ah (,) spread, spread (,) so many (,) bacterias? (looking at Hyunhwa)
- 3 HH *No. Bacteria. This is the plural form.*
- 4 N When they fly.

In Excerpt 27, Nayoung’s utterance in line 1 includes various signs of assistance request: eye contact, pauses, false start, elongation of a syllable, raising intonation and L1 private speech. Acknowledging her partner’s struggle, Hyunhwa assisted Nayoung in building a sentence (line 2). Rather than merely accepting her suggestion, Nayoung counter-suggested a novel, ungrammatical phrase of her own “don’t movement”, probably literal translation from Korean (line 3). Hyunhwa gave corrective feedback with a metalinguistic explanation (line 4). Here, despite Nayoung’s low English proficiency, she made an effort to express her ideas into English, which was supported

by her partner, Hyunhwa.

EXCERPT 27. Peer Interaction of Dyad B in the drafting phase in week 3

- 1 N *As pigeons are on the highway, they don't run away from the approaching cars (.) as pigeons on highway (,) the car (.) come to:: they? (looking at Hyunhwa)*
- 2 HH *As they don't avoid (,) As they don't avoid*
- 3 N *Can't we say 'don't movement'?*
- 4 HH *Movement? Movement is a noun. (.) don't (.) avoid avoid (.) avoid*
- 5 N *The car*

Excerpts 26 and 27 show the learners' mutual sensitivity to the 'subtle interactional cues' in the collaborative dialogue. In accordance with Ohta (2000), they oriented to the subtly articulated cues such as raising intonation ([?]), false starts, elongation of a syllable ([:]) and pauses ([.]), and provided assistance accordingly. Through offering help (line 3 in Excerpt 26; line 2 and 4 in Excerpt 27), Hyunhwa became highly engaged in Nayoung's sentence construction process, and the mediation promoted Nayoung to notice and attend to the grammatical items in question (plural noun forms and sentence construction).

Excerpt 27 also exemplifies another type of indirect request, L1 private speech. The learners resorted to L1 (line 1 and 2) in order to gain control over the challenging task, writing in English, and negotiated more freely with each other (line 3 and 4), co-constructing the text.

EXCERPT 28. Peer Interaction of Dyad B in the drafting phase in week 2

- 1 N People? Can? *It can provide help.* (.) that (.) help (.) *They can provide help.* (.) (looking at Hyunhwa)
- 2 HH Samgyetang helps people (.) (as writing down)
- 3 N *Then write* ‘people’s health’ or ‘stay’
- 4 HH Ah, stay
- 5 N Health?
- 6 HH Stay healthy (.) in summer (as writing down)
- 7 N *Okay.*

In Excerpt 28, Nayoung was struggling to externalize her thoughts, and randomly blurted out words and L1 (Korean) (line 1). Noticing she needed assistance, Hyunhwa attempted to build a sentence based on Nayoung’s comment (line 2). The pair co-constructed the sentence in a vertical way, contributing some linguistic material (here, words) to the completion of the partner’s previous utterance (Ohta, 2001): help (line 1), people (line 2), stay (line 3) and healthy in summer (line 6). Hyunhwa took the lead in completing the sentence, rephrasing Nayoung’s utterance and modifying the subject-verb agreement (line 2) and the form of subjective complement (line 6) (recast). In this excerpt, L1 private speech was used as a steppingstone on which the learner rested, striving to express her thoughts into English, which in turn was acknowledged as struggling and indirect request for assistance to the peer interlocutor (DiCamilla & Antón, 1997; Huh, 2000; Scott & de la Fuente, 2008).

In summary, the collaborative dialogues demonstrated a high level of mutual engagement. In Excerpt 25 and 27, both dyads consciously deliberated upon the language forms (Elaborated engagement (E)). In Excerpts 24, 26 and 28, though each of

the dyad B seemed to engage limited attention to the task, both of them extended upon the peer interlocutors' suggestions and co-constructed the sentences (Limited engagement by both participants (L+L)). When the learners realized 'a hole in their interlanguage', they actively requested for assistance to their partner either in a direct or indirect way, which resulted in explicit forms of assistance: direct reply (NTRI (provide)), often with metalinguistic explanation (Explaining) (Explicitness level 3 and 4 (refer to Table 3.5)), and co-construction (Explicitness level 3) (refer to Appendix 5 for the analysis of peer interaction in the LREs of all excerpts in this study).

The initiation of the language-related discussion by 'the learners', who were in need of assistance among the pairs, showed that they understood the linguistic resources required to express their intended meaning, and that they knew they did not have full control over the language in question. By requesting assistance, 'the learners' began to take on more responsibilities for the writing process and language learning, thereby engaging in active learning (Speck, 2002), a step toward autonomous learning and self-regulation (Dale, 1994; Ohta, 2001).

In addition, the students showed mutual sensitivity to their peer interlocutor's needs for assistance. They oriented to their partner's verbal and nonverbal interactional cues, and provided mediation accordingly. Though 'the mediators', who provided mediation among the pairs, themselves were learners of the second language, but they were able to offer appropriate mediation (Ohta, 2000, 2001; Huh, 2000; Seo & Kim, 2011). The peer interlocutors were able to attune the mediation to the needs and development level, since they shared the same goal and perspectives on the task ("intersubjectivity") (Ohta, 2001). In other words, the participants were able to offer fine-tuned scaffolding to their partner,



when the issue in question was in their own ZPD (Brooks & Swain, 2009).

Moreover, learner reciprocity (the agentive nature of the learners who attempt to become more autonomous) and the quality of mediation afforded successful collaboration (Poehner, 2008). Both higher-level participant and lower-level participant provided mutual scaffolding with one another, jointly creating their own ZPDs. Their collaborative dialogues demonstrated the dynamics of the learner-mediator interaction in dynamic assessment (Poehner, 2008). In each excerpt, the students alternatively took on the roles of ‘the mediator’ and ‘the learner’ depending on where the issue in question was located in their own ZPD. The result was in line with the study by Ohta (1995) who noted that the notions of expert and novice were ‘fluid concepts’ (p. 109), since the same individual could both function as an expert and a novice at different times. As each peer interlocutor in pairs had different strengths and weaknesses, they pooled differential knowledge, creating a greater expertise for the pair beyond that of any individuals involved (Donato, 1994; Ohta, 2001). Thus, the collaborative dialogues in L2 pair writing served as a platform for both of the pairs to engage in joint construction of L2 composition beyond their individual competence.

#### **4.3.1.2 Unrequested Assistance: Corrective Feedback**

When the peer interlocutor made an error, partners often provided corrective feedback in the next turn, modifying the peer interlocutor’s erroneous utterance (NTRI

(provide)). Recast<sup>4</sup> was the most common method among the learners. Ohta (2001) defined recast as ‘an utterance that reformulates a learner’s erroneous utterance, phonologically, morphologically, syntactically, or semantically, but remains semantic contiguity with it (p.141)’. Excerpts 29 and 30 are instances of morphological recasts. In Excerpt 29, dyad A was co-constructing the topic sentence, each contributing phrases (line 1 and 2). In line 3, Kyungjin modified Hyejung’s previous utterance to repair adjective-noun agreement on number, which was accepted by her peer interlocutor (line 4).

EXCERPT 29. Peer Interaction of Dyad A in the planning phase in week 4

- |   |    |                                                                    |
|---|----|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | K  | We think (,)                                                       |
| 2 | HJ | Plant biotechnology has many (.) disadvantage (as writing<br>down) |
| 3 | K  | <u>-Ges</u>                                                        |
| 4 | HJ | (nodding) (writing ‘disadvantages’)                                |

In Excerpt 30, Kyungjin also noticed error in Hyejung’s utterance in line 2 and corrected the past participle form of ‘bite’ (line 3). Hyejung asked for further information, spelling of the form (line 4), and Kyungjin offered the requested resource and completed the sentence (line 5).

---

<sup>4</sup> Recast is considered as an implicit strategy in meaning negotiation, but it is supposed as an explicit form of scaffolding in peer interaction (Ellis, 2008).

EXCERPT 30. Peer Interaction of Dyad A in the drafting phase in week 3

- 1 K If we *are bitten* by mosquito, it is really itching.
- 2 HJ We are bited (as writing down)=
- 3 K =*It is 'bitten'*.
- 4 HJ Ah! *How do we spell?* (erasing and correcting the passive participle)
- 5 K b-i-t-t-e-n (.) by mosquito, it is really itching.

Sometimes, learners questioned the help offered, mapping it against her own knowledge (Gutiérrez, 2008). In Excerpt 31, dyad B was trying to write their topic sentence “Food made with chili powder are hot, but delicious.”

EXCERPT 31. Peer Interaction of Dyad B in the planning phase in week 1

- 1 N Food (,) makes (.) Food (,) makes (.)
- 2 HH No. (,) made (.) *made* (as writing down) made
- 3 N *Then, isn't 'was made' correct?*
- 4 HH No. *It is a modifier.* Food made with (,)
- 5 N Chili (.) powder

In line 1, Nayoung made false starts and often paused, struggling to build a sentence. Hyunhwa provided recast in a syntactic nature, a past participle form of ‘make’, to modify a noun ‘food’ in a participial phrase (line 2). Nayoung misunderstood the participial construction as a passive structure, and questioned the mediation by her partner (line 3). Hyunhwa further explained the structure (line 4), which Nayoung extended on (line 5). This kind of mediation negotiation was frequent during the collaborative writing.

EXCERPT 7. Peer Interaction of Dyad B in the drafting phase in week 4 (revisited)

- ...      ...
- 24 HH    the average (.) span of life (.) was? Were. (saying as she wrote)
- 25 N      *Then shouldn't we write 'life' in a plural form?*
- 26 HH    *No, the average span is the subject. So it's 'was'.* Was short.
- 27 N      Shorter (.) shorter than (.) uh (.) other mice?
- 28 HH    Shorter than (.) other mice (saying as writing down)

Excerpt 7 also demonstrates negotiation of mediation. When Hyunhwa made a subject-agreement error (line 24), Nayoung pointed out the nature of the error in L1 (Explaining) (line 25). Hyunhwa recognized her partner's point, but she chose not to incorporate her suggestions, by giving the reason that the subject "the average span" is considered singular (line 26). In line 27, Nayoung noticed the erroneous comparative in Hyunhwa's utterance in line 26, and provided recast in the next turn (NTRI (provide)), which was accepted by Hyunhwa this time (line 28). The dynamic mutual engagement in mediation negotiation promoted the participants to construct a sentence beyond their individual competence (line 28) (Donato, 1994).

To summarize, when the students noticed errors in the suggestions their partner made, they provided corrective feedback, mainly in the form of recast (NTRI (provide): Explicitness level 3). This finding is contrary to Ohta (2000) which demonstrated peer assistance was "graduated (from implicit to explicit) and contingent", in Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994)'s term, on the need for help. The students preferred explicit forms of assistance during collaborative writing (refer to Appendix 5 for more analysis). It is

probably for the sake of efficiency because the learners perceived collaborative writing more of a joint problem solving activity rather than a language teaching and learning. During collaborative writing, errors of their own and their peer interlocutors offered the learners an opportunity to notice and collaborate to reformulate the deviant utterances (Ohta, 2001).

Furthermore, the learners were open to negotiate the mediation offered by their peer interlocutor, requesting for additional support as well as refusing or accepting it. The elaborated engagement, in which the students discussed over alternatives, questioned and reasoned the mediation provided, helped the participants to consciously attend to the language and to consolidate their existing linguistic knowledge and appropriate their interlanguage (Storch, 2008; Swain, 2000; Swain & Lapkin, 2000, 2001).

### **4.3.2 Unsuccessfully Resolved Language-Related Episodes**

Although learners collaborated to produce a composition beyond their individual competence, they did not always write error-free sentences (Ohta, 2001; Storch, 2002). This section explores the four Korean learners' dyadic interaction which resulted in the unsuccessfully resolved LREs. Section 4.3.2.1 proposes the factors which led to the unsuccessfully resolved LREs. Section 4.3.2.2 demonstrates how learners sought to resolve the LREs outside their ZPDs by turning to the readily available resources: the teacher and the dictionary.

### **4.3.2.1 What Brings about Unsuccessfully Resolved LREs**

Peer dialogue sometimes led to ungrammatical linguistic decisions. Learner knowledge and the depths of attention and engagement help us to understand the intricate process (Ohta, 2001).

As noted by a previous research (Brooks & Swain, 2009; Kim, 2008; Storch, 2008; Watanabe & Swain, 2007), collaboration between the peer interlocutors played a decisive role in the task performance and learning. In case of dyad B, the low level of mutuality and equality during interaction resulted in limited engagement of the pair, led to unsuccessfully resolved LREs. While elaborated engagement (E) and limited engagement by both of the participants (L+L) in a collaborative interaction resulted in language learning, limited engagement often did not afford it (Storch, 2008) (refer to Appendix 5 for the analysis of peer interaction in the LREs of all excerpts in this study).

Excerpt 5 demonstrates the effect of the depths of attention and engagement on language learning. When Hyunhwa had made the subject-verb agreement error (line 19), Nayoung noticed it and provided the correct form (line 20). However, Hyunhwa rejected Nayoung's assistance (line 21) and constructed the sentence on her own (line 23) (L). Though Nayoung was not satisfied with the decision her partner made, she did not try to rebut her partner's utterance and gave up negotiation (line 22). The limited engagement by only one participant, Hyunhwa, failed to offer the opportunity to consult over the language, and led to unsuccessfully resolved LRE.

EXCERPT 5. Peer Interaction of Dyad B in the planning phase in week 1  
(revisited)

- ... ..
- 19 HH *They are hot, so Koreans like them.* Food made with chili powder  
are (.) are [  
20 N [Shouldn't we attach -s?  
21 HH *No. we don't attach -s to food.*  
22 N *Do we?* (pouting her lips)  
23 HH Are (.) hot (,) but (,) tasty. *Ah.* (erasing) *Just say delicious.*

As elaborated engagement over the language in collaborative dialogue exposed learners to linguistic input and positive and negative feedback, and promoted them to cognitively focus on language choices, it created a learning environment during task performance (Donato, 1994; Ohta, 2000; Swain, 2000). On the other hand, limited engagement of learners in the dominant/passive interaction deprived them of an opportunity to consciously attend to and deliberate on the language (Storch, 2008). In accordance with the previous studies (Ohta, 2000; Poehner, 2008; van Lier, 2000), learner's active engagement was integral to language learning.

Inaccurate linguistic decisions occurred within elaborated or limited engagement by both participants as well, when the relevant language knowledge was not fully internalized into the participants' interlanguage. In case of Dyad A, they had difficulty in using transitive and intransitive verbs throughout the program. In Excerpt 20, when Kyungjin misunderstood "suffer" as a transitive verb, and constructed passive structure, Hyejung provided metalinguistic feedback to correct her error (line 10).

EXCERPT 20. Peer Interaction of Dyad A in the drafting phase in week 3  
(revisited)

- ... ...
- 9 K Suffer (.) *Right*. Can be suffered from
- 10 HJ *But suffer is a (intransitive) verb.*
- 11 K *Ah. You're right. You're right.*
- 12 HJ Can suffer from
- 13 K Skin problems

Excerpts 32 and 33 also include LREs of dyad A related to transitive/intransitive verbs. In Excerpt 32, Kyungjin and Hyejung vertically chimed in words, co-constructing a sentence from line 1 to line 4. In line 3, however, after suggesting the verb “die”, Kyungjin added “are” at the end, perceiving the phrase to be in the passive form. Hyejung, on the other hand, focused on the collocational use of the verb and added a preposition “from”, and sought approval to her partner by raising the intonation (line 4). In the next turn, Kyungjin offered feedback in metalinguistic terms, insisting on the passive structure, but her explanation was incorrect; “suffer” is an intransitive verb, so it does not go through passivization. Though she was able to provide assistance in Excerpt 20 regarding the same grammatical point, Hyejung did not notice the error and accepted Kyungjin’s feedback, requesting confirmation on the past participle form (line 6). Hyejung often had trouble using irregular past participles and produced erroneous forms, such as “eated” (line 15 in Excerpt 11) and “bited” (line 2 in Excerpt 30). Here, she also made an error, suggesting an adjective derived from the verb, “dead”. Noticing Hyejung’s error, Kyungjin provided the correct past participle “died”, but in an ungrammatical passive structure (line 7). Hyejung incorporated it and wrote it down



(line 8) and Kyungjin completed the sentence (line 9).

EXCERPT 32. Peer Interaction of Dyad A in the drafting phase in week 3

- 1 K *Every year hundreds of people die from malaria.* Each (,) year?  
*Each year.* [Every year  
2 HJ [Every year (,) many people (,) (as writing down)=  
3 K =die (,) are  
4 HJ Die (,) from?  
5 K *No. We should use passive form.*  
6 HJ *Dead. Right?=  
7 K = are died from=  
8 HJ = are died from (as writing down)  
9 K Malaria disease (Hyejung wrote down as Kyungjin dictated.)*

In Excerpt 33, Kyungjin and Hyejung co-constructed the sentence, seeking the colloquial expression “Nobody knows ~” (line 3-5) and self-correcting subject-verb agreement (line 6 and 7). In line 8, Hyejung questioned the word choice between “affect” and “effect”. They seemed to be confused between the two words due to the similarity in appearance and meaning (line 2, 3, 8 and 9). Hyejung was aware of the difference between transitive and intransitive verbs, and wanted to choose the proper verb for the context (line 10). To ensure their word choice, they looked up the dictionary and found that “effect” functions as a transitive verb.<sup>5</sup> What they did not realize was that the transitive verb “effect” has a different meaning from what they wanted to convey. Upon the finding, Hyejung misunderstood “affect” as an intransitive verb,

---

<sup>5</sup> ‘Effect’ functions as a verb in a formal context, which means ‘to make something happen’, as in *to effect a cure/change/recovery*. (Oxford Learner’s Dictionary)

which is in fact a transitive verb, and decided on “affect” without a direct object following (line 14). Although Hyejung had some metalinguistic knowledge about transitive and intransitive verbs, they failed to resolve the LRE.

EXCERPT 33. Peer Interaction of Dyad A in the drafting phase in week 4

- 1 K We don't know how it will affect? *We don't know the consequences (of biotechnology).*
- 2 HJ Effect? Affect?
- 3 K Yes. We don't know how it will affect. Effect? Affect?  
No one knows. *Let's write something like 'No one knows'. No one knows.*
- 4 HJ Anybody don't know.
- 5 K *Isn't 'nobody' better? =*
- 6 HJ = Nobody know (.) Ah! Nobody knows. (writing down)
- 7 K *It is 'knows'. Knows. (.) How it will affect*
- 8 HJ Affect? Effect? =
- 9 K = *I think 'effect' sounds good, too.*
- 10 HJ *Is it a transitive or intransitive verb? We don't have an object here. I think 'effect' is an intransitive verb.*  
(They are looking up to the dictionary.)
- 11 K *It's a noun.*
- 12 HJ *It functions as a verb, too.*
- 13 K *It looks like a transitive verb. (looking at the dictionary)*
- 14 HJ *Since 'effect' is a transitive verb, we should write 'affect'. We don't have an object after the verb.*

These excerpts (Excerpts 20, 32 and 33) show that the pair was not able to produce accurate sentences, when the linguistic item, the use of transitive/intransitive verbs, was not fully incorporated into their L2 competence. Kyungjin was not able to notice the

error concerning transitive/intransitive verbs and was only able to correct it under guidance from her peer interlocutor (level 3 on the transition scale (refer to Table 3.4)). Hyejung was aware of the definition and function of transitive and intransitive verbs as shown in Excerpt 20 (line 10) and in Excerpt 33 (line 10 and 14), but she could not fully control the use of transitive/intransitive verbs. As to the grammatical point, Hyejung showed an array of regulation level within her ZPD; In Excerpt 20, she was able to provide corrective feedback (level 4 on the transition scale), and she was able to notice the error but could not correct it (level 3 on the transition scale) in Excerpt 33, and she was not able to notice nor correct it (level 2 on the transition scale) in Excerpt 32. She internalized the use of the intransitive verb “suffer”, but she could not fully control the intransitive verb “die” and the transitive verb “affect”. Therefore, she was able to notice and solve the linguistic problem unconsciously in an automatic cognitive process in Excerpt 20. However, she was fully occupied by the heavy cognitive burden of formulating the utterance in L2 with limited resources available within the capacity of working memory, and was unable to correct the linguistic problems in Excerpts 32 and 33 (Ohta, 2001).

#### **4.3.2.2 How the Learners Resolve the Unsuccessfully Resolved**

##### **LREs: Turning to Other Available Resources**

To explain the unsuccessfully resolved LREs in this section, we can turn to the premise of the study, Sociocultural Theory (SCT), which states that learning occurs

when mediation is provided within the ZPD. Within the framework of SCT, the previous studies showed that collaborative dialogues within the ZPD guided the learners to shift from other-regulation, and ultimately to self-regulation, accomplishing increasing independence and control over the language (Brooks, 1992; Donato, 1988; Huh, 2000; Ohta, 1995; Swain, 2000). Thus, when the knowledge in question was outside the ZPDs of both the peer interlocutors in pairs, it led to inaccurate linguistic decisions. This is the place where the students depend on another *other* resources but peers, teachers, dictionaries and other instructional materials available (Ohta, 2001). Facing linguistic challenges, the learners had a tendency to turn to *other* readily available resources, the dictionary (Excerpt 7, 24, 33 and 34) and the teacher (Excerpt 35) in an attempt to resolve the LREs.

As Kyungjin's individual interview shows (Excerpt 34), one of the difficulties participants had was their insufficient vocabulary knowledge, and they turned to the dictionary for an array of vocabulary knowledge.

EXCERPT 34. Individual interview of Kyungjin at the end of the program

*Difficulties we had during pair writing? Vocabulary. We had trouble finding the words to express our intended meaning. I felt I need to learn vocabulary more, every time I faced with vocabulary challenges during writing. In that case, the Korean-English dictionary was really helpful.*

They looked up the Korean-English dictionary, which were provided by the teacher, in order to find the suitable word for their intended meaning, for example "cancer" in

Excerpt 7 (line 15), and to check grammatical knowledge regarding the vocabulary, the plural form of “mouse” in Excerpt 24 (line 3). They also utilized the dictionary to pick up colloquial use of the word. In Excerpt 7, when Nayoung found the word for “life span”, she didn’t just get the word and close the dictionary. Rather she read the examples, picked up the colloquial use and applied it to constructing their own sentence (line 23).

EXCERPT 7. Peer Interaction of Dyad B in the drafting phase in week 4 (revisited)

- ...      ...
- 21 N      *Here it is.* (looking at the dictionary)
- 22 HH      *Span, it's correct. It means a period.*
- 23 N      *Average.* The average span of life was (.) their (.) the average span of life was (picking up the collocational phrase in the example sentence of the word “span” ) ...

However, wrong use of dictionary might cause awkward vocabulary uses or ungrammatical sentence constructions. In Excerpt 33, oscillating between “affect” and “effect” to convey the meaning ‘to produce a change in somebody/something’, they looked it up in the dictionary to see which one is an intransitive verb<sup>6</sup>. They found an example where “effect” takes an object (line 12), and made a hasty decision that it is a transitive verb (line 13), though the transitive verb “effect” does not convey their intended meaning. They rushed into a decision from only a part of the information in the dictionary without considering the context to use the word (Chon, 2009; Harvey & Yuill,

---

<sup>6</sup> In order to convey their intended meaning, a verb always takes an object afterward, which the students did not aware of in this excerpt.

1997). Thus, the proper use of the dictionary deserves learners' attention.

EXCERPT 33. Peer Interaction of Dyad A in the drafting phase in week 4  
(revisited)

- 10 HJ ... *I think 'effect' is an intransitive verb.*  
(They are looking up to the dictionary.)
- 11 K *It's a noun.*
- 12 HJ *It functions as a verb, too.*
- 13 K *It looks like a transitive verb.* (looking at the dictionary)
- 14 HJ *Since 'effect' is a transitive verb, we should write 'affect'.*  
*We don't have an object after the verb.*

After Excerpt 33, when the teacher approached, Hyejung asked for help (line 1) and requested confirmation on their verb choice (line 3) in Excerpt 35. As Ohta (2001) illustrated, the inaccurate language prompted learners to seek teacher's assistance. The teacher's assistance was graduated and responsive to the need of the students. As for the verb choice, she gave an answer to Hyejung, offering further suggestion to work on, the need for an object (line 4). Responded by the teacher, Hyejung questioned the use of the verb "affect" again, matching it up against her own interlanguage (line 5). Acknowledging her need, the teacher provided metalinguistic explanation (line 6) and guided the students to come up with the object they needed (line 8- 14). Rather than giving the exact word, the teacher tried to elicit their engagement. When Kyungjin produced a part of a word, "ancestor", which is actually the opposite of the word in need (line 11), the teacher incorporated it in her feedback and stimulated Kyungjin to continue to search (line 12). In line 13, Hyejung retrieved the first part of the word, but

it seemed to be ‘on the tip of her tongue.’ Then, the teacher reminded her of the word “offspring” (line 14), and finally the LRE was resolved (line 15).

EXCERPT 35. Peer Interaction of Dyad A in the drafting phase in week 4

- 1 HJ *Ah. Teacher. We don't know what to do.*
- 2 K *We want to write 'Because we don't know the consequences of the GMO food, we should research more.'*
- 3 HJ *Nobody knows how it will (,) Which one is correct, 'effect' or 'affect'?*
- 4 T *You should use 'affect'. Affect. How it will affect (,) 'Affect' takes a direct object.*
- 5 HJ *Isn't 'affect' an intransitive verb?*
- 6 T *'Affect' is a transitive verb, so it takes a direct object. It will affect (,) What does it affect?*
- 7 K *That, 'the breeding' (of human)*
- 8 T *What is the consequence of 'breeding (of human)'? Offspring, right?*
- 9 K/HJ *Ah! (nodding)*
- 10 T *Nobody knows how it will affect our offspring.*
- 11 K *Ah. that. (.) anc- =*
- 12 T *= The opposite of 'ancestor'?*
- 13 HJ *Ah. The word that was on the mock CAST this month (.) Ah! Off- off- ?*
- 14 T *Offspring=*
- 15 HJ *= Yes, right! It is 'offspring'!*

This excerpt shows that the role of a teacher as a facilitator is an integral part of collaborative writing. As the students are still in the process of learning, the peers are expected to confront linguistic challenges during collaboration. Especially when the

linguistic point in question is far beyond their current level of development, they could use a teacher as a resource. The teacher should make sure that the learners can always turn to her and provide appropriate assistance.

In sum, although inaccurate decisions are bound to happen more or less in learner-learner interaction, they were able to be resolved by the proper use of the dictionary (Liu, 2014) and graduated and contingent scaffolding from the teacher (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994).



## **CHAPTER 5**

### **CONCLUSION**

This chapter provides the conclusion of the study as to collaborative dialogues of the Korean EFL high school students in pair writing. Section 5.1 summarizes the major findings of the study regarding the research questions addressed. Section 5.2 explores how the results from the current study are applied to the Korean EFL context. Lastly, section 5.3 contemplates limitations of the present study and suggestions for future research.

#### **5.1 Summary of Major Findings**

The present study has attempted to investigate collaborative dialogues of four Korean EFL high school students (dyad A and B) in pair writing. In specific, three research questions were addressed: first, dyadic interaction patterns of the Korean EFL learners in pair writing and second, the functions of collaborative dialogues in the students' pair writing; third, the dynamics of peer interaction in the LREs during pair writing. A summary of the major findings with regard to these research questions are as follows.

First, dyad A manifested collaborative interaction consistently in EFL pair writing. They engaged with each other's contribution and shared responsibility to jointly complete the composition. From the analysis on the linguistic features, text construction behavior, and metatalk (LREs) (Storch, 2001), their collaborative dialogues were

contingent and cohesive, as the suggestions made by a participant were incorporated or extended on by the peer interlocutor, leading to achieve coherence (van Lier, 1992). On the other hand, dyad B showed a change in their dyadic relationship over the course, shifting from dominant/passive to collaborative interaction pattern. The dominant/passive interaction can be attributed to a relatively large L2 proficiency difference and the participants' stances. As the group developed over time, the lower-level participant as well as the higher-level partner actively engaged in the writing process and negotiated the mediation, which facilitated completion of the L2 composition task and heightened sense of confidence in L2 writing.

Second, L1 collaborative dialogue functioned as a crucial cognitive and social tool for L2 learning and writing of the EFL students (Swain & Lapkin, 2000; Huh, 2000). Mutual scaffolding and private speech in L1 collaborative dialogues helped the learners to regulate their cognitive process of strategic L2 writing and L2 reflection. In addition, L1 collaborative dialogues served social functions of mediating communication and establishing intersubjectivity. In other words, L1 collaborative dialogues promoted the learners to maintain focus on the task, provide affective support with one another and deepen their understanding of the target language (Lantolf, 2000). The analysis showed that participants collaborated to recruit interest in the task, to make the task manageable, and continue to pursue the task completion. In addition, learners gave praise and empathized with each other, which aided in lowering their anxiety and raising their self-esteem in L2 writing. Moreover, verbalization in pair writing helped learners to notice the discrepancies between what they had produced and what they perceived to be an ideal solution, to consciously attend to the language, externalizing and testing

hypotheses, and to gain voluntary control over the target language use (Ohta, 2001; Swain, 2000). Thus, L1 collaborative dialogues afforded a cognitive and social space where mutual scaffolding and private speech fostered co-construction of language in the L2 writing task within the intersubjectivity created by the peer interlocutor in pair writing (Antón & DiCamilla, 1998; Huh, 2000).

Third, microgenetic analysis of collaborative dialogues in the Language-Related Episodes revealed that mutual scaffolding and high level of mutual engagement facilitated both of the participants in pairs to consciously reflect on the L2 and co-construct L2 composition beyond their individual language competence. When the learners realized ‘a hole in their interlanguage’, they actively requested for assistance either in a direct or indirect way, using verbal and nonverbal interactional cues, like raising intonation and pauses, and resorting to L1 private speech. The peers were mutually sensitive to their peer interlocutor’s needs for assistance, orienting to the interactional cues, and provided assistance accordingly (Ohta, 2000, 2001). Since they shared the same goal and perspectives on the task (intersubjectivity), they were able to provide mediation attuned to the needs and development level of the peer interlocutor. Contrary to Ohta (2000), the students preferred explicit forms of assistance, such as co-construction, Next Turn Repair Initiator (NTRI (provide)) and Explaining, due to the efficiency of the task completion. The peer scaffolding was mutually provided by the participants, irrespective of their L2 proficiency level, pooling differential knowledge from each learner’s respective strengths (Ohta, 1995, 2001; Donato, 1994). The students were open to negotiate mediation offered by their partner, requesting for additional information as well as refusing or accepting it. Thus, learner reciprocity and appropriate

mediation in peer interaction afforded collaborative learning (Poehner, 2008), and encouraged the learners to appropriate their interlanguage (Storch, 2011; Swain, 2000; Swain & Lapkin, 2000, 2001). In other words, learners' elaborate engagement in dynamic interaction resulted in "collective scaffolding," which afforded them to complete L2 composition that they were not able to produce individually (Donato, 1994; Ohta, 2001).

Lastly, learner's interlanguage and the depths of attention and engagement helped to understand the intricate process of unsuccessfully resolved LREs. The limited engagement in the dominant/passive interaction deprived dyad B of an opportunity to consciously attend to and deliberate on the language (Storch, 2008). Furthermore, inaccurate linguistic decisions occurred in dyad A's collaborative writing, when the relevant linguistic knowledge was not fully internalized into the students' interlanguage. Thus, when the knowledge in question was outside the ZPDs of the both participants in pairs, they were able to solve the linguistic problems by turning to other resources, the teacher and the dictionary. The students looked up the dictionary not only to find a suitable word for their intended meaning and check grammatical knowledge regarding the vocabulary, but also to find out syntactic information and the colloquial use of the target word. Moreover, the role of the teacher as a facilitator was an integral part of collaborative writing, and her graduated and contingent scaffolding encouraged the learners to handle linguistic challenges during the writing process (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994).

In conclusion, L1 collaborative dialogues of the Korean students in L2 pair writing created a cognitive and social space where the peer interlocutors mutually provided

scaffolding with one another and actively engaged in the writing process and L2 learning. This study suggests that collaborative dialogues in the shared L1 function as an integral mediating tool in the Korean learners' L2 pair writing. L2 pair writing tasks can be an effective complement to the English writing courses in Korean high schools, when teachers unfasten the restrictions on the exclusive L2 use and create collaborative learning environments while providing proper resources.

## **5.2 Pedagogical Implications**

The findings of the present study have some pedagogical implications for the Korean EFL teaching and learning. First, the use of the L1 in L2 learning should be reevaluated and teachers need to unfasten the restrictions on the exclusive L2 use during L2 pair writing. The study demonstrated that L1 collaborative dialogue functioned as an integral cognitive and social tool for L2 pair writing in the Korean EFL context where the L1 (Korean) was shared by all the participants in the classroom. Nevertheless, I do not endorse the random use of the L1 use in place of the L2 in the L2 classroom. Rather, the present study suggests that banning L1 may prohibit the learners from employing the influential tool for learning. Therefore, teachers should unfasten the constraints on language use during L2 pair writing.

Second, L2 pair writing task can assist Korean high school students in improving English writing and language proficiency under the condition that the learners collaborate with each other. It would be a viable option for teaching English writing in

Korean high school context, where teachers often give lectures to a large number of students, around 35 per class. By asking for, providing and negotiating mediation between peer interlocutors, learners are given opportunities to jointly write a composition and reflect on their language. Furthermore, it can reduce Korean students' anxiety toward English writing. Affective support provided by the peers in collaborative dialogues can be of great benefit for Korean students who have little confidence in writing (Jeon, Lee, & Kim, 2011).

Third, teachers should encourage collaboration during L2 pair writing. Since collaboration among the pairs is the key to successful pair work, teachers have to create collaborative learning environment. Teachers can train students in how to request and provide peer response and give rationale for using peer response in the classroom in order to enhance collaboration, which helps to improve learners' language competence (Berg, 1999; Choi, 2008; Min, 2005, 2006; Tang & Tithecott, 1999).

Fourth, teachers should provide proper resources for learners during pair writing. They have to be aware of the dynamics of the collaborative dialogues, and provide assistance when learners are in need of their help. The intervention can be provided either during the peer writing or afterwards in a form of written feedback. Either way, it should be graduated, starting with the implicit form and gradually becoming explicit when necessary, and contingent, offered only when it is needed and removed promptly when learners show signs of independence (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994). Moreover, dictionary use strategy training can be integrated into the English writing class (Bishop, 2001; Harvey & Yuill, 1997; Liu, 2014). Learners often randomly choose the target word without considering the context (Chon, 2009; Harvey & Yuill, 1997). Thus,

teachers have to encourage learners to exploit all available information in the entry, spelling, meaning, synonyms, syntactic and collocational information, before deciding on the word for use.

### **5.3 Limitations of the Present Study and Suggestions for Future Research**

There are some limitations to be considered in the present study. First, considering the small-scale, short-term research design, cautions should be taken not to generalize the findings of the present study. Extensive research including large number of students with various age groups, genders, and nationality will broaden our insights into collaborative dialogues.

Second, the effects of video-recording on the learners' task performance could not be overlooked. The fact that the learners were aware of themselves being video-recorded must have affected their performance and collaborative dialogues during L2 pair writing. Therefore, we need to beware of the effect of video-recording in comprehending the learners' pair work. Third, though the present study presumed the learner personal factors, group development and the division of the roles in pairs to cause the transition of the interaction pattern, further studies will provide important pedagogical implications on L2 pair work.

Fourth, with regard to proficiency grouping, the mock CSAT scores could only serve

as an indirect indicator of their language proficiency. As the CSAT format is multiple-choice questions and mainly contains reading (54% of the test items) and listening (26%) questions, allegedly assessing speaking (8%) and writing (12%) ability in an indirect way, it is questionable whether it can reflect students' actual language competence, as indicated in the previous studies (Lee, 2001). Thus, future study needs to employ more valid assessment tools, either a writing pretest or certified English proficiency tests, in order to grasp learners' language ability, especially writing, before the pair writing task initiates.

Fifth, though the current study qualitatively examined the aspects of the collaborative dialogues in pair writing and analyzed the microgenetic growth during writing process, quantitative data analysis can support the findings of the study. Future research needs to implement pre- and post-test to assess learner's language ability in writing tasks, and analyze the language development through collaborative dialogues in pair writing.

Further studies on collaborative dialogues and peer interaction during pair writing can shed light on the implementation of collaborative writing. First, L1 and L2 collaborative dialogues of various proficiency groups of Korean students will broaden our insights into collaborative dialogues. As shown by Swain and Lapkin (2000) and Scott and de la Fuente (2008), intermediate L2 proficiency learners are benefited from using the L1 in collaborative dialogues, compared to the advanced learners. However, more research is needed to investigate collaborative dialogues in the L1 and the L2 in various proficiency groups, including novice-novice interaction.

Second, analysis of conflicts in peer interaction will help the teachers to guide the



learners. During pair writing, there were some incidents of conflict between the peer interlocutors. They had disputes over differences in opinions and stylistic choices and the unequal division of work (Lee, 2012). To investigate how the students handle arguments will help us to guide the learners to work on the conflict in a constructive way.

Third, it will be interesting to investigate the effects of L2 use requirements during EFL pair writing on L2 learning. In the current study, the learners mostly used the shared L1 as a mediating tool during pair work, and L1 collaborative dialogues were beneficial for development of strategic writing process and L2 learning. Exclusive use of the L2 during pair writing will add a cognitive burden to the EFL learners who are already occupied by the challenging task of L2 writing and may inhibit collaboration and impede natural learning strategies (Scott & de la Fuente, 2008). However, it will also offer a great deal of chances to use the L2 for an authentic purpose. Therefore, it will provide us a practical advice on the implementation of collaborative writing to see what really happens in the pair writing process where the L2 is highly encouraged as a medium of collaborative dialogue in Korean EFL context.

Moreover, further study on the teacher's intervention and dictionary use strategy training can assist teachers in providing opportunities for learning in pair writing. The present study revealed that the teacher's active involvement in promoting collaboration and providing appropriate resources helped learners to become autonomous. Therefore, investigating how the teacher's role of facilitator affects collaborative dialogue will offer us a more comprehensive view on developing successful collaborative writing tasks.

Lastly, collaborative dialogues in on-line collaborative writing deserve more attention. These days, learners have easy access to the Internet, which offers a variety of

opportunities to expose themselves to authentic language use. Moreover, Korean high school students are familiar with learning with technology and actually prefer it to traditional learning. Therefore, to examine collaborative dialogues in computer-supported collaborative learning (CSCL) environment, such as wikis and blogs, will assist us in providing more motivating language learning experience.

## REFERENCES

- Aljaafreh, A., & Lantolf, J. P. (1994). Negative feedback as regulation and second language learning in the zone of proximal development. *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 465–487.
- Antón, M., & DiCamilla, F. J. (1998). Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 54(3), 314-42.
- Berg, E. C. (1999). The effects of trained peer response on ESL students' revision types and writing quality. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8, 215-241.
- Bishop, G. (2001). Using quality and accuracy ratings to quantify the value added of a dictionary skills training course. *Language Learning Journal*, 24, 62-69.
- Brooks, F. B. (1992). Spanish III learners talking to one another through a jigsaw task. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 48, 696-717.
- Brooks, F. B., & Donato, R. (1994). Vygotskian approaches to understanding foreign language learner discourse during communicative tasks. *Hispania*, 77, 262-274.
- Brooks, L., & Swain, M. (2009). Languaging in collaborative writing: Creation of and response to expertise. In A. Mackey & C. Polio (Eds.), *Multiple perspectives on interaction: Second language research in honor of Susan M. Gass* (pp. 58–89). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Broukal, M. (2010). *Weaving It Together 2: Connecting Reading and Writing*. Heinle, Cengage Learning.

- Chon, Y. V. (2009). The electronic dictionary for writing: a solution or a problem? *International Journal of Lexicography*, 22(1), 23-54.
- Choi, S. H. (2008). The effects of cooperative learning using scaffolder in small groups on improving English speaking, writing, and attitudes. Unpublished master's dissertation. Graduate School of Education, Dankuk University.
- Dale, H. (1994). Collaboration between children learning to write: Can novices be masters? *Cognition and Instruction*, 10(4), 281-333.
- Damon, W., & Phelps, E. (1989). Critical distinctions among three approaches to peer education. *Interactional Journal of Educational Research*, 58, 9-19.
- Davidson, S. J. (2000). Collaborative dialogues in the zone of proximal development: Grade eight French immersion students learning the conditional tense. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto (Ontario Institute for Studies in Education).
- DiCamilla, F. J., & Antón, M. (1997). Repetition in the collaborative discourse of L2 learners: A Vygotskian perspective. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 53, 609–633.
- Donato, R. (1988). A Psycholinguistic rationale for collective activity in second language learning. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Delaware, Newark.
- Donato, R. (1994). Collective scaffolding in second language learning. In J. P. Lantolf, & G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research* (pp. 33–56). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Ede, L., & Lunsford, A. (1990). *Singular texts/plural authors: perspectives on*

- collaborative writing*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2008). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. New York.
- Frawley, W., & Lantolf, J. P. (1985). Second language discourse: A Vygotskian perspective. *Applied Linguistics*, 6, 19-44.
- Fung, Y. M. (2006). The nature and dynamics of collaborative writing in a Malaysian tertiary ESL setting. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Massey University, New Zealand.
- Guerrero, M. C. M. de, & Villamil, O. S. (2000). Activating the ZPD: Mutual scaffolding in L2 peer revision. *The Modern Language Journal*, 84, 51-68.
- Gutiérrez, A. G. (2008). Microgenesis, method and object: A study of collaborative activity in Spanish as a foreign language classroom. *Applied Linguistics*, 29(1), 120-148.
- Harvey, K., & Yuill, D. (1997). A study of the use of a monolingual pedagogical dictionary by learners of English engaged in writing. *Applied Linguistics*, 18(3), 253-278.
- Huh, M. H. (2000). A Journey into L2 narrative with L1 collaborative dialogue. *Journal of the Applied Linguistics Association of Korea*, 16(2), 107-126.
- Jeon, J. H., Lee, W. K., & Kim, J. R. (2011). Investigating the English speaking proficiency level Koreans want to achieve. *English Teaching*, 66(2), 273-305.
- Jeong, M. K. (2013). A Study of teaching speaking and writing in secondary schools. Unpublished master's dissertation. Hanyang University.

- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1989). *Cooperation and competition: Theory and research*. Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.
- Kang, K. A. (2013). The effects of collaborative small group writing tasks on language learning. Unpublished master's dissertation. Yonsei University.
- Kellerman, E. (1995). Crosslinguistic influence: Transfer to nowhere? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 15, 125-150.
- Kim, S. K. (2012). The Influence of collaborative group writing on English writing performance and characteristics of collaborative dialogues in the process of group writing. Unpublished master's dissertation. The Graduate School of TESOL. Sookmyung Women's University.
- Kim, S. W., & Lee, J. W. (2012). Effects of collaborative writing on middle school students' English writing proficiency. *Journal of Studies in Language*, 28(1), 51-71.
- Kim, Y. J. (2008). The contribution of collaborative and individual tasks to the acquisition of L2 vocabulary. *Modern Language Journal*, 92, 114–130.
- Kim, Y. J., & McDonough, K. (2008). The effect of interlocutor proficiency on the collaborative dialogue between Korean as a second language. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(2), 211–234.
- Kowal, M. and Swain, M. (1994). Using collaborative language production tasks to promote students' language awareness. *Language Awareness*, 3, 73–93.
- Kuiken, F. and Vedder, I. (2002) The effect of interaction in acquiring the grammar of a second language. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 37, 343–358.

- Kwon, O., Yoshida, K., Watanabe, Y., Negishi, M., & Naganuma, N. (2004). A comparison of English proficiency of Korean, Japanese, and Chinese high school students. *English Teaching*, 59, 3-21.
- Lantolf, J. P. (2000). Introducing sociocultural theory. In J. P. Lantolf (ed.), *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. New York.
- Lantolf, J. P., & Pavlenko, A. (1995). Socio-cultural theory and second language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 15, 108–124
- Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- LaPierre, D. (1994). Language output in a cooperative learning setting: Determining its effects on second language learning. Unpublished master's dissertation. University of Toronto (Ontario Institute for Studies in Education).
- Lee, M. B., Shin, D. K., Cho, B. K., Park, T. J., Lee, D. J., Song, M. Y., Yoon, J. H., Park, J. S., Kim, Y. H., & Kim, S. J. (2011). Research on the Curriculum Improvement Introducing the Speaking/Writing Assessment. KICE RRI 2011-7-1. Seoul: Korean Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation.
- Lee, J. H. (2001). Some comprehensive suggestions for the improvement of the College Scholastic Abilities Test. *English Teaching*, 56(2), 333-364.
- Lee, Y. J. (2012). Korean college students' collaborative EFL writing in general English course: Focusing on process and product. Unpublished master's dissertation. Seoul National University, Korea.
- Lee, Y. M., & Yoo, J. M. (2003). Effect of Gender Grouping on Cooperative

- Learning in Middle School Science. *The Korean Earth Science Society*, 24(3), 141-149.
- Leeser, M. J. (2004). Learner proficiency and focus on form during collaborative dialogue. *Language Teaching Research*, 8, 55–82.
- Leki, I. (1990). Potential problems with peer responding in ESL writing classes. *CATESOL Journal*, 3, 5-19.
- Liu, L. (2014). The integration of dictionary use strategy training into basic English class. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(10), 2138-2143.
- Lidz, C. S. (1991). *Practitioner's guide to dynamic assessment*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Lockhart, C., & Ng, P. (1995). Analyzing talk in ESL peer response groups: Stances, functions and content. *Language Learning*, 45, 605-655.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997) Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiations of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 37–66.
- McCarthy, S. J., & McMahon, S. (1992). From convention to invention: Three approaches to peer interactions during writing. In R. Hertz-Lazarowitz, & N. Miller (Eds.), *Interaction in cooperative groups. The theoretical anatomy of group learning* (pp. 17–35). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mendonça, C. O., & Johnson, K. E. (1994). Peer review negotiations: Revision activities in ESL writing instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28, 745–769.
- Mercer, N. (2000). *Words and minds: How we use language to think together*. London: Routledge.



- Min, H. (2005). Training students to become successful peer reviewers. *System*, 33, 2, 293-308.
- Min, H. (2006). The effects of trained peer review on EFL students' revision types and writing quality. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15, 118-141.
- Nelson, G. L., & Murphy, J. M. (1992). An L2 writing group: Task and social dimension. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 1, 171-192.
- Ohta, A. (1995). Applying sociocultural theory to an analysis of learner discourse: Learner-learner collaborative interaction in the zone of proximal development. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6(2), 93–121.
- Ohta, A.S. (2000). Rethinking interaction in SLA: Developmentally appropriate assistance in the zone of proximal development and the acquisition of L2 grammar. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning* (pp. 51–78). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ohta, A.S. (2001). *Second Language Acquisition Processes in the Classroom: Learning Japanese*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Pae, J. K. (2009). A Comparative study of Korean EFL writers' product, process, and perception in computer-supported collaborative writing and individual writing. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Hanyang University.
- Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002) Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36, 573–595.
- Park, Y. R. (2007). Current state of teaching English writing and suggested lesson plans. *The British and American Language and Literature Association*, 23(1), 51-

81.

- Paulus, T. M. (1999). The effect of peer and teacher feedback on student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8(3)*, 265-289.
- Poehner, M. E. (2008). Both sides of the conversation: the interplay between mediation and learner reciprocity in dynamic assessment. in J. P. Lantolf and M. E. Poehner (Eds.), *Sociocultural Theory and the Teaching of Second Languages* (pp. 34-56). London: Equinox Publishing Ltd.
- Rommetveit, R. (1985). Language acquisition as increasing linguistic structuring of experience and symbolic behavior control. In J. V. Wertsch (Ed.), *Culture, communication, and cognition*. (pp. 183-204). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to discourse*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Scott, V. M., & de la Fuente, M. J. (2008). What's the problem? L2 learners' use of the L1 during consciousness-raising, form-focused tasks. *The Modern Language Journal, 92(1)*, 100-113.
- Seo, H. S., & Kim, T. Y. (2011). Collaborative dialogues and L2 learning. *Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics, 27(1)*, 143-167.
- Seong, G. B. (2006). Collaborative learning in the ESL writing classroom. *Foreign Languages Education, 13(1)*, 143-167.
- Shrum, J. L., & Gilsan, E. W. (2005). *Teacher's handbook: Contextualized language instruction* (3rd Ed.). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Speck, B. (2002). *Facilitating students' collaborative writing*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report. Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series. Jossey-Bass,

989 Market Street, San Francisco, CA 994103-1741.

- Stone, C.A. (1993). What is missing in the metaphor of scaffolding? In Forman, E.A., Minick, N. and Stone, C.A. (Eds.), *Contexts for learning: sociocultural dynamics in children's development* (pp. 169-83). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Storch, N. (2001). How collaborative is pair work? ESL tertiary students composing in pairs. *Language Teaching Research*, 5, 29–53.
- Storch, N. (2002). Patterns of interaction in ESL pair work. *Language Learning* 52, 119–158.
- Storch, N. (2005). Collaborative writing: Product, process, and students' reflections. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 14, 153-173.
- Storch, N. (2008). Metatalk in pair work activity: Level of engagement and implications for language development. *Language Awareness*, 17, 95–114.
- Storch, N. (2011). Collaborative writing in L2 contexts: Processes, outcomes, and future directions. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 275–288.
- Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2003). Is there a role for the use of L1 in an L2 setting? *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(4), 760-770.
- Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2007). 'Writing tasks: The effects of collaboration. In M. d. P. G. Mayo (Ed.), *Investigating Tasks in Formal Language Learning* (pp. 157-177). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, Ltd.
- Storch, N., & Aldosari, A. (2012). Pairing learners in pair work activity. *Language Teaching Research*, 17(1), 31-48.
- Swain, M. (1998). Focus on form through conscious reflection. *Focus on form in*

*classroom second language acquisition*, 64-81.

Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning* (pp. 97–114). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M. (2006). Linguaging, agency, and collaboration in advanced second language proficiency. In B. H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Advanced language learning: The contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky* (pp. 95-108). London: Continuum.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together. *Modern Language Journal*, 82(3), 320–337.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2000). Task-based second language learning: The uses of the first language. *Language Teaching Research*, 4(3), 251–274.

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.

Swain, M., Brooks, L., & Tocalli-Beller, A. (2002). Peer-peer dialogue as means of second language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 171-185.

Tang, G. M., & Tithecott, J. (1999). Peer response in ESL writing. *TESL Canada Journal*, 16, 20-38.

Tuckman, B. W. (1965). Development sequence in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin*, 63, 348–399.

van Lier, L. (1992). Not the nine o'clock linguistics class: Investigating contingency

- grammar. *Language awareness*, 1, 91-108.
- van Lier, L. (1996). *Interaction in the language curriculum: Awareness, autonomy and authenticity*. New York: Longman.
- van Lier, L. (2000). From input to affordance: Social-interactive learning from an ecological perspective. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning* (pp. 245–259). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Villamil, O. S., & Guerrero, M. C. M. de (1996). Peer revision in the L2 classroom: Socio-cultural activities, mediating strategies, and aspects of social behavior. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 5, 51-75.
- Villamil, O. S., & Guerrero, M. C. M. de (1998). Assessing the impact of peer revision on L2 writing. *Applied Linguistics*, 19, 491-514.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1981). The genesis of higher mental functions. *The concept of activity in Soviet psychology*, 144-188.
- 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.
- Watanabe, Y. (2008). Peer-peer interaction between L2 learners of different proficiency levels: Their interactions and reflections. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 64(4), 605-635.
- Wells, G., Chang, G. M., & Maher, A. (1990). Creating classroom communities of literate thinkers. In S. Sharan (Ed.), *Cooperative learning: Theory and research*,

95–122. New York: Praeger.

Wertsch, J. V. (1991). *Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wigglesworth, G., & Storch, N. (2009). Pair versus Individual writing: Effects on fluency, complexity and accuracy, *Language Testing*, 26, 445-466.

Wood, D., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 17, 89–100.

Yang, M. S., & Son, Y. G. (2009). A study on the current English writing education in secondary schools. *English Language Education*, 38, 106-135.

Yong, M. F. (2006). The nature and dynamics of collaborative writing in a Malaysian tertiary ESL setting. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Massey University, New Zealand.

## **APPENDICES**

|                                                                                           |            |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| <b>APPENDIX 1. Student English Language Background Survey .....</b>                       | <b>119</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 2. Example of the Collaborative Writing Worksheet .....</b>                   | <b>120</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 3. Individual Interview Questions.....</b>                                    | <b>123</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 4. Transcription Conventions .....</b>                                        | <b>123</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 5. Analysis of Peer Interaction in the LREs in Collaborative Writing.....</b> | <b>124</b> |

## APPENDIX 1. Student English Language Background Survey

This questionnaire is intended to understand your language learning experiences regarding English writing, and your reply will not be employed for the purposes other than research. Read carefully and answer the questions.

1. Name:                      Grade:                      Class:                      Student number:
2. Age:                      Gender: ( M / F )
3. When did you first start to learn English? Where and how?
4. How do you feel about learning English?
5. What is the most interesting thing in learning English? And what is the most difficult thing for you?
6. Have you ever studied English abroad?  
(If you have, please write down the period and place you learned.)
7. Have you ever taken courses in English writing?  
(If you have, please write when, where, and how.)
8. Have you ever taken courses with collaborative learning approach?  
(If you have, please write when, where, and how.)
9. For understanding your general English proficiency level, please write your English scores for these tests.
  - 1) English score/ grade of Mock-CSAT (College Scholastic Ability Test):
  - 2) NEAT Writing:                      Grade:                      The score of writing section:
10. If you have any questions regarding this course, write them down.

*Note.* The questionnaire was provided to the students in Korean, and translated into English by the researcher.









### APPENDIX 3. Individual Interview Questions

1. What do you think about pair writing? How do you like/dislike pair writing?
2. What are the advantages/disadvantages of pair writing?
3. Are there any difficulties/preferences when you work with your partner on the pair writing?
4. Whenever you have some difficulties in pair writing, how do you solve the problem? Or how does your partner help you solve the problem?
5. Do you think that you contributed a lot to complete the writing task? How about your partner's contribution to the writing process?
6. How do you feel about your writing proficiency? Is there any difference in your attitude toward writing before and after the instruction?

*Note.* These questions are modified from *Collaborative Dialogues and L2 Learning: Korean Junior High School Students' Pair-work in English Composition* (Seo & Kim, 2011).

### APPENDIX 4. Transcription Conventions

|                 |                                   |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|
| <i>italics</i>  | Transcription into English        |
| (.)             | Brief pause                       |
| ?               | rising intonation                 |
| (.)             | Continuing intonation             |
| (parentheses)   | Nonverbal features, e.g., (laugh) |
| ((parentheses)) | Comment                           |
| :               | Elongation of a sound             |
| [               | Onset of overlap                  |
| =               | Latched utterances                |
| Underlining     | Pronounced with stress            |
| ...             | Several turns later               |
| Wor-            | Utterances cut off or unfinished  |
| w-o-r           | Spelling out the word             |

## APPENDIX 5. Analysis of Peer Interaction in the LREs in Collaborative Writing

| Excer<br>-pt | Line      | Medi<br>-ator | Bid for Help                                                             | Methods of assistance<br>(Level of Explicitness) | Level of<br>Engagement | Grammar points               |
|--------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1            | 18        | K             |                                                                          | Self-correction                                  |                        | Verb tense (past)            |
|              | 19        | HJ            | error                                                                    | NTRI(P)+Explain<br>ing (3/4)                     | L+L                    | Verb insertion               |
|              | 20-<br>23 | K/H<br>J      |                                                                          | Co-<br>construction(2)                           | E                      | Verb phrase                  |
|              | 25        | HJ            |                                                                          | Self-correction                                  |                        | Subject-verb<br>agreement    |
| 2            | 5-8       | K/<br>HJ      | Indirect request<br>(L1 private<br>speech +raising<br>intonation)        | Co-<br>construction(2)                           | E                      | Verb phrase                  |
|              | 13        | K             | error                                                                    | Explaining (4)                                   | L+L                    | “so~ that...” phrase         |
| 5            | 20        | N             | error                                                                    | NTRI(P) (3)*                                     | L                      | Subject-verb<br>agreement    |
| 6            | 1-7       | HH/<br>N      | Indirect request<br>(raising<br>intonation)                              | Co-<br>construction(2)                           | E                      | Sentence<br>construction     |
| 7            | 7         | N             | Indirect request<br>(L1 private<br>speech)                               | NTRI(P)(3)                                       | L+L                    | “Some~, others...”<br>phrase |
|              | 7         | N             |                                                                          | Self-correction                                  |                        | Verb tense (past)            |
|              | 25        | N             | error                                                                    | Explaining(4)                                    | E                      | Subject-verb<br>agreement    |
|              | 26        | HH            | Indirect request<br>(raising<br>intonation)                              | NTRI(P)+Explain<br>ing (3/4)                     | E                      | Subject-verb<br>agreement    |
|              | 27        | N             | error                                                                    | NTRI(P)(3)                                       | L+L                    | comparative                  |
| 11           | 16        | K             | Indirect request<br>(raising<br>intonation)                              | NTRI(P)(3)                                       | L+L                    | Passive<br>(past participle) |
| 20           | 3-8       | HJ/<br>K      | Indirect request<br>(L1 private<br>speech+pauses+<br>raising intonation) | Co-<br>construction(2)                           | E                      | Verb phrase                  |

|    |          |          |                                                                           |                              |     |                                         |
|----|----------|----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----|-----------------------------------------|
|    | 10       | HJ       | error                                                                     | Explaining(4)                | L+L | Passive (transitive /intransitive verb) |
| 21 | 1        | HH       |                                                                           | Self-correction              | E   | Verb                                    |
| 22 | 3        | K        |                                                                           | Self-correction              |     | Subject-verb agreement                  |
|    | 4        | HJ       |                                                                           | Self-correction              |     | Parallel structure                      |
| 23 | 7        | K/<br>HJ |                                                                           | Self-correction              |     | Adjective-noun agreement                |
| 24 | 2        | N        | Direct question                                                           | NTRI(P)(3)                   | L+L | Irregular plural noun                   |
| 25 | 6,<br>10 | HJ       | Direct question                                                           | NTRI(P)+Explaining (3/4)     | E   | Indirect interrogative structure        |
| 26 | 3        | HH       | Indirect request (raising intonation)                                     | NTRI(P)+Explaining (3/4)     | L+L | Irregular plural noun                   |
| 27 | 2        | HH       | Indirect request (L1 private speech+pauses+elongation+raising intonation) | NTRI(P)(3)                   | L+L | Sentence construction                   |
|    | 4        | HH       | Direct question                                                           | Explaining+NTRI(P)(4/3)      | E   | Noun/ verb                              |
| 28 | 2        | HH       | Indirect request (L1 private speech + pause)                              | Co-construction + NTRI(P)(3) | L+L | Sentence construction                   |
|    | 6        | HH       | Indirect request (raising intonation)                                     | Co-construction + NTRI(P)(3) | L   | Subjective complement                   |
| 29 | 3        | K        | error                                                                     | NTRI(P)(3)                   | L+L | Adjective-noun agreement                |
| 30 | 3        | K        | error                                                                     | NTRI(P)(3)                   | L+L | Passive (past participle)               |
| 31 | 2        | HH       | error                                                                     | NTRI(P)(3)                   | E   | Participial structure                   |
| 32 | 5        | K        |                                                                           | Explaining(4)*               | L+L | Passive (transitive /intransitive verb) |
|    | 7        | K        | Direct question                                                           | NTRI(P)(3)*                  | L+L | Passive (past participle)               |
| 33 | 4-7      | K/<br>HJ |                                                                           | Co-construction(2)           | E   | “Nobody knows~” phrase                  |
|    | 6,7      | HJ/      |                                                                           | Self-correction              |     | Subject-verb                            |

|    |      |          |                |         |                         |                                       |
|----|------|----------|----------------|---------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|
|    |      | K        |                |         |                         | agreement                             |
|    | 9-14 | HJ/<br>K |                |         | Co-<br>construction(2)* | E<br>Transitive/<br>intransitive verb |
| 35 | 4-6  | T        | Direct<br>(HJ) | request | Asking(4)               | Transitive/<br>intransitive verb      |
|    | 8-13 | T        |                |         | Scaffolding             | Vocabulary                            |

*Note.*

Methods of assistance (Level of Explicitness) are based on Ohta (2001:89) (refer to Table 3.5).

Level of Engagement is based on Storch (2008) (refer to section 3.3.3).

\*Asterisk on the methods of assistance section denotes unsuccessfully resolved LRE.

## 국 문 초 록

본 연구는 한국 고등학생들의 협력적 대화가 짝지어 영작문 쓰기 과업과 제2언어 학습에 어떠한 영향을 미치는지 살펴본다. 이를 위해 본 연구에서는 짝지어 영작문 쓰기 과업에서 학습자들의 상호작용 양식을 살펴보고, 협력적 대화의 기능과 언어 관련 담화에서 나타나는 협력적 대화의 양상을 분석한다.

네 명의 한국 고등학교 1학년 여학생들(집단 A와 집단 B)이 4주간의 짝지어 영작문 쓰기 방과후 학교 프로그램에 자발적으로 참여하였다. 상위 학습자와 하위 학습자가 짝을 이루어 매주 글쓰기 계획을 세워 초안을 작성하고 수정하는 협력적 글쓰기 활동을 실시하였다. 이를 영상 녹화하여 학생들의 협력적 대화 양상을 분석하였으며, 프로그램이 끝난 후 학생들의 개별 인터뷰를 실시하였다. 이러한 분석을 통해 살펴본 협력적 대화의 특징과 양상은 다음과 같다.

첫째, 집단 A는 짝지어 영작문 쓰기 활동에서 지속적으로 협력적 상호작용 양식을 보여주었다. 그러나 집단 B는 지배적/수동적 상호작용 양식에서 협력적 상호작용 양식으로 변화를 보였다. 집단 B는 구성원들의 제2언어 능력의 격차가 상대적으로 커서 학습 초기에 지배적/수동적 상호작용을 보였으나, 시간이 흐름에 따라 상위 학습자뿐만 아니라 하위 학습자도 적극적으로 글쓰기 과정에 참여하고 협상하는 과정에 참여함으로써 협력적 상호작용이 나타났다. 학습자들의 협력적 상호작용은 영작문 쓰기 과업의 완수와 제2언어 글쓰기에 대한 학습자들의 자신감 향상을 촉진하였다.

둘째, 모국어로 이루어진 협력적 대화는 학습자들의 영작문 글쓰기와



제2언어 학습에서 중요한 인지적, 사회적 도구로 기능하였다. 모국어 협력적 대화는 학습자들이 과업에 집중을 유지하고 서로에게 정서적 지지를 제공하며 목표어에 대한 이해를 높일 수 있도록 촉진하였다. 모국어 협력적 대화에서 나타나는 상호적 비계와 사적 언어는 학습자들이 전략적 영작문 글쓰기와 제2언어에 대한 의식적 숙고의 인지적 문제 해결의 과정에 도움을 주었을 뿐만 아니라, 의사소통의 수단으로서 상호주관성을 형성하는 사회적 기능도 담당하였다.

셋째, 학습자들은 협력적 대화를 통해 상호적 비계를 제공하고 서로 적극적으로 언어 관련 담화에 참여하여 제2언어 사용에 대해 집중적으로 숙고하고 개인의 능력 이상의 영작문 과업을 완수하였다. 상위 및 하위 학습자 모두 언어적 간극을 알아차렸을 때 적극적으로 언어 관련 담화를 개시하였으며, 동료 학습자들은 상대방의 필요에 적절한 도움을 제공하였다. 학습자들은 주로 명시적 형태의 도움을 제공하였으며, 서로의 의견에 대해 적극적으로 협상하며 집단적 비계를 형성하여 글을 함께 구성하였다.

넷째, 학습자들의 학습자 언어 부족과 제한적 참여는 학습자들의 부정확한 언어적 결정에 영향을 끼쳤다. 관련 언어 지식이 동료 학습자들의 잠재적 발달 영역의 밖에 위치할 경우, 학습자들은 적절한 사전의 사용과 조력자로서 교사의 비계 제공을 통해 과업을 해결할 수 있었다.

결론적으로, 짝지어 영작문 쓰기 과업에서 한국인 고등학생들의 모국어 협력적 대화는 동료 학습자들이 상호적 비계를 제공하고 글쓰기의 과정과 언어 학습에 적극적 참여할 수 있도록 촉진하는 인지적, 사회적 환경을 형성하는데 기여한다. 본 연구는 모국어 협력적 대화가 짝지어 영작문 쓰기 과업의 중요한 매개 도구로 기능하며, 교사들이 제2언어 전용에 대한 제한

을 풀고 협력적 학습 환경을 제공할 때 짝지어 영작문 쓰기 과업이 한국  
고등학교 영어 교육 현장에서 효과적인 보충 활동이 될 수 있음을 제안한  
다.

주요어: 협력적 대화, 집단적 비계, 협동 글쓰기, 또래 상호 작용, 언어 관련  
담화

학 번: 2010-21468