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Abstract

For students to improve their written proficiency in a world language, teachers need to stop spending time correcting grammar and spelling errors for students. By incorporating writer’s workshop into their lessons, teachers can explicitly teach and model various strategies for students to improve their writing skills (Bender, 2007; Berne & Degener, 2015; Culham, 2014; Fountas & Pinnell, 2001; Jacobson, 2010). After collecting first drafts, teachers can analyze students’ writing and differentiate instruction to focus on traits to model during mini-lessons or small-group strategy lessons such as ideas, organization, voice, word choice, sentence fluency, and conventions (Culham, 2003, 2010). Students can learn that excellent writing involves peer review, editing, revising, and re-editing. Teachers can empower students to become multilingual authors and value and enjoy writing various genres. Using the ELA Common Core Standards (2010), the World Readiness Standards for Language Learning (2015), and the NCSSFL-ACTFL Can-Do Benchmarks (2015, 2017) to inform instruction, teachers can integrate writer’s workshop to promote students’ communicative and cultural proficiency. By focusing on building students’ literacy in WL classrooms, they will develop global competence and be able to think critically, engage in meaningful dialogue, and communicate their ideas in multiple languages with a diversity of people. If more U.S. students become multilingual and multiliterate, earning the Seal of Biliteracy in certain states, the impact on national identity will be powerful,
transforming students into active citizens who participate in local, national, and
global affairs.
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Introduction

Oral proficiency of a world language (WL) is essential and desirable; however, speaking, reading, and writing in multiple languages affords a person access to more knowledge, more expertise, and more professional and personal opportunities (Burke, 2016). Illiteracy threatens democracy because illiterates cannot make informed decisions or participate in the political process (Freire & Macedo, 1987). Freire and Macedo call for “a view of literacy as a form of cultural politics” (p. viii) and urge teachers to view literacy as “the relationship of learners to the world, mediated by the transforming practice of this world taking place in the very general milieu in which learners travel” (p. viii). Daniels & Ahmed (2015) challenge teachers to inspire the present generation to become “upstanders” who are “active and informed human beings who will make thoughtful and brave choices in their own lives, in their communities, and on the ever-shrinking world stage” (p. 4). To become upstanders who effectively solve world problems and improve our future, Daniels & Ahmed believe students must be taught to read, write, think, investigate, and collaborate. If the goal of WL education is to empower students to become multilingual and multiliterate, the impact on national identity can allow for active citizens who participate in local, national, and global engagement (Schultz, 2011). If teachers focus on developing students’ literacy early on in WL classrooms, students will develop global competence and be able to think critically, engage in meaningful dialogue, and communicate their ideas in multiple languages with a diversity of people.

In the 2016 Central States Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages Report, Burke (2016) presented two models for developing literacy in world language classrooms that focused on developing WL students’ reading proficiency: reader’s workshop and literature circles. In this Report, we aim to provide readers with strategies to develop WL students’ written proficiency during writer’s workshop. Several of these strategies have been found to improve students’ writing in their first language in English Language Arts classrooms. Although addressed in different CSCTFL Reports, in order to maximize time and resources, teachers can weave the English Language Arts (ELA) Common Core Standards (2010), World Readiness Standards for Learning Languages (2015), and NCSSFL-ACTFL Can-Do Benchmarks (2015, 2017) together to inform their curriculum and instruction and promote communicative and cultural proficiency in world language classrooms (Burke, 2016; Culham, 2014).

Burke (2016) addressed the astounding illiteracy rates worldwide, reporting several concerning U.S. statistics from the Literacy Project Foundation (2015): 44 million adults cannot read a simple story to their children; 50% of adults cannot read a book written at the eighth grade level; 44% of adults do not read a book in a year; six out of 10 households do not buy a single book in a year; 50% of
the unemployed between the ages of 16 and 21 cannot read well enough to be considered functionally literate; three out of five people in prisons cannot read; and 85% of juvenile offenders have problems reading (p. 206). Equally astounding are statistics related to English reading and writing proficiency for U.S. students in grades 8 and 12. According to the National Assessment Governing Board (n.d.), the majority of eighth and twelfth graders are not performing at the proficient level for reading or writing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress. In 2015, only 34% of eighth graders and 37% of twelfth graders scored at the proficient level for reading. In 2011, only 27% of both eighth and twelfth graders scored at the proficient level for writing. According to the U.S. Department of Education (2016), average reading and writing SAT (Scholastic Aptitude Test) scores also have decreased. From 1986-1987 to 2014-2015, the average SAT reading score decreased 12 points (507 to 495). And, from 2005–06 to 2014–15, the average SAT writing score decreased by 13 points (from 497 to 484).

It is clear that U.S. students’ English writing skills are severely lacking (Culham, 2014). In this educational age of accountability, current research and standards show that language teachers, both ELA teachers and WL teachers, would benefit student learning by integrating certain practices when teaching writing (Culham, 2014; Enright & Gilliland, 2011; Reichelt, Lefkowitz, Rinnert & Schultz, 2012; Scott & Rodgers, 1995). Culham (2014) challenges ELA writing teachers to stop using “zombie practices” (pp. 14-15) (e.g., worksheets, spelling tests, covering everything every year) and formulaic models (e.g., five paragraph essay). Scott and Rodgers (1995) and Reichelt et al. (2012) recommend that teachers reflect on the purpose of writing in a world language. ELA and WL writing pedagogy experts challenge teachers to reflect on and improve their methods of teaching writing. Teachers’ conceptions of writing need to change from emphasizing grammatical correctness to focusing on communicative content (Culham, 2014; Enright & Gilliland, 2011; Reichelt et al., 2012; Scott & Rodgers, 1995). Students need to learn that “writing is thinking”, and writing well in the WL is “a matter of thinking in the language” (Culham, 2014, p. 13; Reichelt et al., 2012, p. 27).

Presently, in 29 states and the District of Columbia, students can earn a Seal of Biliteracy, state-level recognition by demonstrating prescribed levels of proficiency in English and one or more languages (Davin & Heineke, 2017; Seal of Biliteracy, 2017). According to the U.S. Constitution, the Tenth Amendment reserves certain rights “to the States respectively, or to the people”, so each state possesses local control of education where public schools are governed and managed by elected or appointed representatives serving on school boards and committees (Local-control state, 2014; U.S. Const. amend. X). Due to this constitutional right, the requirements for students to earn a Seal of Biliteracy on their school transcript varies across states, with various types of proficiency being assessed and recognized (Davin & Heineke, 2017). Davin & Heineke note the “Seal of Biliteracy has the potential to raise the visibility of world language education and influence public opinion about the value of bilingualism in the United States” (p. 495). If students are to earn recognition for being multilingual by their state governments, teachers will need to be trained to use effective multilingual writing practices and norms
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(Enright & Gilliland, 2011; Schultz, 2011; Scott & Rodgers, 1995). Writing has been found to play a significant role in language acquisition, improving students’ fluency and grammatical accuracy (Kuiken & Vedder, 2008; O’Donnell, 2007; Pavlenko, 2009; Schultz, 1991, 2011). Kobayashi and Rinnert (2008) concluded from their research that intensive writing training in ELA and WL classrooms leads to greater effects on students’ communicative and cultural proficiency.

Writer’s workshop provides ELA and WL teachers with a curricular framework for teaching writing by providing “an organic space in which teachers cultivate a community of writers to support students’ growth as writers, thinkers, and citizens of our country and the world” (Pierce, 2014, p. 104). In this paper, we first review literature related to the teaching of writing in WL classrooms. Then, we present various models for using writer’s workshop in WL classrooms that have been useful in ELA classrooms. Next, we suggest ways to incorporate writer’s workshop with Novice, Intermediate, and Advanced WL learners. In conclusion, we recommend that ELA and WL researchers, applied linguists, and literacy experts collaborate in their efforts to promote and investigate best practices in teaching writing to improve students’ proficiency in multiple languages.

Review of literature

In this section we first discuss the purpose of teaching writing to ELA and WL students, and we present different types of writing that is often taught. Then, we examine various theories and research concerning grammar and writing. Next, we discuss the ELA Common Core writing standards (2010) and the Can-Do Proficiency Benchmarks for Presentational Communication (2017) written by the National Council of State Supervisors for Languages (NCSSFL) and the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). Lastly, we present the ACTFL Writing Proficiency Standards for Novice, Intermediate, Advanced, and Superior writers.

Purpose of teaching writing and types of writing

Reichelt et al. (2012) point out that WL instructors may feel challenged by the fact that students may not have authentic needs for writing in the target language. Even worse, considering the low average of proficient writers in grades 8 and 12 in the U.S., teachers of all content areas generally feel unprepared to teach writing in any language (Kiuhara, Graham, & Hawken, 2009; Pytash, 2012; Reichelt & Waltner, 2001). In their national survey, Kiuhara et al. (2009) discovered that 71% of language arts, social studies, and science high school teachers felt they had little to no training to teach writing. Similarly, Lefkowitz (2011) and Reichelt & Waltner (2001) found that WL teachers lacked knowledge and experience with teaching writing. As a result, the purpose of teaching writing in a world language sometimes becomes ambiguous with instructors focusing on writing to reinforce orthography, grammar, and vocabulary, and to teach and test content related to literature and culture (Bushman, 1984; Lefkowitz, 2011; Reichelt et al., 2012). Students may be subjected to writing about topics they do not care about or have experience with, and the teacher collects the papers, takes several weeks to grade
them, focuses on conventions and very little on content, and then returns the papers with no follow-up instruction (Bushman, 1984).

West and Saine (2016) make an important claim, “[n]o longer is writing instruction only the responsibility of the English teacher” (p. 629). To avoid the continued trend of students engaging in inauthentic writing such as “completing worksheets and writing within highly formulaic structures” (West & Saine, 2016, p. 629), teachers must be trained to use effective literacy practices, share a common language, and promote functional authenticity in students’ writing (Behizadeh, 2014; Fountas & Pinnell, 2001; West & Saine, 2016). Fountas and Pinnell explain that schools with effective literacy programs allow students to experience active learning, using literacy as a tool to research information they need, to express opinions, and to take positions. They encourage school leaders and teachers to use common language and work collaboratively toward a shared vision. According to West and Saine, teachers must help students achieve functional authenticity when “real-world applications of the genre of writing are considered during the writing instruction and the genre is assessed not only on the curricular goals but also on the goals of the genre as they exist in the real world” (p. 630).

Behizadeh (2014) pinpoints three factors to improve functional authenticity of writing tasks at school for students: 1) differentiate topics and assessments according to students’ interest and readiness; 2) provide students with an actual audience in which they will make a realistic impact; and 3) give more feedback on and evaluate heavier on the content of the writing over the conventions. Fountas and Pinnell (2001) identify three types of functional writing: transactional, expressive, and poetic. Transactional writing involves students teaching others about their learning (e.g., research reports). Expressive writing allows students to write for themselves or a select individual or group (e.g., journal entries). And, poetic writing provides students with an outlet to express their feelings in creative ways (e.g., short stories). Fountas and Pinnell recommend that teachers focus on a variety of genres such as functional writing (e.g., invitations, lists, recipes), narrative writing (e.g., legends, memoirs, mysteries), informational writing (i.e., biographies, research reports), and poetic writing (e.g., haikus, limericks, sonnets).

Reichelt et al. (2012) have observed certain WL instructors employ experiential learning to engage and motivate students to write in the target language. In classrooms where writing is seen as a tool to promote communication and creative thinking, students write creative stories or narratives for fun; they write shopping lists and notes to landlords or emails and internal memos to customers and business partners; they practice writing in academic genres used in other countries; and they write to connect with other speakers of their world language around the world through blogs, chats, or other online platforms (Reichelt et al., 2012).

*Teaching grammar in context through writing*

Very little research, especially recent research, has been conducted in K-12 WL classrooms, focusing on writing proficiency in world languages (Lefkowitz, 2011; Shrum & Glisan, 2010). Most research focused on writing has taken place in English as a second language (ESL/ELL) and ELA classrooms (Reichelt et al.,
Shrum and Glisan (2010) claim WL writing research is a young field with researchers designing studies that examine various aspects of writing, which makes it “difficult to construct comparisons across studies or even draw many conclusions” (p. 306). Lefkowitz (2011) proposes, “This lacuna in the field in the field may indirectly contribute to the proliferation of traditional practices in the teaching of writing in [WL] education” (p. 227). In ELA classrooms, teachers have shown concern about the ineffectiveness of their methods of teaching writing, reflecting that teaching explicit grammar lessons and having students complete grammar practice worksheets do not actually allow them to learn it in a way that they apply the rules to their writing (Bonzo, 2008; Bushman, 1984; Cruz, 2015; Horst, 2012). Horst reflects on her teaching of writing to ELA middle school students, “we spend month after month learning parts of speech, appositives, participles, verbals, clauses, and other grammatical forms and terminology, [and] there is no improvement in their ability to communicate effectively in writing” (p. 26). WL teachers have claimed the same phenomena occurs in their classrooms (Burke, 2005, 2006, 2012; Reichelt et al., 2012). In Lefkowitz's research, she has found that WL instructors have been “united by the quest for accuracy” when teaching writing, and especially when evaluating it (p. 227). WL instructors enjoy teaching grammar and correcting students’ errors during writing instruction and assessment (Lefkowitz, 2011).

Savignon (1997), following Canale and Swain (1980) and Canale (1983), asserts that together the components of grammatical competence, discourse competence, strategic competence, and sociolinguistic competence offer a model of communicative competence as a basis for curriculum design and classroom practice in proficiency-based WL classrooms. Grammatical competence is integral to the development of communicative competence; however, implicit grammar teaching may occur more often than explicit grammar teaching in teachers’ classrooms who promote proficiency (Burke, 2006, 2012; Ellis, 1997). Larsen-Freeman (2003) discusses “grammaring”, explaining it is a fifth skill to focus on in WL classrooms. Her explanation of grammaring is similar to the concept of grammatical competence: “the ability to use grammar structures accurately, meaningfully and appropriately” (p. 143). In proficiency-based WL classrooms, grammatical competence should be developed by designing lessons in which students relate grammar forms and vocabulary to their own communicative needs and experiences (Ellis, 1997; Lightbown & Spada, 1993; Savignon, 1972). Language should be taught in context with a focus on meaning as opposed to on disconnected grammatical structures (Berns, 1990; Burke, 2005, 2006, 2012; Ellis, 1997; Finocchiaro & Brumfit, 1983; Long, 2000). It is optimal for students to learn grammar and mechanics while engaging in writing instead of while doing grammar practice worksheets (Bender & Degener, 2015; Smith, Cheville, & Hillocks, 2006).

Shrum and Glisan (2010) note that studies in WL classrooms have shown “explicit grammar instruction seems to have little to no effect on the grammatical accuracy of the written product” (p. 306). Cruz (2015) finds that ELA students are able to apply grammar rules better in their writing after engaging in
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“investigations” where she asks students to notice examples of the grammatical structures, punctuation, and other conventions in their independent reading books (p. 86). In second language acquisition research, Schmidt (1990, 2001), Ellis and Shintani (2014), and Nassaji and Fotos (2011) define this phenomenon in language learning as noticing. Ellis and Shintani claim that research investigating the noticing hypothesis have shown, “learners tend to notice some features (e.g., lexis and word order) but are less likely to notice others (e.g., morphological features such as third person -s). Schmidt (2001) believes that the more often students are asked to attend to linguistic forms consciously, the more students will learn.

Beyond the noticing hypothesis, Manchón (2011) asserts that other areas of second language acquisition research affect writing development in WL classrooms including skill learning theory, focus on form research, and the output hypothesis. For DeKeyser (2007), skill learning theory deems that students need ample practice to decrease the time it takes to complete tasks and to perform them with grammatical accuracy. Focus on form research has shown that students improve their proficiency if asked to attend to form and communication simultaneously (Doughty, 2001; Norris & Ortega, 2000). Swain’s (1985, 2005) output theory asserts that if students are prompted to produce spoken or written language, this will lead to developing higher levels of proficiency.

According to Shrum and Glisan (2010), traditionally WL teachers have focused on writing to practice vocabulary and grammar, with the goal being “development of a product that illustrated grammatical and syntactic accuracy” (p. 301). To promote standards-based writing proficiency, they suggest teachers use a process-oriented approach where students write to communicate meaningful messages and focus on the writing process (Shrum & Glisan, 2010). In order to engage in this approach, Phillips (2008) explains that teachers can guide students to (1) generate ideas to ensure students have the lexicon for the task; (2) write a first draft where their ideas are formed into connected discourse; (3) consider teacher and peer feedback; (4) revise their work; and (5) publish their work for real-world audiences.

When studying writing products of third-semester university-level German students, Bonzo (2008) found that topic control influenced students’ written fluency but not their grammatical complexity. However, students’ mean scores for grammatical complexity were higher when they were allowed to choose their own writing topics. Bonzo concluded “participants’ overall level of fluency was significantly higher when the selected their own topics” (p. 722). Bonzo’s research showed that the more the students wrote in German, the higher their level of grammatical complexity, supporting both the skill building and output theories. Bonzo claimed WL teachers should give Intermediate-level students “a degree of freedom regarding the topics they write about” and “afford the language learner increasing amounts of choice in what they write” (p. 732).

Curtain and Dahlberg (2016) describe “functional chunks” of language as the “stepping stone to proficiency”, essential to the development of Novice students’ working vocabulary (p. 104). They describe functional chunks as “memorized and
unanalyzed phrases of high frequency” that include “lexical phrases, formulaic expressions, and prefabricated language” (p. 104). Curtain and Dahlberg explain that for Novice students who are in proficiency-based classrooms where teachers are maximizing their target language use, all learned language is a functional chunk. In particular, they point out that polite formulas (e.g. “I would like…”, “May I please…” ) are learned first as functional chunks without students understanding the individual words. They also claim that “functional chunks are a first step toward later grammar acquisition” (p. 105). By memorizing chunks of language, grammar is learned implicitly, and later these structures become natural for students to apply to other contexts for communicative purposes. As students develop confidence and move from Novice to Intermediate proficiency, they are able to apply rules learned unconsciously when using functional chunks to more open-ended communicative oral and written tasks.

Writing standards: ELA Common Core and NCSSFL-ACTFL Can-Do Statements

According to Calkins, Ehrenworth, and Lehman (2012), the Common Core State Standards (2010) place the most emphasis on writing. Writing is “treated as an equal partner to reading, and more than this, writing is assumed to be the vehicle through which a great deal of reading work and reading assessments will occur” (Calkins et al., 2012, p. 102). The Common Core writing standards emphasize three broad categories: (1) narrative writing, (2) persuasive, opinion, and argument writing, and (3) informational writing (Calkins et al., 2012). Calkins et al. (2012) describe each type of writing category:

- **Narrative writing:** personal narrative, fiction, historical fiction, fantasy, narrative memoir, biography, narrative nonfiction
- **Persuasive, opinion, and argument writing:** persuasive letter, review, personal essay, persuasive essay, literary essay, historical essay, petition, editorial, op-ed column
- **Informational writing:** fact sheet, news article, feature article, blog, website, report, analytic memo, research report, nonfiction book, how-to book, directions, recipe, lab report (p. 104).

If implemented correctly, the Common Core writing standards allow teachers in various grades to spiral curriculum and build on skills previously taught and learned with increased complexity each year (Calkins et al., 2012). Curriculum mapping across grade levels and with various content areas is a necessity for continuity in teaching writing to students (Calkins et al., 2012; Culham, 2014). Culham (2014) believes U.S. students’ English writing proficiency is not improving because school districts do not possess “a scope and sequence or a set of materials and strategies that outlines a core writing curriculum for each grade and across grades” (p. 12). She criticizes schools where students have “an exemplary writing experience and make great gains one year [only to] start all over the next year because the new teacher doesn't know what was taught the previous year or had a different set of objectives in mind” (p. 12). Calkins et al. (2012) remind teachers that the Common Core standards “focus on expectations and not methods” and
“require a planned, sequential, explicit writing program, with instruction that gives students repeated opportunities to practice each kind of writing and to receive explicit feedback at frequent intervals” (p. 108).

Calkins et al. (2012) point out that certain Common Core Anchor Writing Standards for College and Career Readiness focus on the writing process and the quality of student writing. Standard 5 asks students to “develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, editing, rewriting, or trying a new approach”, and Standard 10 recommends students “write routinely over extended time frames (time for research, reflection, and revision) and shorter time frames (a single sitting or a day or two) for a range of tasks, purposes, and audiences”. Students need to write often, follow a writing routine, and they need to learn that writing is a process (Calkins et al., 2012). To be exceptional writers, students must be trained to write well starting in elementary school (Calkins et al., 2012). Elementary and high school students need “repeated practice in writing their opinions and then supporting those opinions with reasons”, and they need to “draft, revise, edit, and publish their writing” (p. 109).

Although ACTFL created a document that aligns the World Readiness Standards for Learning Languages with the Common Core Standards in 2013, we find the NCSSFL-ACTFL Can-Do Proficiency Benchmarks for Presentational Communication (2017) to be more useful to WL teachers when planning curriculum to teach students writing in the target language. The NCSSFL-ACTFL 2017 Can-Do Proficiency Benchmarks for Presentational Communication are included in Table 1 for Novice, Intermediate, Advanced, and Superior writers (p. 1).

Table 1. NCSSFL-ACTFL Can-Do Proficiency Benchmarks for Presentational Communication (2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficiency Level</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>I can communicate in spontaneous spoken, written, or signed conversations on both very familiar and everyday topics, using a variety of practice or memorized words, phrases, simple sentences, and questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>I can participate in spontaneous spoken, written, or signed conversations on familiar topics, creating sentences and series of sentences to ask and answer a variety of questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>I can deliver detailed and organized presentations on familiar as well as unfamiliar concrete topics, in paragraphs and using various time frames through spoken, written, or signed language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>I can deliver extended presentations on abstract or hypothetical issues and ideas ranging from broad, general interests to my areas of specialized expertise, with precision of expression and to a wide variety of audiences, using spoken, written, or signed language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statements listed above are can-do proficiency benchmarks for presentational communication, but NCSSFL-ACTFL (2017) provides extensive, specific writing
performance indicators for each proficiency sublevel, which teachers can consult when planning lessons. It appears that NCSSFL-ACTFL Can-Do Performance Indicators (2017) support Bruner’s (1960) spiral curriculum theory where students are introduced to certain writing tasks with support from the teacher, and then later the skills are reinforced and mastered as students’ proficiency develops. If ELA and WL teachers collaborate in planning curriculum and instruction to build students’ literacy skills, sharing goals informed by the ELA Common Core Standards and NCSSFL-ACFTL Can-Do Statements, perhaps more students would achieve higher levels of reading and writing proficiency in multiple languages. These performance indicators, along with the Common Core writing standards and the ACTFL Writing Proficiency standards can all inform teachers when designing writing curriculum for their WL students.

ACTFL writing proficiency standards

Although Calkins et al. (2012) and Culham (2014) highlight the need to teach writing across disciplines, WL curriculum and instruction is absent from their discussions. ACTFL has published proficiency standards for writers of various world languages. According to ACTFL (2012), Novice writers should be able to: (1) produce lists and notes, primarily by writing words and phrases; (2) provide limited formulaic information on simple forms and documents; (3) reproduce practiced material to convey the simplest messages; (4) transcribe familiar words or phrases, copy letters of the alphabet or syllables of a syllabary, or reproduce basic characters with some accuracy. Intermediate writers should be able to: (1) write primarily in the present tense; (2) write simple messages and letters, requests for information, and notes; (3) ask and respond to simple questions in writing; (4) create with the language and communicate simple facts and ideas in a series of loosely connected sentences on topics of personal interest and social needs; (5) use basic vocabulary and structures to express meaning that is comprehensible to those accustomed to the writing of non-natives.

Advanced writers should be able to: (1) narrate and describe in the major time frames of past, present, and future; (2) write routine informal and some formal correspondence, as well as narratives, descriptions, and summaries of a factual nature; (3) use paraphrasing and elaboration to provide clarity and produce connected discourse of paragraph length and structure; (4) show good control of the most frequently used structures and generic vocabulary, allowing them to be understood by those unaccustomed to the writing of non-natives (ACTFL, 2012). Superior writers should be able to: (1) produce most kinds of formal and informal correspondence, in-depth summaries, reports, and research papers on a variety of social, academic, and professional topics; (2) explain complex matters, and to present and support opinions by developing cogent arguments and hypotheses; (3) use structure, lexicon, and writing protocols effectively; (4) organize and prioritize ideas to convey to the reader what is significant; (5) demonstrate a high degree of control of grammar and syntax, of both general and specialized/professional vocabulary, of spelling or symbol production, of cohesive devices, and of punctuation; (6) use vocabulary that is precise and varied and direct their writing
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Multiple researchers, authors, and practitioners agree that the writer’s workshop model is an effective approach to teaching writing in ELA classrooms (Bender, 2007; Berger, Woodfin, & Vilen, 2016; Berne & Degener, 2015; Culham, 2003, 2014; Fountas & Pinnell, 2001). Writer’s workshop is equally beneficial to English language learners, bilingual students, and students in partial and total immersion classrooms (Bilash, 1998; Calkins, Hartman, & White, 2005; Fierro & Probst, 2014; Hubbard & Shorey, 2003; Spence & Cardenas-Cortez, 2011). When implementing writer’s workshop with 9th grade English language learners, Hubbard and Shorey (2003) observed how important it was to develop students’ literacy in both their first language and English. Students wrote in their native language (e.g., Ilocano, Russian, Spanish, Vietnamese) “using dialogue, paying attention to word choice, using detail and other strategies”, which helped them write in English (Hubbard & Shorey, 2003, p. 59). During mini-lessons, the teacher modeled the writing process, and then during conferences, students were able to ask questions and the teacher addressed individual learning needs. Elementary educators Fierro and Probst (2014) use writer’s workshop to promote community and appreciation for cultural diversity in their dual immersion (Spanish-English) school in Utah. These workshops catalyze “collaboration, mentoring, and discussion” among students and the teacher which improve communicative and cultural proficiency.

Spence and Cardenas-Cortez (2011) address the debate about best practices for bilingual students, acknowledging that some school districts must use an English-only approach according to state law. In their study, in a school district where 92% of families spoke Spanish at home, a 3rd grade teacher was required to teach writer’s workshop in English with no use of Spanish during instruction. The teacher immersed students in the English language, and she encouraged students to be creative, see themselves as writers, and develop a love for writing. The teacher modeled writing personal narratives, informational texts, and persuasive essays during mini-lessons. The teacher promoted social justice by allowing students to explore social issues such as drug abuse and racism in their writing. Spence and Cardenas-Cortez claimed the teacher helped students “develop specific language and habits of mind by taking a stance on a social issue and persuading their audience to consider their point of view” (p. 17). The bilingual teacher accepted students’ “approximations of specialized language, knowing that with additional time and exposure, the children’s writing would become more standardized” (p. 17). They concluded, “Bilingual students have specific needs and particular strengths that can be drawn on for instruction, and teachers who share students’ language and culture have the benefit of being attuned to these needs and strengths” (p. 19). Bauer, Presiado, and Colomer (2017) argue against the English-only instructional approach, claiming schooling should afford students with opportunities to be multilingual and multiliterate. In their research, the teacher’s use of “buddy pairs”
allowed for elementary students to engage in translanguaging, or discussion about writing in Spanish and English (p. 16).

Learning to write in more than one language is extremely valuable in terms of benefiting learners cognitively and socially (Freeman, Soto, & Freeman, 2016; Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2012; Reichelt et al., 2012). By learning how to write in multiple languages, students develop critical thinking skills as a result of building their vocabulary and syntax in the languages (Reichelt et al., 2012). Kobayashi & Rinnert (2012) determined that writers who developed higher levels of proficiency in multiple languages could merge their repertoires of writing knowledge to construct text. In their study of multilingual writers, undergraduate students at Japanese and North American universities, Kobayashi and Rinnert (2012) asserted that writing training and experiences are bidirectional across first (L1) and second language (L2) writing. Specifically, their findings suggest

the amount of L1/L2 writing instruction and experience that writers receive largely parallels their perceived influence of L1/L2 writing on L2/L1, and that L1 writing training and experience continues influencing L2 writing regardless of the amount of L2 writing instruction and experience (p. 113).

The researchers also found that the more experienced WL writers attempted to use writing styles they had seen in what they had read for classes. The students “acquired genre-related rhetorical features with keen awareness of audience”, expanding their “repertoires of knowledge” (p. 116). In a nutshell, as a result of experiencing writing instruction explicitly, and through reading different genres, students become multilingual and multiliterate. Students’ knowledge forms as novice writers and continually transforms, grows, and strengthens in a way that students become highly competent and effective writers, able to communicate their ideas using their autorial personality and developing their own style or styles of writing (Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2012).

Building writing curriculum with writing stages and traits

For decades, educators, researchers, and writing consultants have proposed solutions to solve the writing proficiency epidemic in the U.S. in order to improve students’ ability to write effectively for a variety of purposes (Bushman, 1984; Culham, 2003, 2010; Fountas & Pinnell, 2001). When teaching writing to students, Bushman (1984) provides writing stages and Culham (2003, 2010) recommends teaching writing with focus on specific traits.

Bushman’s five stages of writing

Bushman (1984) offers a five-stage curriculum sequence: (1) prewriting; (2) experimental writing; (3) focused writing; (4) revision; and (5) structured writing. Bushman explains prewriting activities “help students reduce inhibitions toward writing” and “make their writing fresh and alive” (p. 39). For example, before writing about themselves, students can write adjectives under each letter of their name that describe them (i.e. J: jovial, jaunty, jogger; A: amenable, appreciative, apprehensive; C: calm, challenger, cuddly; K: keen, keynoter, knowledgeable)
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(p. 39). During the experimental stage, students practice writing without being concerned about correct form and simply “get words and phrases down on paper” (p. 46). Bushman believes group work and peer assessment are most beneficial to students during the prewriting and experimental stages. During the focused writing stage, students “gradually move from random expression of ideas to the development of one idea” (p. 55). After building strong classroom community, peers can provide one another with positive and constructive feedback of their writing during this stage (Bushman, 1984). The revision stage is “more than merely editing and proofreading”, it is a time to reevaluate writing (p. 72). Bushman recommends teachers have students keep writing folders, and that they only revise certain pieces of writing. The final stage, structure writing, involves mentoring students to write more formally with stricter attention to form. The difference between these last two stages is not what students write about, but how they write it (Bushman, 1984).

Culham’s 6+1 traits of writing

In the 1980s and 1990s, researchers from the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, including Ruth Culham, developed a “comprehensive, reliable, and teacher- and student-friendly writing performance assessment (Culham, 2003). They developed the 6+1 trait model so writing could be assessed beyond only on how well students understood grammar rules. Culham (2003, 2010) has since become an independent consultant and spends time with teachers in the U.S. helping teachers improve their writing curriculum and instruction. The 6+1 trait model has been helpful to ELA teachers and could inspire WL teachers when designing writer’s workshops and rubrics to evaluate presentational writing assessments. The 6+1 traits are summarized below.

1. Ideas: The ideas are the heart of the message, the content of the piece, the main theme, together with the details that enrich and develop that theme.
2. Organization: Organization is the internal structure of a piece of writing, the thread of central meaning, the logical and sometimes intriguing pattern of the ideas.
3. Voice: The voice is the heart and soul, the magic, the wit, along with the feeling and conviction of the individual writer coming out through the words.
4. Word Choice: Word choice is the use of rich, colorful, precise language that moves and enlightens the reader.
5. Sentence Fluency: Sentence fluency is the rhythm and flow of the language, the sound of word patterns, the way in which the writing plays to the ear – not just to the eye.
6. Conventions: Conventions are the mechanical correctness of the piece – spelling, grammar and usage, paragraphing, use of capitals, and punctuation.
7. Presentation: Presentation zeroes in on the form and layout of the text and its readability; the piece should be pleasing to the eye. (Culham, 2003, 2010)

Instead of solely focusing on conventions, correcting students’ errors, Culham (2003, 2010) shows effective writing involves more than paying attention to form.
Implementing and managing writer’s workshop

There are multiple ways to approach writer’s workshop (Bender, 2007; Berne & Degener, 2015; Culham, 2014; Fountas & Pinnell, 2001; Jacobson, 2010). If possible, it is beneficial to students if teachers set up their classroom in a way to support independence during writer’s workshop (Jacobson, 2010). Jacobson has five main areas to her writing-focused classroom: the meeting area, conference area, writing center, and publishing area. At the meeting area, the teacher conducts mini-lessons. This area is close to students’ desks, the LCD projector or Smartboard, and the whiteboard or easel pad. In the conference area, there is a table with chairs and it is where students sign up for conferences and periodically meet with the teacher. Jacobson advises teachers keep records about these conferences, noting when students come to conference and why. At the writing center, students need to have access to mandatory supplies (i.e. writing folders, paper, writing utensils, graphic organizers, editor’s checklists) and optional supplies (i.e. stapler, markers, sticky notes) (Jacobson, 2010). Students need to clean out their writing folders routinely, choosing certain work to showcase in their portfolio or donate to the publishing area. Jacobson dedicates a section of her room as the publishing area where writing is placed on a bulletin board, skits are performed, or a book of students’ writing is included in an anthology or “Big Book” (p. 23).

Writer’s workshop models and key components

Fountas and Pinnell (2001) and Berger et al. (2016) present different models for writer’s workshop. Teachers can use these formats to guide students through Bushman’s (1984) writing stages and explicitly teach Culham’s (2003, 2010) 6+1 writing traits. Fountas and Pinnell approach writer’s workshop through independent writing, guided writing, and investigations. Independent writing allows students to focus on what writers do. Students develop their understanding of the writing process and become proficient in writing different genres. Fountas and Pinnell believe writing topics can be chosen by the students or provided by the teacher. To begin an independent writer’s workshop, the teacher may provide students with a “writer’s talk” that lasts around two minutes (Fountas & Pinnell, 2001, p. 52). During a writer’s talk, the teacher shares information about a specific writer and explains how they craft their writing pieces. After the writer’s talk, the teacher engages students in a five to 15-minute mini-lesson that is based on their needs at that time. This may include showing students different examples of writing from different genres, incorporating different writing strategies, or understanding the writing process. After the mini-lesson, the teacher may do a brief “status of the class” for no more than two minutes (p. 52). The students then will move into the writing process. Fountas and Pinnell recommend that the students write for 30 to 45 minutes. The writer’s workshop concludes with a group share that last for ten minutes maximum. During the writer’s workshop, individual or multiple students may participate in a “guided writing” session with the teacher based on whether they need help on the same topic or strategy (Fountas & Pinnell, 2001, p. 51). Students also may participate in a writing investigation during writer’s workshop.
This is when a teacher provides multiple media resources to look at a topic in detail. Teachers can provide materials from different disciplines (i.e. science, social studies), and students can apply their research skills when investigating. The end product includes some form of presentation that the students give based on the topic that they investigated.

In Expeditionary Learning schools, teachers are trained to use the workshop model to teach reading, writing, and math skills (Berger et al., 2016). These workshops are integrated into instruction to “limit the amount of teacher talk and make time for students to think and do, apply their learning, and reflect on what they’ve learned” (Berger et al., 2016, p. 29). The workshop model puts responsibility for learning on the students and promotes collaboration and communication between students and teachers. After the Common Core standards were published, Expeditionary Learning curriculum designers revised their workshop model (Berger et al., 2016). They now use Workshop 1.0 to model new skills for students and Workshop 2.0 to build on skills with which students already have some experience. Workshop 1.0, similar to Fountas and Pinnell’s (2001) workshop model, involves the following: (1) Introduction/Mini-lesson: The teacher provides direct instruction and modeling of a skill; (2) Guided Practice: Students practice the modeled skill and the teacher assesses understanding and provides support as needed; (3) Independent Practice/Application: Students apply the skill independently with the teacher conferencing with students as needed; (4) Sharing/Debrief: Students share their work and progress to the whole class and the teacher guides a debrief on the process of learning the skill modeled in the mini-lesson, identifying next steps and goals (Berger et al., 2016). The components of Workshop 2.0 are: (1) Engage, Grapple, Discuss: Teachers engage students with a question, quote, object, picture, or activity to stimulate background knowledge. Then, students grapple independently with a text. Next, students discuss the text using a structured protocol. (2) Focus: After assessing students’ readiness for certain writing skills, the teacher implements specific mini-lessons and guided practice based on their needs. (3) Apply: Students engage in writing, applying the writing skills the teacher has assessed as the necessary focus. (4) Synthesis: Students share their thinking about their writing and reflect on their progress as writers (Berger et al., 2016). Essentially, Workshop 1.0 involves didactic teaching, and Workshop 2.0 requires teachers to use a more constructivist approach.

Fountas and Pinnell (2001) believe that writer’s workshop should be done frequently to establish in the students’ minds that writing is important and should be integrated daily. The process of writer’s workshop should be predictable for students so they can focus on their writing and not worry about finding supplies or asking what they need to be doing. Teachers should always state the purpose of why the students are writing and explain that writer’s workshop is not just another assignment to earn a grade. Fountas & Pinnell (2001) believe expectations for students should be held high and they should know that the final draft is a way for them to showcase their knowledge and skills. Students also should be made aware that revisions and editing are a part of the process and are just as important as constructing the final draft. Writer’s workshop teaches students what it is like
to be a part of a writing community. By using demonstrations by authors and illustrators, the students see that they are contributing to the writing community in the world, and in their classroom. Students should support one another in the classroom, just as authors support each other in the large writing community (Fountas & Pinnell, 2001).

In Table 2, we present several key components of writer’s workshop that we believe are essential to improve students’ writing: mini-lessons, mentor texts, teacher feedback, small-group lessons, journals, peer response, author’s chair, and publishing.

**Table 2. Key Components of Writer’s Workshop**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Component &amp; Researchers/Theorists</th>
<th>Definition/Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mini-Lessons</strong> (Bender, 2007; Berne &amp; Degener, 2015; Jacobson, 2010)</td>
<td>Teachers model writing and state how the students can use the writing traits; should take no more than 10 minutes and should be structured to fit students’ needs; students to watch and listen them while they model and think aloud, silently observing during mini-lessons; teacher prompts students to begin discussing what they noticed in the teacher’s writing piece.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mentor Texts</strong> (Berne &amp; Degener, 2015; Culham, 2014)</td>
<td>Any text that can be read with a writer’s eye and then use it to practice specific writing skills; students look can be “writing thieves” (Culham, 2014, p. 31), examining these texts, reflecting how the author wrote them and what their purpose was.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Feedback</strong> (Bender, 2007; Berne &amp; Degener, 2015; Ferris, 2007; Jacobson, 2010)</td>
<td>Teachers need to be selective and prioritize their goals at various points of the writing process, communicating with students if they are focusing on content or form, articulating their approach to feedback explicitly to students; teachers conduct individual or small-group conferences with students, using protocol: (1) Set goal; (2) Reflect; (3) Point; (4) Question; and (5) Teach one skill (Jacobson, 2010, p. 44).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small-Group Lessons</strong> (Fountas &amp; Pinnell, 2001)</td>
<td>Multiple students with same readiness level and needs are grouped for focused strategy lesson lasting no more than 12 minutes; “guided writing” lesson (p. 50).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Journal Writing and Writer’s Notebooks</strong> (Berne &amp; Degener, 2015; Lenters, 2012)</td>
<td>Students are given time throughout the week to write about different prompts without the fear of being assessed and graded on their writing; students build stamina in writing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peer Response (Berne & Degener, 2007; Flint & Rodriguez, 2014; Koshewa, 2014)

Teachers model expectations for support and critique; students are grouped heterogeneously by mixed readiness, where weaker writers are paired with stronger writers; students arrive with a written draft to discuss, a positive attitude, and the will to seek critique and improve their writing; teachers need to create a strong, positive, and respectful learning environment; students can be taught FRIA response guidelines: Students (1) provide feedback about what they believe to be the essence of the piece; (2) respond to the writing by providing the author with a positive comment, and then they ask questions and give suggestions about the piece; (3) invite the author to comment on specific sections of the paper or raise concerns; (4) advise the author to prioritize one of two suggestions for revision.

Author’s Chair and Publishing (Jacobson, 2010)

Teacher uses protocol for author’s chair: (1) Author sits in front of the class in a specified chair, reads his/her writing; (2) class applauds; (3) classmates share positive comments about the author’s writing; (4) author asks if there are questions about the writing; “writers are motivated by an audience”, and students “write for longer periods, use livelier language, include dazzling details, and search for their unique voice when performing for classmates” (p. 50). Instead of pursuing perfection when publishing, teachers can train parents or other volunteers to work with students to keep their work as authentic as possible; correct punctuation, spelling, capitalization, grammar is important, but published student work must keep the students’ original language whenever possible.

Incorporating writer’s workshop into world language classrooms

By incorporating writer’s workshop and its various components in WL classrooms, students can focus on presentational writing skills and teachers can evaluate students’ proficiency levels in writing more closely. Students can experiment with the WL and apply their knowledge from grammar and vocabulary lessons to their original writing pieces and incorporate new techniques that are taught during mini-lessons, strategy lessons, or conferences. During writer’s workshop, students can engage in intrapersonal and interpersonal communication while participating in self-reflections and peer reviews. Writer’s workshop should be incorporated with all students studying WL at the elementary, secondary, and college-level. Whether students are writing simple sentences and bulleted lists, or persuasive essays and fictional stories, they can improve their communicative proficiency during writer’s workshop. In this section, we provide ideas for lessons WL teachers can implement with Novice, Intermediate, and Advanced students. For each level, we give examples of writing tasks that can be implemented with
students at and above their level of proficiency. To improve students’ proficiency while differentiating instruction, teachers need to challenge students with writing tasks above their level when possible. So, novice students should be provided with scaffolded Intermediate tasks; Intermediate students should be challenged with Advanced tasks, and Advanced students should be exposed to Superior tasks. Also, teachers should keep in mind that in one classroom while certain students may be able to produce written products at Intermediate Low, other students may write at the Intermediate High level. Brigid (Author 1), a veteran WL teacher, uses examples from her high school French teaching experiences at an all boys’ Catholic high school in Chicago. Haylee (Author 2), a pre-service WL teacher, provides examples she has, or plans to, use in the high school Spanish classroom. Samples of student work for these tasks, reproduced with student permission, and some teaching materials are found in Appendices A-G. Although the examples are in French or Spanish, the lessons can be implemented in any WL classroom.

**Writer’s workshops for Novice students**

Novice WL students need to begin writing in the target language the first day of class. Teachers should label their classroom with the target language, and students should be learning vocabulary, grammar, and functional language chunks on a daily basis in order to develop their proficiency and build their literacy skills. Students should record their learning in their writer’s notebook, a paper or electronic journal. Written products Novice students might create include a *Ma Vie* (My Life) poster, a restaurant menu, a comic strip, or an advertisement. Students should be writing paragraphs soon after learning to write sentences. When writing paragraphs, WL teachers should engage students in writer’s workshops to teach them early on that writing in the WL is a process. Two writer’s workshops that focus on learning to write personal narratives in our French and Spanish classrooms are described below.

**Todo Sobre Mi (All About Me).** In the Spanish I classroom, Haylee conducted a writer’s workshop using the Workshop 1.0 model (Fountas & Pinnell, 2001), and focused on gender and number agreement to help students write personal essays about themselves. To begin the writer’s workshop, she passed out writer’s notebooks that contained the following: lists of student writing topics, an editing marking guide, a *Lista de No Excusas* (List of No Excuses) (Appendix A), the writer’s workshop assignment and rubric, and a peer editing form. She introduced the process of writer’s workshop by explaining what was in the notebook and how to use it. For the project *Todo Sobre Mi* (All About Me), during the pre-writing phase, students filled out a graphic organizer in their writer’s workshop notebook (Appendix A). Then, Haylee strategically grouped students by mixed readiness, placing stronger writers with weaker writers. They worked together to peer edit their graphic organizers and wrote their paragraph. After multiple revisions, students then shared their work during a gallery walk, and according to a protocol, students left comments and praises on their peers’ published work. After collecting these writing products, Haylee decided to focus her mini-lesson on gender and number agreement. At the class meeting area, she used a
PowerPoint presentation and a SMARTboard. The students added notes from the mini-lesson to their writer’s notebooks. Then, students worked with their small groups from the previous day to revise their paragraphs. As the students worked, Haylee circulated in the classroom conferencing with individual students. She checked to see how the students were feeling and asked them where she could help them on their writing. After conferencing, Haylee assessed what students needed a small group lesson on other common writing issues. Students finished their drafts, presented their work in a gallery walk, and then published the work on the classroom bulletin board. According to the NCSSFL-ACTFL Can-Do Proficiency Benchmarks (2017), this type of written performance task aligns with the Novice-Mid performance indicator where students present simple information about themselves using memorized words, phrases, and simple sentences.

Winning $100. Since so many of her students played basketball and enjoyed watching basketball games, using the Workshop 2.0 model (Berger et al., 2016), Brigid asked her French 1 students to imagine what they would do if they won $100 at a Chicago Bulls game. She asked students to write a paragraph of five to seven sentences, which they had done several times before using the present tense. Since the beginning of the year, students had been implicitly learning the conditional tense, using certain formulaic polite expressions, functional chunks, on a daily basis such as, Est-ce que je pourrais aller aux toilettes (May I go to the bathroom), and J’aimerais un autre papier, s’il vous plaît (I’d like another paper please) (Curtain & Dahlberg, 2016). During a mini-lesson, Brigid modeled writing a paragraph on the board so students could more easily write their first draft. During work time, if students needed help conjugating verbs, she wrote the correct forms on the board for all students to benefit. After students submitted their first drafts, Brigid read over the paragraphs and circled any grammar or spelling that needed to be corrected, which she believed the students could correct themselves. She also wrote comments in French to prompt them to elaborate on their ideas. For example, in her feedback to the student who wrote the last paragraph in Appendix B, she wrote: “Commence avec si je gagnais…pour connaître le sujet. Bonnes idées, mais tu dois utiliser des liaisons: aussi, en plus, enfin.” (“Begin with if I won…to understand the topic. Good ideas, but you should use transitions such as also, in addition, finally”). In class before returning the first drafts, Brigid taught a mini-lesson pointing out common grammar or spelling errors the students had made in their first drafts. She also provided examples of sentences that needed more details and used the think aloud strategy to provide feedback about how students could elaborate on their writing, such as using transitions. After the mini-lesson, Brigid strategically grouped students by mixed readiness, placing stronger writers with weaker writers. During writing time, students worked together to improve their paragraphs. Their final drafts were worth 30 points, 10 points for their originality, 10 points for their effort, and 10 points for grammar and spelling. Student work samples are found in Appendix B. According to the NCSSFL-ACTFL Can-Do Proficiency Benchmarks (2017), this type of written performance task aligns with the Intermediate-Low/Mid performance indicators where students write about an event that could happen in their life and discuss their preferences. Novice
students used functional chunks in the form of formulaic expressions, which are the building blocks to grammar acquisition (Curtain & Dahlberg, 2016). When taught explicitly how to conjugate the conditional tense later on, the students were able to reflect back to their use of conditional in classroom expressions and this writing prompt that asked them to imagine what they would do with $100 they won at the Chicago Bulls game.

**Writer’s workshops for Intermediate students**

Intermediate-level writer’s workshops should provide students with the opportunity to build upon the knowledge that they learned the previous years in their WL classes while also challenging students to write at the Advanced-level occasionally. Students should be writing more than lists or short paragraphs, and they should be integrating a deeper level of cultural knowledge into their writing. Intermediate-level writers should create written products such as a short story, a detailed itinerary for a trip, or a short report on a country or famous person. Teachers should encourage Intermediate-level writers to explore the WL more deeply during writer’s workshops by modeling how to use informational texts, mentor texts, and authentic materials to inspire their own writing (Berne & Degener, 2015; Culham, 2014). Also, at this stage, students can engage in independent journal writing to write about personal experiences they have in the WL, or to reflect in the WL about the writing process (Berne & Degener, 2015; Lenters, 2012).

**Creative writing.** Story cubes can be used as a problem-solving tool to promote creative writing in ELA and WL classrooms (O’Connor, 2004). Story cubes are a set of blocks with images on each side of the block. Students can use these images to help them write creative stories. In an Intermediate-level Spanish classroom, Haylee plans to provide students with story cubes that have images of different cultural objects or people on the sides of the die (i.e. Don Quijote, Frida Kahlo, the king and queen of Spain) (Appendix C). After students choose a certain number of story cubes at random, and roll them, when they land, the students will line up the story cubes and look at the images. The students then will write down the images that they need to use to help write a well-developed and creative story (i.e. Don Quijote painting, a pan of paella, a map of the Canary Islands, a flamenco dancer, a Day of the Dead skull). In a mini-lesson, Haylee will demonstrate to students how to use the story cubes to write their piece by thinking aloud as she writes. Students will watch and record notes in their writer’s notebooks on when and how she uses the story cubes to help create ideas in her story. When it is their turn to write, Haylee will strategically group the students who are stronger in creative writing with students who need more practice. Each group will share a box of story cubes, but each student will create their own story. As Haylee conferences with students, she will be looking for how the students are incorporating each picture into their story. She will reference her mini-lesson when needed and remind students that the cubes can build a story. After multiple drafts and peer revisions, students will create their final draft and draw an illustration or comic strip to go along with it. Students will share out their story during author’s chair
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and publish their stories in their portfolios. According to the NCSSFL-ACTFL Can-Do Proficiency Benchmarks (2017), this type of written performance task aligns with the Intermediate-Low/Mid performance indicators where students create a simple story about cultural products and practices using sentences and a series of connected sentences.

**Informational texts.** Each semester, Brigid’s French II and French III students were required to submit one written product and make one presentation that involved deeper learning. For the written products, students were presented with a list of suggestions, but students could propose their own project ideas. Students submitted products such as reports on French politicians and French towns, and biographical books about their classmates. A sample student report on politician Lionel Jospin is presented in Appendix D. Throughout the semester, Brigid planned writer’s workshops as needed so students could work on their projects at school. Students submitted drafts of their work for feedback or met with Brigid to discuss their work during conferences. Mini-lessons and small-group strategy lessons focused on writing traits that she assessed as needing explicit instruction. Students’ work was showcased and stored in the publishing area of Brigid’s classroom. These written products were graded as satisfactory or unsatisfactory. According to the NCSSFL-ACTFL Can-Do Proficiency Benchmarks (2017), this type of written performance task aligns with the Intermediate-High/Advanced Low performance indicators where students write brief reports about topics they have researched on a variety of topics using a few short paragraphs.

**Independent journaling.** Although Brigid did not ask students to reflect in journals about the learning process in a proficiency-based classroom, she and her students did discuss it regularly during class. Writing in journals involved writing personal thoughts and narratives in her classes. Before taking her first group of students for their first visit to France, Brigid bought pocket-size composition books for them to carry while they traveled. She suggested students write their thoughts, feelings, and questions in French in their notebooks, and encouraged them to journal about their experiences while visiting various regions in France they had studied about in class. One French III student typed up his journal entries and submitted them for his semester written product (Appendix E). Brigid did not to edit his work for correct grammar and spelling. Swain (1985, 2005), Bonzo (2008), and Shrum and Glisan (2010) all discuss the importance of allowing students to write without restrictions, selecting their own topics, to develop higher levels of proficiency and grammatical accuracy. According to the NCSSFL-ACTFL Can-Do Proficiency Benchmarks (2017), this type of written performance task aligns with the Advanced-Mid performance indicator where students write in detail about a study abroad program experience they attended and their experiences and reactions to it.

**Writer’s workshops for Advanced students**

Advanced-level writers should be focusing on improving their writing proficiency, building their skills to write for wider audiences. Students should be reading various genres, and then writing using those genres. Teachers can
encourage students to write about social issues and attempt to persuade others to consider their point of view. Teachers can model genre-related rhetorical features with students during mini-lessons, so students become multiliterate. Advanced students should be provided with Superior-level writing tasks to challenge students to write above their level with modeling and support from the teacher and peers. By promoting higher levels of written proficiency in students’ world language, they can merge their repertoires of writing knowledge to construct text and develop their authorial personality and become highly competent and effective writers, developing their own style or styles of writing (Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2012).

**Reading to write.** We agree mentor texts can help students learn about different genres of literature and help them practice certain writing skills (Berne & Degener, 2015; Culham, 2014). According to the NCSSFL-ACTFL Can-Do Proficiency Benchmarks (2017), this type of written performance task aligns with the Advanced Mid to Superior performance indicators where students write stories based on personal experiences or literature they read in organized paragraphs across major time frames.

At the end of the second semester of French III, Brigid’s students read *Gargantua* by François Rabelais. Literature circles were used to discuss the satire on education, war, and religion. Students were put into small groups of mixed readiness with stronger and weaker readers in each group. Each group was assigned certain days to lead the class discussion. In each group there was a discussion director, summarizer, word watcher, and illustrator (Burke, 2016). Together the groups helped their classmates understand the story by asking questions, summarizing, defining unfamiliar words and expressions, and sketching pictures they visualized while reading. After reading *Gargantua*, Brigid asked students to write their own satire on their choice of topic. Students wrote entertaining stories related to their lives. During French 4, students read fables, plays, and philosophical fiction. After reading fables written by Marcel Aymé, students wrote their own fables (Appendix F). Writer’s workshops consisted of conferences, peer editing, strategy lessons on ideas, organization, and conventions, and voluntary participation in author’s chair. Students were evaluated on their understanding of the fable genre, their organization, grammar, and spelling.

During the second semester of Spanish IV, Haylee plans to have students read an adapted version of *El ingenioso hidalgo: Don Quijote de la Mancha* by Miguel de Cervantes. Many Spanish teachers believe this is the most important book written in the Spanish language. Students will participate in Socratic seminars and literature circles to discuss the themes and details of the story. They will develop an understanding of the *caballerías* genre (stories about knights). For their written product, students will have the option to create their own *caballería* or write a sequel to *Don Quijote*. Writer’s workshops will consist of individual or small-group conferences, peer editing, and mini-lessons on ideas and organization. Haylee will help students improve their conventions during small-group strategy lessons as necessary. She will encourage students to share their work during author’s chair to get feedback from peers, and also so students can be inspired to make changes or add to their stories. Students will have the opportunity to publish their work in the classroom binder for classmates to read on their own time.
Writing to reflect and persuade. In French schools, French and international students learn to write the résumé (summary) and dissertation (philosophical essay) genres. After Brigid learned how to write these genres when studying abroad in France, she believed her Advanced-level high school students would benefit from learning to use these styles of writing. Her goal was to teach them how to write like the French while also helping them improve their writing in English. Philosophical topics that her French III and IV students wrote about included the following:

Moi, je veux faire uniquement ce qui me plaît la vie. (I want to do only what pleases me in life.)

Aujourd'hui, j'ai vingt ans et qu'on ne vienne pas me dire que c'est le plus bel âge de la vie. (Today, I'm 20 years old and people tell me it's the best time of my life.)

A-t-on raison d'estimer que l'écriture a plus de valeur que la parole ? (Are we correct in thinking that writing has more value than speaking?)

Topics like these promoted critical thinking in students and pushed them to use more complex word choice and grammar. Students worked on these résumés and dissertations in class. They participated in mini-lessons on voice, organization, and word choice. To gain feedback, students met with Brigid in the conferencing area, and peers met with classmates. Their final drafts were worth 50 points, 30 points for content, 10 points for comprehensibility, and 10 points for grammar and spelling. A sample student dissertation is found in Appendix G. According to the NCSSFL-ACTFL Can-Do Proficiency Benchmarks (2017), this type of written performance task aligns with the Advanced Mid to Superior performance indicators where students write essays presenting their opinion or argument about academic, social, or professional issues or topics in organized paragraphs across major time frames. Students at the Advanced level are still working on improving their grammatical accuracy, focusing more on meaning than form in their writing.

Recommendations for research and collaboration

Research is severely lacking in the area of writing proficiency in world languages, with most research focusing on ELL, ESL, and EFL students (Lefkowitz, 2011; Reichelt et al., 2012). Additionally, from the existing literature, researchers have found that WL teachers often feel unprepared to teach writing and mostly focus on correcting students' grammar (Lefkowitz, 2011; Manchón, 2011; Reichelt et al., 2012; Schultz, 2011). WL teachers need training in writing pedagogy so they understand that focusing on the writing process and 6+1 writing traits is essential to their students' development as multilinguals. It is necessary for ELA and WL researchers, applied linguists, and literacy experts to collaborate with one another and with classroom teachers to investigate best practices in teaching writing in world languages and to discover the effects of using writer's workshop and other strategies that have worked well in ELA classrooms.

In order to empower students to become multilingual and multiliterate, WL teachers need to focus on developing students' literacy early on in WL classrooms. Using the ELA Common Core Standards (2010), the World Readiness Standards for Language Learning (2015), and the NCSSFL-ACTFL Can-Do
Proficiency Benchmarks (2017) to inform instruction, teachers can integrate writer's workshops to promote students' communicative and cultural proficiency. Teachers can use strategies such as mini-lessons, mentor texts, teacher feedback, small-group lessons, journals, peer response, and author's chair while teaching writing. By focusing on building students' literacy in WL classrooms, they will develop global competence and be able to think critically, engage in meaningful dialogue, and communicate their ideas in multiple languages with a diversity of people. If more U.S. students become multilingual and multiliterate, earning the Seal of Biliteracy in certain states, the impact on national identity will be powerful, transforming students into active citizens who participate in local, national, and global affairs.
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Appendix A

Sample Novice-Level Writer’s Workshop with Lesson Materials, *Todo Sobre Mi*

**Writers’ Workshop Plan Template**

**Preparation**

**In-depth Investigation or Learning Experience Topic:** *Todo Sobre Mi* (All About Me)  
**Writing Trait:** Conventions: Gender, and Number Agreement  
**Which phase(s) of the writing process will be involved?** Pre-writing, drafting, revising.  
**Background Information** (What scaffolding needs to be done prior to this workshop?)

Students need to know that we are working on writing and describing ourselves and our favorite things. Students need to know that we are continuously building onto our *Lista de No Excusas*.

**Writing Invitation and Purpose:**

We are working on describing our daily life and the things that we like to do. Please fill in the *Todo Sobre Mí* graphic organizer. This sheet will help you with the next step. You will take the information this graphic organizer and turn it into a paragraph. You will present your paragraph and graphic organizer during a gallery walk.

**Handouts and student materials:**

Students will use their writer’s workshop notebooks to complete the task. Everything that they will need to complete will be in their notebook. This includes the *lista de no excusas*, *guía de edición* (editing guide) y *guía de todo sobre mí* (guide for All About Me assignment). Students will be writing about their personal life and everything that makes them up.

**Teaching Tools:** What tools will you need to perform your think aloud and to capture students’ thoughts from the debrief?  
Document viewer, pens, writing samples from students, projector/SmartBoard, chart paper, markers, Conventions: Gender, and Number Agreement PowerPoint.

**Mini-Lesson** (5-15 minutes)

What kind of modeling will you do?  
I will model how to use proper gender and number agreement in Spanish by giving examples on the PowerPoint and modeling how to use this grammar rule in my own writing.  
Will you use a draft of your writing or a student’s draft?  
I will use writing from my students’ writing to show how to edit, and then my own paper to show how to fill in the graphic organizer and use the *Lista de No Excusas* as a guide.
Think-aloud: What precise language or main points will you use in your think-aloud?
I will model how to compose a draft with the *Lista de No Excusas* as a guide, e.g., “*Cada frase empieza con una mayúscula y termina con una forma de puntuación. Soy una chica, entonces necesito usar el término femenino cuando puedo.*” (Each phrase begins with a capital letter and ends with some form of punctuation. I am a girl; therefore, I need to use feminine endings when I can.)

**Practice/Application** (20-30 minutes)
Focus Script: What precise instructions will you give the students to clarify the intent of their writing?
I will instruct the students to fill out the graphic organizer as best as they can. I will ask them to specifically use the *Lista de No Excusas* to guide their writing. I will instruct the students to write as much as they can about themselves to show me all of what they know in their final product.
During practice, will students work individually? If they will be working in pairs or small groups, how will students be grouped?
Individually, but they may consult with their table partner if they need immediate help while the teacher is conferencing.
How much time will they be given to practice?
15-20 minutes
With whom will you confer with during this time?
I will talk with all of the groups for a status of the class to figure out how the groups are working and what concerns they may have about the assignment.
I will use this protocol for peer response:
- Author will switch papers with their table partner during work time.
- Taking on the role of an editor, students will read the piece to themselves in the room, or ask to read aloud in the hallway and edit using a clipboard.
- On a small recording form, the students will provide feedback to the author of the paper. The feedback must include: 2 praises, 2 constructive comments, 1 question
- Partners will then return the paper and comments.
- A new draft will be written.

**Group Share/Debrief** (5-15 minutes)
Will students share in pairs, a group, or as a whole class?
The students will share their final project during a gallery walk during class.
Debriefing Questions: What question(s) will you ask the students in order to focus their debrief?
¿Crees que La Lista de No Excusas te ayuda? (Do you think the List of No Excuses helped you?)
¿Te gusta escribir sobre ti o te gusta escribir sobre otras personas? (Did you like to write about yourself or do you like to write about other people?)

**Recording:** How will you keep track of this great thinking? (Anchor chart, student journals, sticky notes on wall, etc.)
We will use chart paper to create a graffiti chart of students’ thinking. Each chart paper will have a question and the students will have different colored markers for their graffiti.

**Lista de No Excusas** (List of No Excuses)

**Capitalización** : **SIEMPRE empieza una frase con una letra capital.**
(Capitalization: ALWAYS begin a sentence with a capital letter.)

**Ej.** Yo voy a la playa durante el verano. (Ex. I go to the beach during the summer.)

**Puntuación: Cada frase necesita una forma de puntuación.** (Punctuation: Each sentence needs a form of punctuation.)

**Ej.** ¡Me encanta la comida Mexicana! (I love Mexican food!)
¿Te gusta jugar el fútbol? (Do you like to play soccer?)
Quiero ir a España. (I want to go to Spain.)

**Los Pronombres**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yo (I)</th>
<th>Nosotros (We)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tú (You)</td>
<td>Vosotros (You all, formal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Él / Ella/ Usted (He, She, You [formal])</td>
<td>Ellos/ Ellas/ Ustedes (They, You all)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**El verbo Ser = to be**

| Yo SOY (I am) | Nosotros SOMOS (We are) |
| Tú ERES (You are) | Vosotros (Y’all, formal) |
| Él/Ella/ Usted ES (He/She/You [formal] are) | Ellos/ Ellas/ Ustedes SON (They [male]/ They [female]/ Y’all are) |
Si je gagnais $100 au match de Bulls, j’achèterais beaucoup de choses. D’abord j’achèterais PlayStation jeux. Deuxième, j’achèterais des disques compacts. Troisième, je mangerais à mon restaurant Leona’s. J’achèterais une moûtre aussi.


Appendix C

Intermediate Lesson Spanish Creative Writing, Story Cube

Appendix D

Intermediate Student Work, Informational Text

Lionel Jospin

Lionel Jospin est un homme très intéressant et très important en France. Pendant toute sa vie, il a travaillé dans beaucoup de pays sur les projets politiques. Ces projets ont aidé développer la France et le monde qu’on connais aujourd’hui.


Sa famille a fait un déménagement à Marne ou Lionel faisait les études au lycée. Il aimait sa vie en Marne, mais il voulait trouver les occasions universitaire en Paris. Il a choisi l’Institut d’études politiques à Paris en 1956. Il habitait à l’Antony universitaire où il prenait part aux activités politiques. En 1961 il est accepté à l’ENA(l’école national d’administration) mais il faisait d’abord son service national. Lionel a fait le
cours de formation pour devenir un officier de l’armée. Il s’engagait dans les corps de tanks. Après les deux ans, il est retourné à l’ENA pour faire des études.


En 1995, Jospin est devenu le candidat socialiste pour le Président de France, mais il n’a pas gagné l’élection.
Après cette perte il est élu le secrétaire du parti Socialiste. Il est élu pour le premier fois par les membres du parti. Il a recu 94,16% des voix.


Lionel Jospin était un homme très influent en France pour la plupart de sa vie. Il était le professeur et un homme politique dynamique. Il a consacré sa vie à servir les peuples françaises. Il n’avait jamais oublié son
travail comme un jeune homme dans les mines de charbon au nord. Ce travail était très difficile. Les ouvriers et leur problèmes et leur droits avaient la priorité dans la vie politique de Jospin.

Dans sa vie personnelle, il a trois enfants par les deux femme:

Elizabeth et maintenant Sylviane. Sylviane est un professeur et un auteur des livres sciences sociales.

Appendix E
Intermediate Student Work, Independent Journaling

Le Journal de Voyage à France
le 11 avril, 2001 (Chicago-16H30)


Il y a quelque belle filles qui sont allé Romania, j’espère que c’est le commencement pour regarde des belle filles pour la voyage.


le 12 avril, 2001

Je n’ai reste pas, mais, je sorts avec deux fils qui sont avec la groupe du Romanik Nous arrivons en Zurich à 8h40 (Zurich temps) et partir pour Nice à 9h30.

Pour la voyage à Nice, j’ai bu un bouteille du vin, il était bonne, et il est aussi petit, mais, il est la commenceur du la fete en France. La groupe ont reste à l’Eden Bleu. Il y a un piscine, mais il est frois. Je ne nage pas parce que je ne voulrais changer mes vetements. La groupe était hereuse que j’apporte un frisbee, alors, nous jouons avec la dans la piscine, mais je juste place ma cheveux dans la piscine pour laver. Apres la, je me bronze pour un petit fois.
Quelque personne ont joué au ping pong avec moi, j'étais la meilleure. Nous finions parce que Mike a promené sur le ball.

La groupe allait à Cannes pour le reste de soir. Nous regardons les commercials et j'ai acheté pour un carte de téléphone. Pour diner, nous mangeons à L'Ascarnceau. J'ai payé pour un bouteille de vin, mais juste un autre personne a un verre l'alcool et j'ai fini la vin, alors... Nous retournons à l'hôtel après manger et je ne rappelle pas quelque chose de cet soir. Je rappelle réveiller à 5H30 le matin prochaine.

le 13 avril, 2001

Il etais bonne, je leve à 5H30. Je promenade dans l'hôtel pour regarder la soleil, mais, je n'ai pas vu le soleil. A 8H, nous mangeons pour le petit dejeuner. En premier, nous allons à la Fragonard Parfum Usine, j'ai achete pour cent dollars du parfum, maintenant j'ai beaucoup de cologne et parfum.


Il y a un personne s'appelle Claude. Il est le mec! Il conduit l'autobus, et il assiste moi quand j'ai juste 20F, et je exchange ses 300F avec 44 dollars! J'aimerais que nous changeons le nom de groupe s'appelle "Viva de Claude". Je fume des cigares, et Mlle Burke a regardé moi. En premier, je pense que j'étais en ennui, mais j'ai été étonné.

Conférie Florian est la restaurant nous mangeons pour le soir. Je mange une salade avec thon, de la soupe, et une petit glace. Je ne bu pas la beir parce que je besoin économisé mes argent pour le fin de voyager, et je ne suis pas aussi pauvre.

Nice est un bonne place, mais, des rues sont tres occupé plus que autres, et plus gentil. Je ne fume pas beaucoup maintenant parce que j'espère que je ne intoxiqué pas à lui. Mon groupe a promenade dans les bien rues pour longtemps.
Appendix F

Advanced Student Work, Reading to Write Fables

La bataille. X part avec Shaggy, et

Manitah partit aussi, parce qu’ils ne veulent

pas voir la bataille. Will téléphone les cochons

et le grand chien. Rick les cochons et Rick

entrent la maison le à même temps. Il et

était jeune aussi qu’ils sont les conte à la

maison et à la maison de son papa.

D’où x, Manitah, le chien partent. La

maison aussi les situation est très ridicule

et com... Mais le lendemain Rick parte

par la fenêtre.

Appendix G

Advanced Student Work, Writing to Reflect and Persuade, La Dissertation

La Dissertation

Je suis écrit mon vision de l’avenir et réaliste. Je
suis cette j’ai une grand potentiel. Mon mon père avec moi
et elle donne moi le courage (mon père aussi).
Maintenant j’explique mon sujet. Le prochain
phrases sont par le informations à aide moi dans
ma vie.

Je suis plus important dans ma vie, parce
je suis le homme à la mon maison. Mon père
il n’est pas la. Il est avec un nouvelle femme et
pas de mariage avec mon mec maintenant. Je
desire aller l’université, parce je suis le père
à la future. Je pense je suis en très bien personne
a jouer au basket. C’est mon visio mais il est
très, très difficile à fait. Je suis très intelligent
et je serais un entraîner quand je fait l’université.
et dans la NBA.
Ma mère aide ma pour que, elle parlait bien Francais, elle disait bien Francais, elle avait le très fort encouragement pour moi. Mais je parle très fort avec le promise et il y a deux ans, par le mal de performance, pas le mot.

Je n'ai pas d'amis, mais un peu parque ils donnent un temps pas sérieux et j'aime le drôle personne dans ma vie. Quand je joue au basket je suis dans un... Il est mon meilleur ami, j'amoure le match.

Ma mère aide moi très beaucoup et basket est très bien pour les plaisir dans ma vie. Les autres raisons est bien mais j'aime l'autre beaucoup. Le autre est le branches et le aube est le très, J'utilise ma mère mot pour l'inspire dans ma vie et basket est un outlet. Ma mère parle "tu n'arrête pas," "alle, alle, alle." Quand j'suis dans le court, elle me dit à manger et je revois encourager. J'ai fait très bien pour elle. Ma mère aussi il est très sympahe à moi.

Il est le plus réaliste de dire que parce j'attend l'école très bien. Je pense d'être bien reporte et plus de personne est impression similaire c'est tout de l'intéressant pour ma sujet c'est dissertation. Après l'université je joue au basket dans la NBA. J'ai un moyen familiale avec 36-4 jours et un grand maison à Chicago. C'est une possibilité.

C'est j'alle à Niger avec ma petite amie (pour, maintenant.)