

UC Berkeley

The CATESOL Journal

Title

Output as a Source of Input: Collaborative Writing Tasks for Developing the Grammar and Linguistic Resources of L2 Writers

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2fd2p3hp>

Journal

The CATESOL Journal, 32(1)

ISSN

1535-0517

Author

Goins, Mitchell

Publication Date

2021

DOI

10.5070/B5.35915

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Peer reviewed



Output as a Source of Input: Collaborative Writing Tasks for Developing the Grammar and Linguistic Resources of L2 Writers

The role of grammar instruction within second-language writing instruction has been a subject of debate for several decades. Researchers have debated the necessity of grammar instruction, different methodologies of grammar instruction, and grammar instruction's effectiveness for second-language writing development. Despite research indicating the benefit of grammar instruction for second-language learning and writing development, practical applications of grammar instruction to second-language writing instruction remain sparse within the discourses of second-language learning. Drawing upon theory, research, and practice from within the fields of Second Language Acquisition and Applied Linguistics, this article articulates three practical form-focused collaborative writing tasks that facilitate explicit focus on grammar and language form within the context of L2 writing.

Grammar instruction has a prominent place in second-language (L2) writing scholarship and research. Discussions about the role of grammar instruction in L2 writing instruction address a range of issues, from the time that should be spent on grammar instruction (e.g., Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005) to the politics of grammar instruction (e.g., Canagarajah, 1999; Pennycook, 1989) to the effectiveness of written corrective feedback and error correction (e.g., Ferris, 1999; Truscott, 1996). Indeed, the topic of grammar instruction has become part and parcel of L2 writing's disciplinary discourse. After all, numerous studies have demonstrated not only the distinct nature of L2 writing and the linguistic difficulties that L2 writers face (Raimes, 1985; Silva, 1993) but also the fact that L2 writers need, and benefit from, targeted grammar instruction (Ellis, Basturkmen, & Loewen, 2001; Swain & Lapkin, 2002).

The research notwithstanding, the topic of grammar instruction in a L2 writing context has gained newfound importance for ESL practitioners in California as a result of Assembly Bill (AB) 705. In light of this bill, California

Community College educators are being asked to "Review currently offered credit ESL curriculum and consider integrating skills (e.g., grammar/writing, or reading/writing/grammar)" so that credit ESL students are better prepared to transition into transfer-level English. At the same time, the bill has necessitated that credit ESL programs develop new "ESL pathways that transition students from the highest levels of credit ESL course work directly into transfer-level English (TLE) rather than into developmental English courses." Given the full implementation of AB 705 in Fall 2020, many credit ESL programs are already developing new curricula which focus more on developing students' academic language proficiency, of which grammar is an integral part (CCC, 2018).

Needless to say, grammar instruction competes for time and attention with other important goals within the L2 writing classroom. In fact, it has been cautioned that a L2 writing class is *not* a grammar class and that explicit grammar instruction can distract both teachers and students from the multiple literacy goals of a writing curriculum—namely: invention, pre-writing, drafting, revising, editing, etc. (see Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005; Neumann, 2014; Truscott, 1996). This is indeed a caution worthy of attention. However, if grammar is, as Frodesen and Holten (2003) describe it, "a set of linguistic resources from which native and nonnative speakers alike select forms based on appropriateness for meaning, for audience, and for textual demands," then language forms and the meanings they realize in written communication are inseparable (p. 157). In other words, grammar instruction and L2 writing instruction are inextricably connected. Moreover, studies in second language acquisition (SLA) have demonstrated that output plays an important role in L2 acquisition (Swain,

1995). That is, L2 written output is not simply an outcome made possible by L2 learning but rather a means for developing L2 acquisition. Specifically, written output provides a means for L2 writers to test their hypotheses about the L2 and receive feedback on their writing, including its grammar forms (Swain, 1998). Furthermore, Williams (2007) noted that written “output does have a number of important roles for developing L2 acquisition...and writing ability” (p. 9). Namely, the modality of writing, the permanent record it leaves, and the slower pace at which it occurs all afford L2 writers more attentional resources to focus on language forms as they write (Williams, 2012, p. 325). In all, both the interrelation of grammar and writing and the roles of L2 writing for developing L2 acquisition generate questions for the L2 writing instructor:

1. What place should grammar have in a L2 writing class?
2. What are the options for teaching grammar in a L2 writing class?
3. How do I integrate and implement grammar instruction into my teaching of L2 writing?

This article first provides a brief literature review that demonstrates the necessity of grammar instruction in a L2 writing context and the role that L2 writing plays in L2 acquisition. Then, drawing upon SLA and applied linguistics research, it offers three practical form-focused collaborative writing tasks that facilitate explicit focus on grammar and language in the context of student writing: a dictogloss task, a reformulation task, and a peer-review task. These three writing tasks focus students’ attention on language form within their own writing, providing opportunities for students to co-construct grammar knowledge as they have conversations about their language. At the same time, instructors have the opportunity to respond to the emerging linguistic issues with just-in-time grammar instruction. In turn, students’ written output can become a rich source of grammatical input.

Grammar Instruction and L2 Writing Pedagogy

In the 1960s and 1970s, grammar instruction was the curricular foundation of most L2 writing courses (Frodesen & Holten, 2003). In fact, it was not until the communicative language teaching era of the 1980s, when numerous studies in both first language (L1) writing (see Hartwell, 1985) and SLA seemed to discredit the efficacy of teaching grammar in writing courses, that L2 researchers and practitioners began to question this approach. Krashen’s (1982) monitor model, for example, posited that explicit grammar knowledge did not always translate into the ability to use this knowledge in spontaneous, authentic communication. Moreover, the process movement within L1 composition during the 1970s and 1980s had a direct effect on L2 writing pedagogy. Many studies of the composing process in L1 writing (see Flower & Hayes, 1981; Perl, 1979; Sommers, 1980), which revealed the complex and recursive nature of writing, as well as salient differences between novice and experienced writers, led to pedagogies that prioritized idea generation, arrangement, and drafting over attention to grammar rules and language form, often relegating issues of grammar to the final stages of the writing process (Micciche, 2004). This research was followed by studies of the composing process in L2 writing (see Zamel, 1983), which by and large found similar results—namely, that more experienced writers focused more on ideas and content throughout the writing process. In short, findings in the fields of SLA and composition studies reinforced the idea that grammar instruction was ineffective.

More recently, however, many of these conclusions have been called into question as a result of new findings in SLA research that demonstrate a positive role for grammar instruction in L2 learning (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005). For example, Norris and Ortega’s (2000) meta-analysis of 49 studies revealed a positive role of form-focused instruction within L2 teaching. Their analysis found that “L2 instruction of particular language forms induces substantial target-oriented change” and that “instruction that incorporates explicit...techniques leads to more substantial effects than implicit instruction” (p. 500). Furthermore, Ellis (2002) highlighted the results of several studies whose aim was to investigate the efficacy of grammar instruction for L2 acquisition. Reporting on the results of these studies, Ellis (2002) stated that “instructed learners generally achieved higher levels of grammatical competence than naturalistic learners,” causing him to conclude that “there is now convincing direct and indirect evidence to support the teaching of grammar” (p. 86). As a result of these findings, “it is clear that [L2] writing instructors have a role to play in making writers aware of language form” (Frodesen & Holten, 2003, p. 144).

In the same way that research in SLA has acknowledged a positive role for grammar instruction in L2 writing, the field of SLA has begun to acknowledge a positive role for L2 writing in L2 acquisition (Williams 2012, p. 321). Until recently, L2 writing has been most often perceived as the result of L2 acquisition rather than facilitative of it (p. 321). Today, however, there is growing interest among SLA researchers as to the role that written output can play in L2 acquisition. Williams (2012) reviewed a large body of research to demonstrate potential roles for writing in L2 development and posited that its facilitative effects on L2 acquisition are due in large part to the “inherent features of writing: (1) its permanence and (2) the slower pace at which it occurs in comparison to speaking” (p. 322). These distinct features of writing, Williams (2012) argued, “permit more learner control over attentional resources as well as more need and opportunity to attend to language both during and after production” (p. 322). The very act of writing, as Williams points out, entails a focus on language form, making the L2 writing classroom a rich environment for form-focused instruction.

As described above, the critical role of form-focused instruction (FFI) in L2 acquisition has been widely established in SLA and applied linguistics. Likewise, L2 output, and more specifically, L2 writing, has been acknowledged as having an important role in L2 acquisition. Together, FFI and L2 written output serve important roles in helping L2 writers develop grammar and linguistic knowledge necessary for writing. The question then becomes: How do L2 writing instructors integrate form-focused instruction and L2 writing in a way that facilitates the development of L2 writers’ language resources? One possible answer is focus-on-form (FonF), an instructional procedure with roots in SLA research. First introduced by Long (1991), FonF “overtly draws students’ attention to linguistic elements as they arise incidentally in lessons whose overriding focus is on meaning or communication” (p. 45-46). The essence of FonF is that it draws students’ attention to forms without isolating them from a meaningful, communicative environment. Within this communicative environment, FonF is a procedure by which instructors draw students’ attention to language form in response to their communicative need. In this sense, FonF, when it was first introduced by Long (1991), was reactive in nature, only focusing on forms when students needed them to carry out a language task. Ellis (2016) expands this definition, however, noting that FonF need not be reactive in nature, but that it can preemptive and planned; that is, activities can be planned in order to elicit specific language forms on which the L2 instructor wishes to focus within an environment that is communicative (p. 409). In sum, FonF “occurs in activities where meaning is primary but attempts are made to attract attention to form” (p. 411). However, within this definition, FonF comprises both reactive and preemptive instructional procedures.

How FonF ought to be applied in the L2 writing classroom is still being explored. Williams (2012) notes that “the negotiation that often occurs during collaborative prewriting activities can increase interactional moves thought to facilitate language learning” (p. 326). In other words, collaborative dialogue about writing between students can serve as a means for deepening students’ awareness of and attention to language forms. Such interactions are often referred to in SLA literature as language-related episodes (LREs), defined by Leeser (2004) as “segments of learner interaction in which learners either talk about or question their own or others’ language use within the context of carrying out a given task in the L2” (p. 56). An example of a language-related episode (LRE) would be students discussing a grammar rule or how something should be written in a L2. Swain and Lapkin (2002) demonstrated that as students participate in collaborative writing tasks, they discuss language use and form. Williams (2012) argued that LREs, “rather than written production itself, may provide a better way to observe how focus on form is accomplished in writing and through writing instruction” (p. 326). In other words, LREs provide a rich context for L2 writing instructors to provide FonF in the L2 writing classroom as they focus students’ attention on language form within the context of their own writing.

Applying Focus-on-Form to L2 Writing Instruction

As discussed, SLA researchers have explored the use of collaborative writing activities to engage L2 learners in LREs: “any part of the dialogue where learners talk about the language they are producing, question their language use, or correct themselves or others” (Swain & Lapkin, 2002, p. 292). The pedagogical justification for LREs between students (and students and teachers) derives from a sociocultural theoretical perspective: the notion that social interaction is integral to cognitive development. Vygotsky’s (1986) Social

Development Theory, in particular his notion of the zone of proximal development, provides the theoretical foundation for LREs. Vygotsky argued that learning occurs within the zone of proximal development—the distance between a student’s ability to accomplish a task with the assistance or collaboration of a more competent peer or a more knowledgeable other and their ability to accomplish it on their own. Thus, LREs enable students to scaffold each other’s understandings of language form and meaning. At the same time, LREs provide clear opportunities for L2 writing instructors to join students’ conversations about language form and provide explicit grammar instruction. As students and teachers participate in LREs during collaborative writing tasks, their attention is focused on language form while they are involved in a task that is focused on meaning. This leads to the question, what are the collaborative writing activities that facilitate FonF within a L2 writing context? In the next section, I discuss three different tasks that facilitate FonF within the context of L2 writing: (1) a dictogloss task, (2) a reformulation task, and (3) a peer revision task.

Dictogloss Task

A dictogloss is an activity in which students listen to and take notes on a passage that their instructor reads aloud at a normal speed. The speed at which the text is read does not give students enough time to transcribe the text while the instructor is reading it; rather, students work together to reconstruct the text that they heard using their shared linguistic knowledge (Wajnryb, 1990). This task facilitates FonF by simultaneously engaging students in conversations about the content of a passage *and* the language necessary to reconstruct it. In order to be facilitative of L2 learning, a dictogloss task must be appropriately difficult, facilitating collaborative interaction between students that falls within their zones of proximal development. In other words, the text chosen should not be so easy that students can easily reconstruct it independently, with no assistance from a peer, nor should the text be too difficult that two students, working together, cannot understand it at all or even begin to reconstruct it.

Once an appropriate level text is selected, a dictogloss task can be used to facilitate reactive or preemptive FonF. To facilitate reactive FonF using a dictogloss task, no particular language forms or constructions should be emphasized or highlighted by the instructor. Instead, the instructor should let the task itself and the communicative needs of the students dictate what language forms and constructions will become the targets of explicit language instruction. For example, in a text that includes several instances of passive voice, an instructor, upon noticing that many groups of students are struggling with accurately reconstructing the passive voice construction, may interrupt the activity with a mini-lesson on the passive voice. To do this well, instructors need to be walking around the room and attuned to student conversations, ready to jump in and offer just-in-time and responsive instruction on emerging areas of difficulty. Alternatively, an instructor may want to facilitate preemptive FonF and thus preempt the dictogloss activity with a mini-lesson on the passive voice. In each case, the dictogloss task facilitates FonF by engaging students in a task in which the communication of meaning is primary but attempts are made to attract students’ attention to language form.

A dictogloss task can be used to facilitate FonF for a range of L2 writers, from lower proficiency students to higher proficiency students. Leeser (2004) investigated the degree to which L2 proficiency affects L2 students’ capacity to FonF during a dictogloss task, including the type, number, and outcome of LREs students produced. He found that higher proficiency students engaged in a larger number of LREs compared to lower proficiency students, and that the former focused more on grammatical items during LREs while the latter focused more on lexical items. Furthermore, he noted that higher proficiency learners showed greater success in solving the linguistic questions and problems they faced during the reconstruction phase of the dictogloss task than did their lower proficiency counterparts. Presumably, lower proficiency learners focused on fewer grammatical items and had less success in solving linguistic problems due to the fact that they were focused primarily on extracting meaning from the text, not the forms used to convey it per se. Higher proficiency learners, on the other hand, who most likely had higher levels of comprehension, had more attentional resources to dedicate to linguistic and grammatical forms within the text.

As a general rule, then, preemptive FonF may be more effective with lower proficiency learners, as it would provide learners with some background knowledge on the linguistic form needed during the reconstruction phase of the dictogloss task. In addition, the passage should be short and include select forms which were preemptively taught (i.e, the passage should not include extraneous forms that distract students from the linguistic form(s) under discussion). Preemptive mini-lessons will vary widely based upon students' proficiency levels. Beginning learners, for example, may benefit from a dictogloss which brings their attention to the differences between the simple past and past progressive tenses, in which case a preemptive mini-lesson would focus on the differing verb forms (verb + *ed* vs. was + verb + *ing*) and the meanings they realize. Similarly, low-intermediate learners may benefit from focus on subject-verb agreement, and so a possible mini-lesson may focus on subject pronouns and their relationship to the verb *to be*. In each case, the underlying goal of addressing such grammar items in preemptive mini-lessons is to focus students' attention on a particular language form and the meaning it conveys. By themselves, however, such mini-lessons do not enact FonF, as they position grammar and linguistic items as objects of study, not as tools for communicating per se. It is within the following dictogloss activity that students will have the opportunity to discuss and use the form in a meaningful context as they activate it during the reconstruction of the passage, thereby enacting FonF.

In contrast, reactive FonF is more suitable for higher proficiency learners, though there remains a place for preemptive FonF as well in cases where the instructor identifies a broad need amongst many students for focus on a specific grammar item. Unlike preemptive FonF, reactive FonF addresses discrete problems that arise during LREs in the reconstruction phase of the dictogloss task. LREs have the potential to focus on an array of linguistic items, from lexical to syntactic to semantic. Nevertheless, instructors, having chosen the text being used for the dictogloss activity, will be aware of the linguistic forms therein, and therefore can make predictions about what linguistic questions and problems students may encounter in the reconstruction phase. With this knowledge, instructors can prepare possible lessons or examples that address the most salient forms within the text with which students will most likely struggle. For example, if the passage includes several verb tenses that the instructor knows often cause students difficulty, then being prepared with examples or a lesson on certain tenses is most effective. In the end, each instructor will have to decide upon the appropriate level text for the dictogloss activity and then be ready with lessons and explanations that will, where necessary, assist students in appropriating the forms necessary for text reconstruction.

Reformulation Task

Reformulation is another task that focuses students' attention simultaneously on meaning and language form. Cohen (1983) described reformulation as "having a native writer of the target language rewrite the learner's essay, preserving all the writer's ideas, making it sound as nativelike as possible" (p. 4). Reformulation goes beyond merely correcting the surface errors of a text and includes substantive revision of students' texts, including "vocabulary, syntax, cohesion, and rhetorical functions" (p. 5). As such, Cohen noted that "most students need assistance in comparing their version with the reformulated one, and that these comparisons need to be purposely eye-opening and engaging" (p. 17). Researchers have used reformulation as an instrument for facilitating LREs. Swain and Lapkin (2002), for example, conducted a study to better understand the potential of reformulation in facilitating LREs and consequently L2 learning. The participants within their study consisted of two English-speaking students who were enrolled in a French immersion program in Canada. Each student was 12 years old and in seventh grade. Prior to the study, these two students were between a high-intermediate and advanced level in French. The researchers first asked the two students to write a story together based upon a series of pictures. Then, a native speaker reformulated their story, and they were asked to notice the differences between their text and its reformulation. Next, a team of researchers showed them a videotape of themselves noticing the differences between the two texts and asked them to comment further on the differences they noticed and what they were thinking about as they compared the two texts. Finally, the team of researchers gave the two students back their original text and asked them to make any changes they wanted, individually, followed by an interview asking students to comment on all stages of this process.

Surprisingly, the two students produced 47 LREs in the initial writing of their story, and in the comparison of their original text and the reformulation, they produced 29 LREs. During these comparisons, students discussed prepositional phrases, adverbial phrases, and verb usage, to name a few items, all within the meaningful context of the story they had written, thereby enacting FonF. Overall, the study demonstrated that “reformulation of learners’ writing...is an effective technique for stimulating noticing and reflection on language” (p. 298). In the end, the two students “got approximately 78% of the post-test items or structures correct” in their final revision (p. 299).

Reformulation can be tailored to accommodate students across a range of proficiency levels and ages. The aforementioned students, for example, had participated in a French immersion program since the age of five, enabling them to participate in LREs about a wide range of linguistic items. Reformulation of students’ entire texts might be more suitable to higher proficiency learners who have deep linguistic repertoires. Reformulation as such lends itself to reactive FonF, in that students may notice changes in the reformulated versions of their texts that they do not fully understand. In these cases, as students participate in LREs in response to the reformulations of their texts, instructors have an opportunity to provide explicit instruction and explain why the change was made and the grammar construction or rule that required the change. Lower proficiency learners, in contrast, may benefit more from selective reformulations that emphasize particular language forms or structures. For example, an instructor may decide to exclusively reformulate verb tense forms or prepositional phrases. In these cases, instructors enact preemptive FonF, selecting specific portions of text to reformulate and to which to draw students’ attention.

Practicing reformulation in a L2 writing class is indeed time-consuming and effortful, considering an instructor must reformulate the texts of multiple students or pairs of students. One option would be to have students write a text in pairs during one class period, or for homework, and, then, after reformulating them, the teacher asks students to compare their passages with the reformulations the next class period. A reformulation activity such as this could be set up to elicit specific language forms so that the majority of students would be discussing similar form-function relationships during their group discussions, thus providing opportunity for the instructor to provide instruction that targets the entire class.

Another option for instructors with limited time is to only reformulate one text and, with a student’s or group’s permission, use this reformulation to facilitate LREs between all students in the class. Such an approach could be used to facilitate preemptive FonF, as LREs would only focus on selected reformulations, or reactive FonF, in which case the instructor would reformulate the entire text, allowing for LREs about an invariable number of linguistic items.

Depending upon the size of the class and the type of writing being done, reformulation may not be feasible. In other cases instructors may be uncomfortable with reformulation because it downplays students’ voices. As an alternative, reading instruction can provide models of specific linguistic formulations for students, and paraphrasing texts can help them develop these linguistic formulations while still maintaining their own voice.

Finally, it is important to note that the goal of reformulation is conscious reflection on and discussion about language, not error correction per se. In fact, as an error correction strategy, reformulation runs counter to the advice of researchers who argue that selective and strategic correction is best and facilitates advancement toward the development of self-editing strategies (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005, pp. 265-266).

Peer Revision Task

Lastly, peer revision is another task that has the potential to facilitate FonF. Peer revision tasks facilitate FonF in that they involve students in meaningful conversations about the content and meaning within their own writing while at the same time concentrating their attention on the language forms used to convey it. As an example, Guerrero and Villamil (2000) analyzed the interactions between two students as they participated in a peer review task and noted that:

[F]rom a target language and ideal rhetorical perspective, the students sometimes exchanged correct information, sometimes incorrect; sometimes they made bad decisions, sometimes good. From a

sociocultural perspective, however, the students were at all times creatively co-constructing their own system of making meaning in an L2. (p. 65)

In other words, peer revision facilitates LREs that focus their attention on meaning and language form.

Given that peer revision tasks are often tied to a range of learning outcomes and previous course content, preemptive FonF is probably most suited to this task, as it allows the instructor to draw students' attention to and reiterate linguistic and rhetorical topics that have already been covered. If, for example, an instructor has covered comparative conjunctions (e.g., *On the other hand*, *In contrast*, *Likewise*, *Similarly*), a peer revision task might employ preemptive FonF by making such language constructions the focus of a peer review guide. The guide would scaffold LREs amongst students about their uses of comparative conjunctions within their texts. Meanwhile, the instructor would be able to reinforce any previous instruction by joining students' conversations or perhaps presenting a mini-lesson on this topic based upon observed gaps in students' knowledge. The preemptive focus will vary greatly based upon the proficiency level of students. The above example, for instance, may be modified for more beginning learners and focus on very basic transition words used in narrative writing (e.g., *First*, *Second*, *Finally*).

In some cases, when working with very advanced L2 writers, reactive FonF might be appropriate, giving students opportunity to engage in LREs about whatever linguistic items they choose. The instructor would simply observe students as they participated in the peer revision task and seize on opportunities to join LREs and then teach any language forms of particular difficulty for the students. The drawback of such an approach is twofold: on the one hand, such an approach does not give students much direction about what to discuss or focus on, unlike the dictogloss and reformulation tasks. Additionally, it does not allow the instructor to use the peer revision task to reinforce previous course content that has been taught leading up to the writing assignment. Still, reactive FonF might be suitable to the peer revision task near the final stages of the writing process after substantial revision in previous peer revision sessions has already taken place. In this way, instructors can use peer review tasks preemptively to reinforce learning in the beginning stages of a paper and at later stages use reactive FonF to allow students to focus on language items of their choosing.

Task Considerations

The overall purpose of these three collaborative writing tasks is to get students thinking about and discussing language forms needed to communicate a broad range of meanings and ideas, from basic sequencing words and transition phrases to more advanced phrases for contrast, condition, comparison, agreement, disagreement, and much more. The most beneficial aspect of these tasks is that they facilitate conversations about language in active and student-centered ways and provide L2 writing instructors with opportunities to teach grammar within the context of meaningful writing activities. Furthermore, these tasks can combine seamlessly with what many L2 writing instructors are already doing in class. Another benefit to these tasks is that they allow L2 writing instructors to create (preemptive FonF) or react to (reactive FonF) conversations about language and offer explicit language instruction. When deciding whether to use preemptive or reactive FonF, instructors should keep several factors in mind. For one, FonF instructional procedures should respond to students' communicative needs. That is, instructors need to be attuned to students' linguistic output during tasks so that they can discern students' needs and make judicious decisions about what aspects of language to address and to what degree. For example, an instructor might use reactive FonF during a dictogloss task, noticing that many students are having trouble reconstructing the unreal conditional construction. However, should the instructor continue to notice that students continue to have trouble producing the unreal conditional, the instructor might see fit to use preemptive FonF and spend more time on this language construction. In short, FonF procedures, whether preemptive or reactive, should always be tailored to students' linguistic and communicative needs.

Likewise, given that each student's needs are different, and each student's interlanguage unique, FonF instruction will not always address the whole class. At times, an instructor may use reactive FonF instruction that deals with passive voice for one group of students and reactive FonF instruction that deals with conditionals for another. Having said that, a writing instructor may observe that a majority of the class could

benefit from explicit instruction on a particular form, in which case preemptive FonF instruction aimed at the entire class would be appropriate. In sum, instructors need to be students of their students, closely monitoring students' output to determine their linguistic needs and the appropriate FonF procedure to employ.

Lastly, the role of collaborative writing activities in facilitating L2 learning rests, in large part, on the characteristics of a particular task (Swain, 1998, p. 79). That is, a task that elicits LREs for one group of students may not do so for another due to various factors such as the familiarity of the topic of the task, the proficiency of the learners, the age of the learners, and so on (p. 79). Therefore, instructors should aim for tasks that elicit output and discussion that accounts for students' background knowledge and interests, and which, most importantly, falls within their zones of proximal development so that learning can occur. Another factor that is crucial in the effectiveness of tasks for producing LREs is student preparedness for task performance. Prior to any task, instructors should ensure that students' have a clear understanding of their responsibilities. This can be facilitated through teacher modeling and role-playing by teachers prior to the task itself (p. 80).

Conclusion

As discussed, teaching L2 writing requires that instructors attend to an array of tasks, from facilitating pre-writing and drafting to peer-review and editing to commenting on and grading student work. It is no secret that L2 writing instructors have their work cut out for them. Amongst these many concerns are grammar and linguistic concerns, and while L2 writing instructors do their best to address grammar along with everything else, it remains an area that is often deemphasized or even ignored within the contexts and discourses of L2 writing instruction. Indeed, while research demonstrates a positive role for form-focused instruction in the L2 writing classroom, there remains a notion that grammar instruction is, at worst, detrimental to students' writing development and, at best, secondary or supplemental to the other more important aims of L2 writing instruction. This article has aimed to discount both of those notions, demonstrating not only that grammar instruction is beneficial to students' L2 writing development but also that it can be integrated seamlessly into L2 writing instruction. More specifically, this article demonstrates how the collaborative writing tasks of Dictogloss, Reformulation, and Peer Review enable instructors to address grammar and other linguistic concerns concurrently within the contexts of writing activities and assignments often already in use in class.

Finally, the role of collaborative work amongst students in promoting language output and language learning seems promising. Indeed, many studies have demonstrated that collaborative dialogues, or LREs, promote L2 learning, even L2 writing development. However, as Harklau (2002) points out, despite a good deal of research in SLA and applied linguistics that has examined the role of talk in the development of reading and writing, "these approaches often treat text as an artifact or trace of social interactions that lie largely outside the text itself" (p. 340). In other words, L2 writing is often construed as a sign of L2 acquisition rather than a means of it. In light of this, there is a need for more research and teaching practices that explore the possibilities for and effectiveness of FonF instructional procedures within the context of L2 writing instruction. It is only then that researchers may begin to understand more clearly the potential roles for FonF within L2 writing instruction and its capacity to facilitate not only L2 acquisition generally but also L2 writing development specifically.

Acknowledgements:

I would like to thank my colleague, Meaghan Young-Stephens, for her invaluable feedback on multiple drafts of this paper.

Author:

Mitchell Goins is a full-time English faculty member at Malcolm X College. He previously taught ESL at Richard J. Daley College and first-year writing at DePaul University.

References

- California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, (2018). *Assembly Bill 705 Initial Guidance Language for Credit English as a Second Language*. Memorandum. Retrieved from: <https://asccc.org/>
- Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). *Resisting Linguistic Imperialism in English Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cohen, A. (1983). Reformulating second-language compositions: A potential source of input for the learner. Paper presented at the annual convention of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Toronto, ON (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 228 866).
- Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H. and Loewen, S. (2001), Learner uptake in communicative ESL lessons. *Language Learning*, 51(2): 281-318.
- Ellis, R. (2016). Anniversary article. Focus on form: A critical review. *Language Teaching Research*, 20(3), 405-428.
- Ferris, D. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(1), 1-11.
- Ferris, D., & Hedgcock, J. (2005). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32(4), 365-387.
- Frodesen, J. & Holten, C. (2003). Grammar in the ESL writing class. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the Dynamics of Second Language Writing* (pp. 141-161). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Guerrero, M. de & O. Villamil (2000). Activating the ZPD: Mutual scaffolding in L2 peer revision. *The Modern Language Journal* 84(2), 51-68.
- Harklau, L. (2002). The role of writing in classroom second language acquisition. *Journal Of Second Language Writing*, 11(4). 329-350.
- Hartwell, P. (1985). Grammar, grammars, and the teaching of grammar. *College English* 47(2), 105-127.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Leeser, M. J. (2004). Learner proficiency and focus on form during collaborative dialogue. *Language Teaching Research*, 8(1), 55-81.
- Long, M. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. De Bot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign Language Research in Cross-Cultural Perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Micciche, L. (2004). Making a case for rhetorical grammar. *College Composition and Communication*, 55(4), 716-737.
- Neumann, H. (2014). Teacher assessment of grammatical ability in second language academic writing: A case study. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 24, 83-107.
- Norris, J. M., & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 Instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 50(3), 417-528.
- Pennycook, A. (1989). The concept of method, interested knowledge, and the politics of language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23(4), 589-618.
- Perl, S. (1979). The composing processes of unskilled college writers. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 13(4), 317-336.
- Raimes, A. (1985). What unskilled ESL students do as they write: A classroom study of composing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19(2), 229-258.
- Silva, T. (1993). Toward an understanding of the distinct nature of L2 writing: The ESL research and its implications. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(4), 657-677.
- Sommers, N. (1980). Revision strategies of student writers and experienced adult writers. *College Composition and Communication*, 31(4), 378-388.
- Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics* (pp. 125-144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Swain, M. (1998) Focus on form through conscious reflection. In C. Doughty and J. Williams (Eds.) *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 64- 81). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2002). Talking it through: Two French immersion learners' response to reformulation. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 37(3), 285-304.
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46, 327-369.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *The Collected Works of L. S. Vygotsky. Volume I: Thinking and Speaking*. New York, NY: Plenum.
- Wajnryb, R. (1990) *Grammar Dictation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Williams, J. (2007). Focus on form and L2 writing instruction. *The Korean Language in America*, 12, 1-14.
- Williams, J. (2012). The potential role(s) of writing in second language development. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(4), 321-331.
- Zamel, V. (1983). The composing processes of advanced ESL students: Six case studies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17(2), 165-187.