

A Review of Studies on Languaging and Second Language Learning (2006-2017)

Ruiying Niu

Faculty of English Language and Culture, Guangdong University of Foreign Studies, Guangzhou, China

Lijia Li

Faculty of English Language and Culture, Guangdong University of Foreign Studies, Guangzhou, China

Abstract—Since Swain postulated the concept “languaging” in 2006 to capture the role of language production in second language (L2) learning, a growing body of empirical studies has been conducted on languaging. However, little research has reviewed these studies. The present paper reviews 15 empirical studies that were conducted over the past decade on languaging in L2 learning, followed Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory of mind, and directly took languaging as the treatment or part of the treatment. We distinguished task-prompted and teacher-imposed languaging in the paper. All studies reviewed focused on teacher-imposed languaging. On the basis of reviewing the foci and findings of the studies, we offer our critical comments and recommendations for future research.

Index Terms—second language learning, languaging, sociocultural theory, grammar explanation, written corrective feedback, translation, critical review

I. INTRODUCTION

Since Swain (1985) put forward the comprehensible output hypothesis, various concepts like “output”, “verbalizing”, “verbalization”, “collaborative dialogue”, and “languaging” have been employed to capture the role of language production in second language (L2) learning. Languaging, as the most recent term, was postulated in Swain (2006) and considered more suitable and inclusive than other concepts. Particularly, output carries the image of language working as a conveyor of a fixed message, verbalizing and verbalization are assumed to refer to only speaking instead of both speaking and writing (Swain, 2006), and collaborative dialogue implies the exclusion of individual output and written output (Swain & Watanabe, 2013), whereas languaging “conveyed an action - a dynamic, never-ending process of using language to make meaning” (Swain, 2006, p. 96). Since the postulation of the concept “languaging” (Swain, 2006), a growing body of empirical studies on languaging have been conducted (e.g. Moradian, Miri, & Nasab, 2017; Suzuki, 2012; Swain, Lapkin, Knouzi, Suzuki, & Brooks, 2009). However, little research has reviewed these studies. The present paper intends to make a critical review of the empirical studies on languaging. We begin the review by defining the term “languaging” and accounting the theoretical basis for its language-learning function, then critically review the foci and findings of relevant empirical studies, and finally offer our critical comments and recommendations for future research.

II. LANGUAGING AND THEORETICAL BASIS FOR ITS LANGUAGE-LEARNING FUNCTION

Swain (2006) was not the first scholar to use the term “languaging”, but she endowed the term a new meaning. Earlier than Swain (2006), Lado (1979) used “languaging” as a generic term to refer globally to various uses of language. Differently, Swain (2006) gave the term a new meaning, using it to refer to “the process of making meaning and shaping knowledge and experience through language” (p. 98), which is compatible with but different from the concept “self-explaining” (Chi, 2000). Swain (2006) advocates that “languaging about language is one of the ways we learn a second language to an advanced level” (p. 96) and “it is part of what constitutes learning” (p. 98).

The language-learning facilitation function of languaging is originated in the sociocultural perspective of mental development. The sociocultural perspective maintains that human beings’ cognition development including language learning is socially mediated, and that language is the most essential mediating tool (Vygotsky, 1978). Based on the Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory, language learning is situated in the sociocultural milieu in that it is constructed through interactions between individuals, physical artifacts (e.g. the computer and the textbook) and more capable others (e.g. teachers and peers), and is accomplished when the co-constructed knowledge is brought under self-control and autonomous use (Lantolf, 2011; Vygotsky, 1978). In this knowledge co-construction and internalization process, language functions as the agent, regulator, and mediator of language learning (Swain & Lapkin, 2011); particularly, it is languaging that “serves to mediate cognition” (Swain, 2006, p. 97), including attention, recall, and knowledge construction in language learning. Languaging embodies as speaking and writing, serving as vehicles “through which thinking is articulated and transformed into an artifactual form” (Swain, 2006, p. 97), about which one can language

further, with thought being completed and transformed and a new and deeper understanding being achieved. This leads to language learning.

Languaging can be task-prompted or teacher-imposed. Task-prompted languaging, taking the form of collaborative dialogue or private speech, results from performing such writing tasks as jigsaw, dictogloss, text-reconstruction, text-editing, picture description, and composition writing either collaboratively or individually (see review in Storch, 2013), and has been identified as language-related episodes in empirical studies. Task-prompted languaging has been substantiated to be able to enhance language learning (e.g. Swain & Lapkin, 1998, 2002) but it is incidental and cannot be manipulated for more effective and efficient language learning as it is restricted to solving language problems encountered during performing a task and does not allow learners to articulate their thinking intentionally. In order to take full advantage of languaging, pedagogically teacher-imposed languaging can be implemented. Teacher-imposed languaging is produced when languaging is treated as the task instead of the “by-product” of task performance; in empirical studies, languaging is the treatment or part of the treatment. This paper reviews the studies that involved teacher-imposed languaging and were published over the past decade (2006-2017). For the convenience of writing, in the remaining part of the paper, we choose to use languaging where we are referring to teacher-imposed languaging.

The reviewed papers were selected through searching our university library’s “resource finder”, a searching engine accessing such academic journal corpora as Elsevier Science Direct, Sage, Taylor and Francis, Springer, and ProQuest. We also searched China’s Web of Knowledge (the largest academic corpus containing almost all published journal articles and unpublished theses in China) so as to include the relevant papers published in China as well as those unpublished relevant theses. Another method we employed was to trace down the papers referenced in more recent studies in order to include all relevant papers as far as possible in our review. It should be noted that we excluded non-empirical studies, studies focusing on translanguaging, and studies concerning languaging from the psycho-cognitive perspective on language learning. Simply put, the paper mainly reviews those empirical studies that focus on languaging in L2 learning, follow Vygostky’s sociocultural theory of mind, and directly take languaging as the treatment or part of the treatment. It turned out that fifteen papers were qualified to be included in this review (Brooks, Swain, Lapkin, & Knouzi, 2010; Ishikawa, 2013, 2015; Ishikawa & Suzuki, 2016; Jia, 2015; Knouzi, Swain, Lapkin, & Brooks, 2010; Li, 2015; Liang, 2014; Moradian et al., 2017; Suzuki, 2009, 2012, 2017; Suzuki & Itagaki, 2009; Swain et al., 2009; Yilmaz, 2016).

III. A CRITICAL REVIEW OF STUDIES ON LANGUAGING IN L2 LEARNING

The reviewed studies can be categorized into two types predicated upon the modality of the languaging involved in them. Four of them concentrated on oral languaging while the other eleven investigated written languaging. It seems that there is an imbalance between the number of studies focusing on oral languaging and that focusing on written languaging, as an anonymous reviewer pointed out. Yet this is the reality within our review scope. We chose to stick to and reflect this reality in this paper. Then corresponding to the two types, we review the relevant studies in the following two sections.

A. *Studies on Oral Languaging in L2 Learning*

The studies focusing on oral languaging include Swain et al. (2009), Brooks et al. (2010), Knouzi et al. (2010), and Li (2015). They all examined the role of oral languaging in L2 learning. The first three studies are based on the same research project aiming for L2 learners’ learning of the French grammatical concept of voice. Of the three, Swain et al. (2009), using a pretest-posttest design, examined the effect of nine French L2 learners’ oral languaging about the French grammatical concept of voice on the acquisition of this grammatical concept, finding that all participants gained improvement in knowledge and application of the target concept but to different degrees, participants’ quantity of languaging was positively correlated with their more accurate and in-depth understanding of the concept, and that participants’ quality of languaging mediated the processes of understanding cognitively complex ideas. In order to further determine why some learners benefited more from languaging than others, Knouzi et al. (2010), through analyzing the languaging behaviors of a higher and a lower languager and tracing the development of their understanding of the French concept of voice in a microgenetic way, found that the higher languager not only produced more languaging but also engaged in better-quality languaging. Specifically, languaging served as a self-scaffolding tool for the higher languager, who could efficiently use it to solve cognitive conflicts, mediate mental processes, and construct meaning, while the lower languager tended to misinterpret the task and function of languaging, pursue different goals, and leave conflicts unresolved. Brooks et al. (2010), based on Vygotsky’s distinction between spontaneous concept and scientific concept, explored the role of languaging in mediating French L2 learners’ understanding of the French grammatical concept of voice and their written production of the targeted grammatical forms, and demonstrated two participants’ progress from having no knowledge to possessing an emergent knowledge of the French grammatical concept of voice through languaging about given explanations of the concept. To summarize, the three studies examined different aspects of the role of oral languaging in enhancing students’ development of the French grammatical concept of voice.

Li (2015) addressed the effect of pair and group oral languaging on the learning of English grammatical concepts of tense and aspect by Chinese EFL learners. The study, adopting a pretest-posttest design, recruited 9 participants who

showed different proficiency levels of English tense and aspect based on a Chinese-English translation task: 4 of high-proficiency, 4 intermediate, and 1 of low-proficiency. The 9 participants were allocated into 4 groups, respectively composed of 3 high-proficiency learners (3H), 1 high-proficiency and 1 intermediate learner (H-I), 2 intermediate learners (I-I), and 1 intermediate and 1 low-proficiency learner (I-L). During the treatment stage, all 4 groups/pairs languaged about the provided explanations about English tense and aspect displayed on PPT slides. Data analysis indicated that all participants gained improvement in their understanding of tense and aspect and the discrepant-proficiency pairs (i.e. H-I and I-L) improved more than the homogeneous-proficiency pairs/groups (i.e. 3H and I-I) as measured by pretests and posttests, which could be attributed to the fact that the former two pairs engaged in a larger amount of and more types of languaging than the latter two pairs/groups.

To summarize, all four studies observed the positive learning effect of languaging on grammar understanding and use, and they respectively revealed the impact of learners' existing grammar knowledge (Swain et al., 2009), quantity and quality of languaging (Knouzi et al., 2010), and proficiency pairing/grouping (Li, 2015), as well as the process of cultivating scientific concept about grammar (Brooks et al., 2010). Yet, the studies cannot inform us about whether languaging is more effective and efficient than other methods, say, teacher-fronted instruction in facilitating grammar learning since they did not incorporate any control or comparison group. In addition, although the effect of proficiency pairing/grouping has been explored (Li, 2015), it is not clear whether pair/group languaging is more effective than individual languaging.

B. Studies on Written Languaging in L2 Learning

According to what learners have languaged about, the studies investigating written languaging can fall into three categories, in which learners respectively languaged about written corrective feedback (e.g. Jia, 2015; Liang, 2014; Moradian et al., 2017; Suzuki, 2009; Suzuki, 2012, 2017; Yilmaz, 2016), translations (Ishikawa, 2013, 2015; Suzuki & Itagaki, 2009), and grammar explanations (e.g. Ishikawa & Suzuki, 2016). The three categories of study will be reviewed in the following three sections.

B1. Written languaging and written corrective feedback

Of the seven studies involving written corrective feedback, six focused on direct written corrective feedback (DWCF) while only one focused on indirect written corrective feedback (IWCF). The one focusing on IWCF (i.e. Suzuki, 2009) is reviewed first. Suzuki (2009) investigated the effect of languaging about IWCF on the improvement of L2 writing accuracy. Twenty-four Japanese EFL learners were required to complete a writing task in three stages: writing a draft; languaging about specific linguistic errors indirectly corrected (i.e. underlined or marked) in the draft; and revising the draft. Data analysis revealed that the average number of linguistic errors significantly decreased from the draft to its revision, and languaged errors were more likely to be revised, showing the positive effect of languaging. However, as the author realized, the study was limited in that it did not incorporate a comparison group so as to separate the effect of languaging from that of indirect feedback, and it did not examine the long-term learning effect or transfer effect of languaging by including a delayed posttest or a new piece of writing. Besides, in Suzuki (2009), the participants were observed to occasionally have difficulty in identifying, correcting, and explaining indirectly-corrected errors. Thus, whether providing students with direct written feedback would be a better choice became an issue and also an issue worth researching.

Studies exploring the effect of languaging about DWCF were conducted by Suzuki (2012, 2017) and other researchers following him (Jia, 2015; Liang, 2014; Moradian et al., 2017; Yilmaz, 2016). Suzuki (2012) was the first to address the effect of written languaging in response to DWCF on L2 writing accuracy. Again twenty-four Japanese EFL learners were invited to complete a writing task in three stages as done in Suzuki (2009), but in Suzuki (2012) an English-native speaker provided learners with direct corrections of lexis- and grammar-based errors and learners languaged about these direct corrections in writing. Data analysis found that written languaging about direct feedback helped learners successfully revise those errors in immediate writing revision, and learners gained improvement in the correction of both lexis-based and grammar-based errors.

Yilmaz (2016) is a replication of Suzuki (2012) in the Turkish EFL context. 17 Turkish learners were required to write a paragraph and then received direct corrections from their teachers for their paragraph. After that, they made languaging about the direct corrections followed by revising their paragraph. Results revealed that errors were significantly reduced on the revised paragraphs, and more successful languaging about direct corrections led to more successful revision of errors.

Considering that Suzuki (2012) did not isolate the effect of languaging from that of feedback, Moradian et al. (2017) did a further study to separate the effect of languaging from that of DWCF by including a control group. Specifically, two Iranian EFL groups were allocated to complete a writing task on the same prompt in three stages: writing the first draft, receiving DWCF, and revising the first draft. The only difference was that one group merely reviewed the DWCF on their drafts while the other group not only reviewed the DWCF but also languaged about the DWCF. An analysis of the two groups' performances revealed that both groups made significant gains in grammatical accuracy of their revised writings, but that the DWCF-plus-languaging group gained significantly more learning than the DWCF-reviewing group, proving the effect of languaging.

Jia (2015), a study conducted in the Chinese EFL context, was also built on Suzuki (2012) but incorporated both

control groups and delayed posttests. The study invited four groups of Chinese EFL learners (i.e. experimental group 1/EG1, experimental group 2/EG2, control group 1/CG1, and control group 2/CG2) to complete a writing task in three stages: writing the first draft of a composition, receiving DWCF, and revising the first draft. The differences between the four groups were that both EG1 and EG2 languaged about DWCF while both CG1 and CG2 reviewed DWCF at Stage 2, and both EG1 and CG1 revised their first drafts immediately following stage 2 whereas both EG2 and CG2 revised their first drafts two weeks later. The study found that written languaging helped learners successfully correct errors in both immediate and delayed revisions, written languaging helped reduce errors both in grammar and lexis, and written languaging together with DWCF mediated learners' self-regulation during revision.

Liang (2014) examined the effect of Chinese EFL learners' written languaging on text revision as well as the differences between learners' languaging about direct written corrective feedback (DWCF) and indirect written corrective feedback (IWCF). The study required twenty-two students to complete three writing tasks with each going through three stages: writing the first draft, receiving both DWCF and IWCF depending on the teacher, and revising the first draft. Of the twenty-two students, twelve made languaging about the DWCF and IWCF they received while the other ten merely reviewed the corrective feedback on their compositions. Results revealed that written languaging helped error correction, both languaging about DWCF and that about IWCF were associated with improved accuracy, but that students languaged more about DWCF than about IWCF in terms of both quantity and quality. Yet, the study did not examine the potential different effects of languaging about DWCF and that about IWCF on text revision.

Suzuki (2017), using the same data as that in Suzuki (2012), investigated the effect of quality of written languaging on L2 learning, particularly intending to uncover the relationship between the quality of written languaging and the success of students' immediate revision of essays. He identified three categories of written language episodes (WLEs): noticing only (i.e. explanation without reasons and metalinguistic terminology), noticing with reasons (i.e. explanation with reasons and/or metalinguistic terminology), and uncertainty (i.e. "I don't know" episode). Results showed that both noticing only and noticing with reasons contributed to accuracy improvement. Thus, Suzuki considers written languaging as an effective mediating or retrospective tool for problem-solving in the development of L2 learning.

In summary, current studies concerning written languaging about corrective feedback have proved the learning effect, including immediate and delayed effect, of written languaging, and found the association between languaging quality and learning effect. Future studies can explore the transfer effect of written languaging about corrective feedback by adopting a new writing task as the posttest. More studies are also needed to examine the potential learning effect of written languaging about DWCF and languaging about IWCF. Researchers can also investigate the role of written languaging used together with other feedback approaches like writing reformation or provision of writing models.

B2. Written languaging and translations

In addition to examining the learning effect of languaging about corrective feedback, researchers have also investigated the language learning effect of languaging in translation tasks (i.e. Ishikawa, 2013, 2015; Suzuki & Itagaki, 2009). Suzuki and Itagaki (2009) in a seminal study examined the relation between type of grammar exercises, level of L2 proficiency, and type of written languaging in Japanese EFL learners' performance of grammar exercises. The so-called grammar exercises were actually Japanese-English sentence translation and English-Japanese sentence translation, respectively being production-oriented and comprehension-oriented. 141 Japanese EFL learners were divided into two groups (high-intermediate and low-intermediate) based on their English proficiency, and then each group was randomly allocated into two subgroups. Each learner in the four groups was then asked to perform one type of translation task. In addition, students were also required to write in Japanese whatever they were thinking about while performing the translation tasks. The authors identified participants' languaging as three types: L1 lexis-oriented languaging, L2 lexis-oriented languaging, and grammar-oriented languaging. By analyzing the languaging data, the authors demonstrated that type of translation task and level of proficiency were both likely to determine the type of languaging. Specifically, (1) participants who performed comprehension-oriented translation were found to generate more grammar-oriented languaging than those who performed production-oriented translation, and (2) the high-intermediate proficiency participants engaged in more grammar-oriented languaging than the low-immediate proficiency participants did. However, the study did not examine whether languaging leads to L2 learning, and if so, how.

In response to the deficiency of Suzuki and Itagaki (2009), Ishikawa (2013) addressed whether written languaging in performing translation tasks actually facilitated L2 learning, particularly Japanese EFL learners' learning of tense consistency, by using a pretest-posttest design. In the study, written languaging was named as metanotes. Following a translation-based metanote-taking practice, the participants, fourteen Japanese EFL learners took a grammar-recognition pre-test, which requested participants to judge whether an English sentence was grammatically correct, and if not, to correct the sentence. Based on the pre-test result, the participants were divided into two groups, an experimental and a control group, of a similar proficiency level. Then the treatment was conducted in three stages: completing a translation task; participants checking their own translation with a model translation; and taking a posttest and completing a questionnaire. The important point is that the experimental group was asked to take metanotes in Stages 1 and 2 while the control group was not. Data analysis showed that the participants did not focus on the target form (i.e. tense consistency) as much as expected, and the participants did not always accept the provided translation model even when they noted the mismatch between their translation and the model translation. Thus, it is of no wonder that no learning

effect was observed from comparing the pretest and the posttest, especially so when the pretest and posttest did not match what students languaged about in the treatment. Yet qualitative analysis demonstrated that metanotes might facilitate L2 learning.

On the basis of Ishikawa (2013), Ishikawa (2015) investigated how L2 proficiency and task outcome affected written languaging, with written languaging still taking the form of metanotes, in Japanese EFL learners' performance of translation tasks. By administering a placement test, 24 Japanese EFL learners were evenly assigned to two groups: a higher-level group/HG and a lower-level group/LG. Considering that the participants in Ishikawa (2013) did not produce many grammatical metanotes, Ishikawa (2015) provided more metanote-taking practice for the participants. Both groups did the translation task in three stages: completing the translation task with metanotes, checking translation with a model translation while taking metanotes, and completing an exit questionnaire. Results revealed that HG produced more correct translations than LG; HG took more metanotes than LG without reaching statistical significance though; both groups took more lexis-notes than grammar-notes but HG took more grammar-notes than LG did; neither group took many metanotes on tense and tense consistency; and that participants took more metanotes when their translations were incorrect.

To conclude, existing studies concerning written languaging about translations indicate that in order for translations to facilitate language learning, it is essential to inform learners of what they should language about. Should it be linguistically correct mismatches between students' translations and model translations, or incorrect or improper parts in students' translations? If it is the former, even when students note the discrepancies, they may not necessarily accept the model as found in Ishikawa (2013). Instead, it is more likely that the latter, that is, incorrect or improper parts in students' translations will lead to students' uptake and learning. In actuality, translations are similar to students' compositions since they are both language output. Considering that translations are common activities in language learning, it is worthwhile to examine the learning effect of translations and the learning effect of languaging in performing translations, but future related studies should distinguish languaging about linguistically correct mismatches and languaging about incorrect or improper parts.

B3. Written languaging and grammar explanations

We found one study which has dealt with the effect of written languaging about grammar explanations on L2 grammar learning (i.e. Ishikawa & Suzuki, 2016). Ishikawa and Suzuki (2016) involved three groups of participants: the group engaging in written languaging (+WL group), the group performing grammar exercises (-WL group), and the control group only taking the pre-test, immediate and delayed posttests (a recognition test and a translation test). The treatment was conducted in the following procedure: (1) In Week 1, all three groups took a pre-test, which was a recognition test containing ten sentences regarding the target grammatical structure - the hypothetical conditional in English. (2) In week 2, the +WL and the -WL groups were asked to read explanations on the target structure first, and then the +WL group were required to write down their understanding of the target rule (i.e. written languaging), whereas the -WL group were asked to work on a grammar exercise related to the target structure. After that, both the +WL and the -WL groups took a posttest. (3) One week later, a delayed posttest was administered to all three groups. Results showed that both the +WL and the -WL groups outperformed the control group on the immediate or delayed posttest, but only the +WL group scored significantly higher than the control group regarding the result of their delayed posttest, demonstrating the facilitative effect of written languaging. Ishikawa and Suzuki (2016) is similar to Swain et al. (2009) in research design, the difference being that different grammar items were targeted and the former involved written languaging while the latter oral languaging. Apparently the status-quo in this respect shows that more studies are warranted to explore the effect of written languaging on the learning of other grammar items by involving longer reading input and output, instead of grammar explanations and sentence translations, respectively in the treatment and posttest.

IV. CRITICAL COMMENTS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This review has focused on the studies in the past ten years, especially those empirical studies that took languaging as the treatment or part of the treatment. Our review reveals that current studies have proved the learning effect of both oral languaging and written languaging. Yet, studies involving larger samples and exploring longitudinal learning effect or learning transfer by incorporating new writing tasks as posttests are still needed.

In terms of research theme, the reviewed studies have examined quite a number of issues, including the learning effectiveness of languaging (e.g. Suzuki, 2012; Swain et al., 2009), the relation between languaging quantity and language learning (e.g. Knouzi et al., 2010), the relation between languaging quality and language learning (e.g. Suzuki, 2017), the mediating function of languaging (e.g. Brooks et al., 2010), and the association between proficiency pairing and languaging (e.g. Li, 2015). Despite the wide coverage, more themes can be investigated building on existing studies. One possible area is the effect of training. Current studies have included training as part of the experiment (e.g. Ishikawa, 2015), but no study has particularly examined the effect of languaging training. Training is especially necessary considering that neither oral nor written languaging is a natural part of language learning, because students are often required to review teachers' feedback on their writing but seldom required to explain each feedback point either orally or in writing.

Another research direction is investigating whether oral languaging and written languaging would result in different

learning effects. As reviewed in this paper, current studies have examined either oral or written languaging. In spite of the argument for the equivalence of oral and written production (e.g. Suzuki, 2012), there are also arguments (Harklau, 2002; Wolff, 2000) for and research findings (e.g. Niu, 2009) about the superiority of writing over speaking in language learning. It is hence necessary to find out whether modality of languaging would make a difference in language learning, and if yes, how.

The third possibility is examining the learning effect of pair or group languaging. As our review indicates, current studies on languaging have mainly concentrated on individual languaging, whereas the effectiveness of collaborative learning has been empirically substantiated (see Storch, 2013). It is worthy to explore the learning effect of collaborative languaging as well as learners' interaction and scaffolding dynamics in collaborative languaging.

In addition, student stances on languaging could be researched. Research on student stances in making languaging is meaningful because it relates to languagers' agency and motives in doing the activity and can illuminate individual differences. However, we still have little knowledge about student stances and motives for different modes of languaging (i.e. oral, written, individual, collaborative, face-to-face, or computer-mediated languaging) and how student stances and motives would impact on their languaging performance and hence language learning. Studies are warranted in this direction.

One more direction concerns languaging in virtual online space. Given the important role of technology in education, technology-mediated language teaching and learning have become an indispensable research area. However, few studies have been conducted on languaging in the technology-mediated environment. Studies are needed to examine the impact of online languaging (e.g. conducted via skype, wechat, or QQ on the computer or mobile phone) on language learning and to explore how online languaging can be incorporated into online instruction, as well as teachers' and students' perceptions about the usefulness of languaging in virtual space.

A final research direction is applying experimental research about languaging to authentic classroom pedagogy. The most valuable return of doing language learning research lies in using research results to innovate teaching practice and increase learning efficiency. However, current studies on languaging are mainly confined to experimental environments in the Canadian French L2 context and the Japanese, the Chinese, the Iranian and the Turkish EFL contexts, and applied to limited activities like writing feedback, translation, and grammar explanation. Therefore, classroom-based studies are needed to understand how languaging can be incorporated in real-life teaching practices, particularly in different pedagogical activities and various pedagogical contexts, and how teachers can use languaging to improve practice and enhance students' language learning.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank the anonymous reviewers' comments on an earlier version of this paper. All remaining errors are our own. The study has been supported by the Guangdong Province Higher-Level University Key Subject Program and the Featured Innovation Project of Guangdong University of Foreign Studies (No. 17TS14).

REFERENCES

- [1] Brooks, L., Swain, M., Lapkin, S., & Knouzi, I. (2010). Mediating between scientific and spontaneous concepts through languaging. *Language Awareness, 19*(2), 89-110.
- [2] Chi, M. (2000). Self-explaining expository texts: The dual processes of generating inferences and repairing mental models. In R. Glaser (Ed.), *Advances in instructional psychology* (pp. 161-238). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- [3] Harklau, L. (2002). The role of writing in classroom second language acquisition. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 11*, 329-350.
- [4] Ishikawa, M. (2013). Examining the effect of written languaging: the role of metanotes as a mediator of second language learning. *Language Awareness, 22*(3), 220-233.
- [5] Ishikawa, M. (2015). Metanotes (written languaging) in a translation task: do L2 proficiency and task outcome matter? *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, 9*(2), 115-129.
- [6] Ishikawa, M., & Suzuki, W. (2016). The effect of written languaging on learning the hypothetical conditional in English. *System, 58*, 97-111.
- [7] Jia, D. (2015). An experimental study on the effect of written languaging on English writing revision (Unpublished master's thesis). Lanzhou University, Lanzhou.
- [8] Knouzi, I., Swain, M., Lapkin, S., & Brooks, L. (2010). Self-scaffolding mediated by languaging: Microgenetic analysis of high and low performers. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 20*(1), 23-49.
- [9] Lado, R. (1979). Thinking and "languaging": A psycholinguistic model of performance and learning. *Sophia Linguistics, 12*, 3-24.
- [10] Lantolf, J. (2011). The sociocultural approach to second language acquisition: Sociocultural Theory, second language acquisition, and artificial L2 development. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition* (pp. 24-47). London / New York: Routledge.
- [11] Li, L. (2015). Effect of languaging on the acquisition of tense and aspect. *Papers on Education (19)*, 22-25.
- [12] Liang, Z. (2014). Effect of written languaging on second language writing (Unpublished master's thesis). Xiangtan University, Xiangtan.
- [13] Moradian, M. R., Miri, M., & Nasab, M. H. (2017). Contribution of written languaging to enhancing the efficiency of written corrective feedback. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 27*(2), 406-421.

- [14] Niu, R. (2009). Effect of task-inherent production modes on EFL learners' focus on form. *Language Awareness*, 18(3-4), 384-402.
- [15] Storch, N. (2013). Collaborative writing in L2 classrooms. Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
- [16] Suzuki, W. (2009). Improving Japanese university students' second language writing accuracy: Effects of languaging. *Annual Review of English Language Education in Japan*, 20, 81-90.
- [17] Suzuki, W. (2012). Written languaging, direct correction, and second language writing revision. *Language Learning*, 62(4), 1110-1113.
- [18] Suzuki, W. (2017). The effect of quality of written languaging on second language learning. *Writing & Pedagogy*, 8(3), 461-482.
- [19] Suzuki, W., & Itagaki, N. (2009). Languaging in grammar exercises by Japanese EFL learners of differing proficiency. *System*, 37, 217-225.
- [20] Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235-253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- [21] Swain, M. (2006). Languaging, agency and collaboration in advanced language proficiency. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Advanced language learning: The contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky* (pp. 95-108). London: Continuum.
- [22] Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together. *Modern Language Journal*, 82, 320-337.
- [23] Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2002). Talking it through: Two French immersion students' response to reformulation. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 37, 285-304.
- [24] Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2011). Languaging as agent and constituent of cognitive change in an older adult: An example. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 14(1), 104-117.
- [25] Swain, M., Lapkin, S., Knouzi, I., Suzuki, W., & Brooks, L. (2009). Languaging: University students learn the grammatical concept of voice in French. *The Modern Language Journal*, 93(1), 5-29.
- [26] Swain, M., & Watanabe, Y. (2013). Language: Collaborative dialogue as a source of second language learning. In C. A. Chapelle (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics* (pp. 3218-3225). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- [27] Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- [28] Wolff, D. (2000). Some reflections on the importance of writing in foreign language learning. In I. Play & K. P. Schneider (Eds.), *Language use, language acquisition and language history* (pp. 213-226). Trier: WVT Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier.
- [29] Yilmaz, M. (2016). Improving Turkish EFL learners' writing accuracy: Effects of written languaging and languaging types. *Procedia - Social and Behaviour Sciences* (232), 413-420.

Ruiying Niu was born in Shangdong Province, China in 1971. She received her doctoral degree in English language education from The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China in 2008.

She is currently a professor in Faculty of English Language and Culture, Guangdong University of Foreign Studies, Guangzhou, China. She has published papers in both Chinese and international academic journals. Her research interests include second language acquisition and the sociocultural theory of language learning.

Lijia Li was born in Guangdong Province, China in 1993. She received her bachelor degree in English language and culture from Guangdong University of Finance and Economics, China in 2016.

She is currently an MA student in Faculty of English Language and Culture, Guangdong University of Foreign Studies, Guangzhou, China. Her research interest is second language acquisition.