The language Learning Potential Role of Written production(Output) : Learning to Write vs Writing to Learn

Nasser GARDAOUI

Centre Universitaire d'Ain Timouchent

Abstract

Recent literature in second language acquisition (SLA) suggests that mere exposure to language is insufficient for interlanguage development. Learners need opportunities to produce in their L2 (oral/written output) which will enable them to 'notice' gaps in their existing L2 kowledge. While the noticing function of output has been increasingly researched by a number of applied linguists, the nature of such 'noticing' and its effects in the context of EFL have not been fully investigated .This study has explored this role of noticing and the results suggested that the learners were aware of their lack of L2 linguistic knowledge, and sought to produce linguistically more accurate drafts tending to pay closer attention to L2 input (linguistic forms) in the model texts that were provided .

Keywords*: L2 learning, output, noticing, input, linguistic forms*

ملخص

اثبتت الدراسات الحديثة في مجال اكتساب لغة ثانية ان المدخلات غير كافية لإكتساب اللغة، و لهذا يحتاج الطالب إلى الأداء اللغوي الذي يمكنه من الانتباه الى ثغراته اللغوية. رغم ان دور اداء اطالب اللغوي في رفع درجة الانتباه للثغراث اللغوية كان محل لعدة ابحاث الا أن طبيعة هذا الانتباه و اثره على التعلم في وسط غير وسط اللغة الأم أي كلغة أجنبية لم يستفي حقه من البحث. تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى ابراز اهمية الانتباه أثناء الأداء اللغوي و تمحورت اهم النتائج حول انتباه الطلبة الى ثغراتم اللغوية إعتمادا على النص النموذجي ومحاولة استعماله لتحسين اداءهم الكتابي .

الكلمات المفتاحية : اكتساب اللغة الأجنبية، أداء الطالب اللغوي ، الانتباه، المدخلات، وحدات لغوية

Résumé

La littérature récente en acquisition d'une L2 suggère que la simple exposition à la langue est insuffisante au développement de l'interlangue. Par conséquent les apprenants ont besoin d'occasions de produire en L2 (oral ou écrit) pour pouvoir repérer les lacunes dans leurs connaissances linguistiques (saisie de l'écart). Très peu d'études ont été réalisées sur la nature et l'effect de ce processus dans lequel les apprenants s'engagent dans le cadre de l'acquisition d'Anglais langue étrangère. Cette étude a exploré le rôle de ce phénomene de 'saise de l'écart' et les résultats ont démontré que les apprenant deviennent conscients de leurs lacunes linguistiques lorsqu'ils essaient de produire la L2 ; cherchaient à produire des versions linguistiquement plus correctes et accorder plus d'attention à l'input(formes linguistiques)auquel ils sont exposés dans les textes modèles qui ont été fournis.

Mots clés : *Apprentissage d'une langue étrangère (L2), Prodcution langagière (output), Saisie de l'écart, Input, Formes Linguistiques*

1.Introduction

Writing is often employed in L2 teaching, the purpose of which is for learners to produce better compositions so that their writing skills can be enhanced. Research and theory on EFL teaching and learning indicates that writing(L2 production) can be viewed in two ways-either as a skill to be taught, learned, and assessed (the learning-to- write dimension) or as a means and basis for learning (writing-to-learn line of research). In a number of studies addressing the language learning potential role of written output attention is drawn to learners decision-making while producing their L2, finding salient L2-related internal processes or composing behaviors among second-language learners (e.g., Adams, 2003, Cumming, 1989, 1990; Izumi and Bigelow, 2000; Izumi, Bigelow, Fujiwara and Fearnow, 1999; Qi and Lapkin, 2001;Swain and Lapkin,1995).The research project to be described in this article is framed in the writing-to-learn line of research dimension where practice in writing can be seen as one form of output practice that (in conjunction with feedback) can stimulate learners' noticing of language forms .

The background literature is   reviewed in the following section.The next section focuses on the research design by delineating the data collection methods used for the study.Section 4 reports the research findings in response to research questions . Section 5 discusses the findings, and section 6 concludes this paper.

2. The language Learning Potential Role of L2 Production (Output)

Reseach on classroom instruction and particularly the competing theories of SLA do not always agree on what fosters learning . According to Ellis (2008) language instruction can at least be viewed from two perspectives: some researchers and language teaching methodologists have taken an input-based approach to classroom instruction which aims at providing learners with language input in the form of listening and reading tasks. Although these approaches make use of different pedagogical techniques, they are all based on a common assumption-namely, that experience in L2 reception (listening to L2 speech and reading L2 texts) lays the foundation for L2 learning, including L2 production. Krashen's (1985) Input Hypothesis offers perhaps the most widely discussed theoretical justification for the importance of comprehension practice in L2 development. This hypothesis holds that L2 learning develops in a receptive modality i.e. by understanding messages (from oral and written input). Van Patten (1996,2004 and elsewhere), following Krashen (1985, 1998), argues that input is solely responsible for the development of L2 whereas L2 production (output) helps in the learner's ability to access the L2 system already developed by the intake of comprehensible input.VanPatten does not agree with the claim that 'using a form in one's output is a direct path to acquisition.' (2004 p 27) and suggests instead, on the basis of current evidence, that acquisition does not appear to be dependent on output.

In contrast to input-oriented approaches to L2 acquisition, an output-centered approach to teaching emphasizes the importance of building into instruction opportunities for L2 production.One form

of output-based instruction is the one practiced in traditional ELT methodology

2.1.Language Production in Traditional Grammar

As noted by some scholars, the view that L2 production is an important part of learning constitutes a central part of 'traditional' foreign language teaching methodology' (DeKeyser, Sokalski 2001 p 83).Based on our experience we believe that participation in classroom activities that lead to output practice (speaking or writing) is important for developing learners' abilities to communicate in the target language. Encouraging students to 'use' the target language has always been considered an integral part of language teaching methodology. As a component of L2 instruction, practice encompasses different kinds of language-related performance but some general design choices are considered basic. Most methodologist distinguish two general stages in the teaching of linguistic knowledge; presentation and practice.The purpose of the presentation stage is to introduce a grammatical feature (deductively or inductively) to help the learner acquire new linguistic knowledge. During the practice stage, learners are required to engage in extensive production of utterances containing the new structure. Ellis (1997 p90) refers to these two types of practice as 'text-manipulation' and 'text-creation activities'. 'Text-manipulation supply learners with the sentences to produce and ask them to operate on them in some limited way- fill in a blank , make a choice from items supplied, substitute another item, transform them into some other pattern, and so on'.'Text-creation activities require learners to produce their own sentences containing the target structure'. Thus, there is a received tradition about the role of language practice which assigns it a prominent place in L2 classroom learning. In line with recent development, the construct of 'output' i.e., L2 oral and witten production has been proposed as a possible contributing factor to L2 learning. Several researchers draw attention to the value of the L2 learner's production in the SLA process allocating more positive and causal role to output in developing the L2 system.

2.2. Recent Views on Output Practice

According to Gass and Selinker (2008) the standard and traditional viewpoint on output is that it is not a way of creating L2 knowledge, but a way of practicing already-existing L2 knowledge. However, some theorectical accounts of L2 learning advanced by some researchers make a number of claims which go beyond this 'practice'function of output, and which have to do with the development of the interlanguage system, and not only increased efficiency in using it. In Skehan's (1998) view language production is essential to force the learner to process linguistic data at a syntactic level, forcing the learner to move from one system (memory-based) to the other (rule-based) and vice-versa. A strong claim for this idea of 'output as a process' comes from Merril Swain (1995,2000, 2005) who, in response to Krashen's input hypothesis (1985), suggests that in addition to being the end result of the language learning process, output can actually have an important role in promoting language development.Its main tenet is that the activity of producing the target language (speaking or writing) is, under some (yet-to-be-specified) circumstances, part of the process of second language learning (Swain (2005).These observations have led other L2 learning researchers to suggest important roles for L2 production in language instruction as well. Two impoprtant contributions of L2 written output   are summarized below.

2.2.1. Output as an Attention-Drawing Device

From an output-based perspective, it has been argued that meaning-focussed instruction does not suffice in acquiring language forms. Output presents learners with unique opportunities to process language more deeply in ways that may not be necessary for comprehension (Izumi 2000). That is giving some attention to the form of their linguistic output, promotes more grammatical analysis of the L2 than meaning-driven processing alone.To quote Swain again, while producing the L2, one is forced to move from 'semantic processing' that characterises comprehension to the 'complete grammatical processing required for accurate production.(Swain1995 p 128).

However, among various means or approaches of getting learners to pay attention to L2 forms, the role of output has received comparatively less attention from researchers. To the researcher's knowledge, only a few studies have investigated the claims for a role of output in attention to L2 form (Izumi and Bigelow, 2000; Izumi et al., 1999).Therefore , more research needs to be done to investigate what the suitable means of getting learners to focus on form are.

2.2.2 Effects of Output on Attention to Input

In addition to output being an attention-directing option, L2 production may have a role to play by orienting the learner's attention to language forms in the input (Ellis 1997). For example, when learners produce output and encounter difficulties in expressing message meaning, the awareness of those shortcomings can direct learner's attention to the form of their L2 output, pushing them to attend more carefully to the input in search for the needed language forms which then may be used in subsequent output.According to Ellis (1997, 2008) output is a result (rather a cause) of acquisition and is thought to be beneficial to L2 learning only when learners treat it as auto-input (also referred to as virtual input or back door learning). Gass (1997), Gass and Selinker (2008) explain that output processing serves as a priming device in which learners are prompted to process relevant information during subsequent input processing.Whereas attention in output arises internally through production processes, in that learners themselves decide what they find problematic in their language production ; input functions as an external attention-drawing technique.In other words attention to L2 forms is induced by external means (Izumi 2000).

For our present purposes, the relevant line of research is the one in which researchers have explored the manner in which output encourages learners to recognize problems in their interlanguage (IL) as a result of trying to produce the target language and also the manner in which providing learners with input/feedback and prompting them to process such input has any effect on learning. Accordingly, the participants in these studies were asked to

produce a text, and they were then provided with some kind of input or feedback whose effect on learning was assessed. Learning has been operationalized in two main ways: performance on language tests (pre- and post-treatment), and/or differences between the features of the text produced before and after the provision of input/feedback.As the study's focus is on the the processes involved when constructing output and not the outcomes, we used the second procedure i.e., input incorporation and learner uptake .Learner uptake is defined as both the type and the amount of revisions incorporated in the participants' revised versions of their original texts.

3.The study

3.1 Participants

The participants were 36 young adult students (14 students from Class A and 22 students from Class B) who completed all the stages of the writing task.The data to be analyzed for this study come from a total of 33 students (13 students from Class A and 20 students from Class B) who completed all the stages of the writing task.

3.2 Target Structures

In the present study, no target structures were chosen prior to the study. Instead, the investigation relied entirely on what students reported in the form of note-taking in the analysis of what students noticed in the composing and the comparison stages.

3.3. Data Collection Procedure

The data collection procedure was based on previous studies which emphasized the usefulness of multi-stage tasks in eliciting those composing behaviours among L2 writers (e.g., Adams, 2003; Hanaoka, 2007; Qi and Lapkin, 2001). For the present study, a writing task was designed to provide the participants with the opportunity to notice linguistic problems as they wrote a narrative in response to a picture prompt , notice the gaps between their interlanguage and the target language by comparing their own

production with a sample model text which was used as feedback and, finally, rewrite their first draft after the comparison procedure.

3.4. Instrument

A picture prompt (from Azar 2003) given to each participant was used to elicit the data for the study. It consisted of several picture framesrequiring learners to write a narrative paragraph.These pictures also helped to control the propositional content of the story that the students wrote. The model input text intended to be used as a basis for comparison was also taken from the same textbook (Appendix A). This model is thought to be

at native-writer level and substantially more advanced than the best writer of all 36 participants .

4.Results

Analysis of learners' descriptive notes (verbalised problems) helped us to identify linguistic problems learners encounter while poducing their L2. The analysis and classification of the note-taking episodes produced by the students is reported as data on the evidence of learners' recognition of linguistic holes in their L2 knowledge during the initial written description task and subsequent feedback processing in the comparison task.

4.1 Learner Noticing in the Composing Stage

As summarized in Table 1, there were 80 occasions in which students consciously noticed a linguistic problem as a result of producing, or trying to produce, the target language that is, an average of 2.42 per participant . A qualitative analysis of learners' descriptive pieces and the notes that they had taken revealed that the difficulty experienced by participants in their attempt to describe the pictures promoted their awareness of problems or 'holes' in their L2 knowledge through output production. For example, in terms of their lexical knowledge most learners noted that they lacked the knowledge of terms such as 'the language used when greeting people', 'neighbour' 'broom', or 'dining room'. In terms of grammatical knowledge , many students noted that they were not sure what tense to use in verb phrases like '…he was slept

at 10:30/ he   slept at 10:30'   or   '…-'he go to bed or he went to bed'. As such, these verbal self reports indicated that learners had noticed their linguistic problems at the moment of production.

Table 1:Language Problems Recognized in the Initial Written Output

Task and the Stage 2 comparison task

Category	StageI	StageII
Lexis	24	04
Form	18	02
Mechanics/Punctuation	4	--
Discourse	7	01
Content	17	42
Other	10	--
Total	80	48

The other notes concerned either spelling ,discourse problems, or queries about the content of the pictures . The overt focus of learner's self-reports is described below with some examples (appendix C). In all the examples, the italics indicate the part verbalized by each participant .As noted previously (see section on data analysis) the definition of note taking episodes was also extended to include learners' noticing of aspects of their written output when compared with an input model text used as feedback.

Lexis:

(1) - ''I was six o'clock PM Bob had dinner';I'm not sure if we say have dinner or take dinner I think had dinner better I can't find an other word I put dinner room.(Student 2)

(2) - 'When he saw his' voisine' I don't know how to write 'voisine' in English, perhaps it is nhebor(Student 3)

(3) I don't know the English word for what was in the hand of the woman.(Student 2)

Lexical episodes included those instances in which the students focused on or sought the meaning of lexical items.Notes taken by learners in Stage 1 revealed that learners had a higher tendency to attend to the lexical items as a problem (24 instances,table 1, stage 1) at the moment of L2 production. Within the lexical episodes, the focus was predominantly on word choice, word meaning and word search as shown in the examples above. In these examples, the focus of the note taking episodes is a lexical aspect. In the first example, the   student talked about a lexical problem he encountered because of his inadequate linguistic resources; the student evaluates the appropriacy of two lexical choices : 'take dinner or have dinner'. In the second example, having difficulty producing a word 'neighbour' in English, the student encoded the meaning in French (a language familiar to learners). In example 3, the learner did not have the English word to express the part of the tool that the woman in the picture was handling. Lexical items were found to be verbalised more frequently than other items. (24 instances, see table 1) as a problem at the moment of production. Learners' tendency to focus mainly on lexical problems during production may be simply because they found lexical feutures easier to report than for instance grammar or discourse-based note taking episodes. Another possible reason could have been that the learners could not know many words in the pictures to express what they saw and, consequently, had to focus their attention on lexical items.

This semantically-oriented type of noticing at the moment of production is in agreement with William's (2001) study, in which lexically-centered episodes (LREs) made up 80% of the classroom interactions. This pattern also parallels findings obtained in Hanaoka's (2007) study.

Form :

(4) -'…when he slept the phone start ringing' ,What is the past of ring ? (Student1)

(5) -I wrote'He started to eat'I'm not sure if it is correct may be it should be 'he started eating' I don't know the rule(Student 3)

(6) I don't know which tense in '…at 6:05 he ate his food that founded on the plate'(Student 11)

Form-based note taking episodes involved items whose focus was morphological or syntactical in nature. They were the second most frequently verbalized by the participants (16 instances,table1 stage I). However, the findings show that verb tense/aspect (choice and formation) features seemed to be the grammatical aspects of most concern.In other words, learners reported noticing verb tense/aspect   more than they reported noticing other language forms .The examples above show learners'concerns about verbal morphology in example 4, verb pattern in 5 and tense choice and formation in 6.This finding might also be attributed to the fact that the participants found the use of verb tense more challenging compared to the use of other language aspects.Experience in teaching tenses shows that these grammatical features are persistent areas of concern even for advanced learners.This finding is also consistent with Storch (1998) which also found a similar concerns in her classroom-based study.

Mechanics /Punctuation

(7) -'Homework' one word or two (Student1)

(8) -I don't know if he is correct spelling for 'neibour' (Student 23)

(9) -I have some vocabulary problem:toock up his , toock or took (Student 28)

Learners cared little about mechanical matters in general .Among the five major categories, this category was the least frequently verbalized (4 instances ,table 1).Examples 7,8,9 show learners' concerns about the spelling of the words: homework ,neighbour and took.In the study, the participants were not allowed to use external sources and I think feedback from an external source such

as the teacher or the dictionary would have helped to solve the students' problem.With regard to punctuation, no student (out of 33) commented on the use of punctuation.

Discourse

(10) I don't know how to combine sentences (Student 9)

(11) I don't know how to begin the paragraph (Student 16)

(12) I wrote finally but I'm not sure if it's correct:'Finally Justin waved to his. (Student 17)

The discourse note-taking episodes referred mainly to inter-sentential relationships and were often verbalized in terms of lack of knowledge with utterances such as 'I don't know how to…or 'I'm not sure if…'. Discourse considerations were less of a concern to learners.They were the least frequently verbalized among the five major categories (7 instances,table 1 stage I) after the category of mechanics and punctuation. It seems that the particiapnts tended to approach the composition task on a word-by-word basis; they could not venture beyond the single word and consider the entire sentence or relationships between ideas in the text.

Content

(16) I don't know who is the woman in the third picture (Student 2)

(17) What does the second picture discuss? (Student15)

(18) I don't know whether the picture is decribing the morning or the evening (Student 17)

These episodes were defined as any notes concerning content clarification or idea generation other than language-related problems. The content note taking episode were the third most frequently verbalized by the participants(17 instances). The examples above were concerned with what information in the pictures should be included in their paragraph. They suggested that the students were unable to find an adequate description of some pictures. However, they stopped short of mentioning any specific lexical or grammatical features.

Other issues

(19) 'In my paragraph I just wrote what did Bob not where he was,I didn't give many details (Student 8)

(20) I can't talk about all the details (Student 9)

(21) 'I can't give the details when he went to sleep' (Student 21)

The 'other' category was intended to cover those features which were difficult to code (10 instances). The majority of other note taking episodes concerned queries about the possibility of including learners' own opinions in the descriptive writing.

4.2 Learner Noticing in the Comparison Stage

In the Stage 2 comparison task learners spent about 15 minutes reading the model text and comparing it with their original text. As a whole, the number of note taking episodes originated in Task 2 was larger than Task 1, except for the content-related note taking episodes, which accounted for nearly almost of the totality of the participants' noticing. The findings regarding Stage 2 suggested that learners had very different prioritites about their own written output.The students appeared to make more effort in finding the proper language to express their ideas rather than discussing the language issues.They predominantly noticed problematic features related to the content (our content category -appendices B and C) of the story and the way to express it (n=42,stage II; content category -appendice C).These concerns were expressed in a variety of ways that included: 1) the students' acknowledgement of the ideas and expressions used in the models, their perceptions of the differences between their own ideas and ways to express those ideas on the content of the pictures in the model text (e.g., 'Instead of 'fell into a deep sleep' I wrote 'was sleeping'; '…the model text says greeted , I wrote 'saluted.'). 2) their intention of having used some of the ideas and expressions on the content of the pictures in their original texts instead of the sentences they really wrote (e.g., I intended to say :while Bob was walking to school he met Mrs Smith but I couldn't imagine it; I didn't know that there was Mrs Smith I depend on my ideas in the end of paragraph, I intended to say that he didn't answer the phone but I thought it wasn't

necessary). This increase in the number of content-related issues may be linked to the fact that some students noted that some of the expressions used in the models differed from their own and could be used to improve their original texts. For example, six participants changed the beginning of their story for the one written in the model text 'Bob was home again', as they considered the latter to be easier and more accurate . This shows a useful role of models in promoting learner noticing and specifically in drawing learners' attention to the ideas and expressions i.e. to the content of what they wrote in their original texts.The remaining episodes were related to the language issues and included 4 note taking episodes related to lexis, 2 note taking episodes related to grammar, and 1 discourse-based note taking episode .(table1, stage II).

5.Discussion of the Findings

  The present study, along with earlier research (e.g., Hanaoka, 2007: Qi and Lapkin, 2001 and Swain and Lapkin,1995) has found evidence for the noticing function of output hypothesized by Swain (1995,2005). It confirmed previous findings that noticing, facilitated by feedback, has an impact on learners' subsequent writing.During their L2 production attempt, learners noticed certain gaps and/or holes in their L2 knowledge, found the relevant solutions in the model input, and incorporated them into a follow-up written output task. With regard to the relationship of the features noticed in the Stage 2 comparison task and the Stage 1composing task, the findings show that only 11 (out of 48) stage 2 features were related to stage 1.Our assumption was that if a certain linguistic feature is realized as a problem in the composing stage, its correspondent in the model input text was more likely to be a focus of attention.. The participants' written reports, however, did not reflect this.The problematic features which were related to Stage 1 problematic features involved some words that the participants had not been able to use or access, such as 'broom' or 'wave at', time expressions such as 'at 6:00 p.' instead of 'at six' a word that an individual did not know how to spell ("looking") and other 8 features concerned with verb forms. On the other hand, the 37 features that were not related to Stage 1 problematic features

included, above all, ideas and ways of expressing them (the content category) that students had not imagined in their first composition as expressed by one participant in this note: I intended to say while Bob was walking to school he met Mrs Smith but I couldn't imagine it (student 7 appendix C).

With respect to the noticing function of output (Swain, 1995; Swain and Lapkin, 1995), the results revealed that there were some distinctive differences in the quality of noticing between the Stage 2 and the Stage 1 tasks .In the Stage 2 task, the participants noticed some new problems with their original output while studying the TL models (mostly related to the content category). In this case the learners said 'I should have written (said) it this way.' 'while in the former case the learner typically wonders', 'How can I write (say) this?' 'I don't know how to write/say'.In this sense, those problems or 'holes' (Swain, 1998) that the participants noticed during stage 1 may represent proactive recognition of problems, whereas those problems that they noticed for the first time during the comparison stage without being preceded by noticing of 'holes'may be said to be reactive recognition of problems.

Furthemore, the fact that the dominant concerns of the participants in Stage 1 and Stage 2 were so different is not in keeping with the findings reported in previous studies that have used applied feedback techniques (Hanaoka, 2007;Qi and Lapkin, 2001).These studies report that their participants noticed and searched for solutions in the feedback provided for about two-thirds of the solvable 'holes' they had previously noticed when writing their original texts in Stage 1. However, that was not the case with our students as their attention was mainly focused on the ideas and expressions that appealed to them in the models.Therefore, the sense of lack of fulfillment (Qi and Lapkin, 2001) that the participants in those studies had experienced as they noticed 'holes' while writing their texts, and which had pushed them to search for satisfactory solutions in the feedback, was not apparent among the participants in our study. We have found that nearly all students were unable to notice a mismatch between their written output and the model input text, the gap between these two not being suitably narrow.

It may be concluded, then, that the participants in our study, in their response to the picture prompt in their initial production did not know many words to express what they saw in the picture prompt and, consequently, had to focus their attention on lexical items.In Stage 2, the participants, after their previous attempt to write the narrative paragraph, were especially receptive to the ideas and expressions that now became salient in the models (content-related note taking episodes).

One important question concerns whether (and to what extent) the process of output modification that learners engaged in results not only in immediate improved performance i.e.,in short-term effects on learning (as measured by incorporation of corrections in revised texts), but also long-term changes in the learners' interlanguage. Qi and Lapkin (2001) notes that 'noticing as a result of producing the target language (TL), as in the context of L2 composing, also has important roles to play in L2 development'(p. 279). In the sam vein, Gass and Selinker (2008) argue that 'An initial step in grammar change is the learner's noticing (at some level) a mismatch between the input and his or her own organization of the target language" (p. 28). According to Ellis (1994), making 'cognitive comparisons' leads to a restructuring of a learner's interlanguage. Put another way, learners would need to notice whether their language production is target like or not through making comparisons against certain model texts in order to trigger the accommodation and/or restructuring of their existing L2 knowledge. However, not all the current study's findings can be interpreted from this perspective in which output-input-output sequences can directly affect learning. Interlanguage development, in SLA research, is generally defined as leading to changes in long-term memory as measured by improvement from pretest to posttest(or delayed posttesting).In the current study, learning has been operationalized in only one way: Short-term differences between the features of the learner's texts produced before and after the provision of input/feedback.i.e, immediate uptake(one 50-minute class).Since this study did not involve any pre/posttesting or delayed post-testing, it is unknown whether the uptake and incorporation of more targetlike forms in the final production

attempt was indicative of long-term changes in the learners' interlanguage system. In addition, noticing the gap involves a deeper linguistic analysis and not the simple noticing of L2 exemplars as most of our learners did. It would be appealing to investigate whether the learners' processing of the new linguistic items (e.g., content related items) exceeds simple noticing and immediate uptake, in order to   reveal a clearer picture of the relationship between output, uptake, and L2 learning. A possible way of approaching this would be to include a pre/posttest and a delayed third production task to see whether, and to what extent, the initial stage of storing information (i.e., uptake) triggers long-term memory changes.

6.Conclusion

In general, the results from this study lend support to the research conducted previously which, as suggested by the Output Hypothesis (Swain,2005), claims that output practice promoted in L2 writing fosters noticing processes, especially noticing the hole (while engaged in text-generation activity) and noticing the gap (via the analysis of the feedback model text received on learners' own writing). It is also a finding from this research that this noticing activity results in short-term effects on learning (as measured by incorporation of corrections in revised texts).For teachers, who wish to take an active interventionist approach to help their students develop their L2 grammatical knowledge, L2 written(and oral) output produced in meaningful contexts may create potential learning opportunities that can be exploited by the teacher.The regard for accuracy appears to be particularly important at the time when the national curricula in pre-university English language education no longer values the study of the formal   aspects   of   language   opting   instead   for   a   more communication-oriented approach, often at the expense of the precision of expression.In all cases, learning is believed to be enhanced through the act of producing language, because output, by its mechanisms, increases the likelihood that learners become sensitive to what they can and cannot say in the TL, leading to the repraisal of their L2 abilities

Definitely, it would be imprudent to assume that the results as reported in this study, constitute sufficient grounds for the formulation of far-fetched pedagogical recommendations, and there surely exists the need to explore the issue much further . Hence, these findings may not be generalizable across learner populations and acquisitional contexts.

Bibiography

Adams, R. (2003). L2 output, reformulation and noticing: Implications for IL development. *LanguageTeaching Research*, 7, 347–376

Azar,B.S.(*2003).Fundamentals of English grammar*

DeKeyser, R. M., and Sokalski, K. J.(1996) The differential role of comprehension and production practices, *Language Learning*, 46, 613–642+

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford

University Press.

Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition* Oxford :Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (1999). *Learning a second language through interaction.*Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Ellis,R.(2001).*Form-focused instruction and second language learning*

Blackwell, Oxford,UK.Malden, MA.

Gass, S. and Selinker, L. (2008). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course,* 2nd edition. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum

Gass, S. (1997). *Input, interaction, and the second language learner*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence

Hanaoka, O.(2007). spontaneous attention to form in a four-stage writing taskOutput, noticing, and learning: An investigation into the role of spontaneous attention to form in a four-stage writing task *Language Teaching Research* 2007; 11; 459

Izumi, S., and Bigelow, M. (2000). Does output promote noticing and second language acquisition? *TESOL Quarterly, 34*(2), 239-278.

Izumi, S., Bigelow, M., Fujiwara, M., & Fearnow, S. (1999). Testing the Output Hypothesis: Effects of output on noticing and second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 21,* 421-452.

 Qi, **D.S**. and **Lapkin**, **S**. 2001: Exploring the role of noticing in a three stage second language writing task. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 10: 277–303.

Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principles and Practice In Applied Linguistics: Studies in Honour of H. G. Widdowson* (pp. 125-144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M. (1998). Focus on form through conscious reflection. In C. Doughty

& J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language*

Acquisition (pp. 64-81). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition

through collaborative dialogue. In J. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural Theory*

 and Second Language Learning (pp. 97-114). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M. (2005). The Output Hypothesis: Theory and research. In E. Hinkel

(Ed.), *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (pp.

471-483). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

VanPatten, B. (2004). Input processing in second language acquisition. In B. VanPatten (Eds.),*Processing instruction: Theory, research, and commentary* (pp. 5-31).

Williams, J., (2001) . The effectiveness of spontaneous attention to

Form.   *System*   29,   325–340   .

APPENDICES

<div align="center">

Appendix A

Model passage

</div>

At 6:00 p.m.,Bob sat at the table and began to eat..At 6:05, Bob was in the middle of dinner.While Bob was eating his dinner Ann came through the door. she likes Bob a lot and always enjoys her conversations with him.Before going to bed, Bob prepared everything for the next day.His bedtime is at 10:30 pm.Bob was tired and immediately fell asleep. . It's 11:00.Trr… Trr… Trr… the telphone was ringing and Bob couldn't answer it .He was sound asleep in his bed. but just another school day In the morning when Bob woke up, got out of bed and prepared to go school.Bob left his house at 8:00 a.m. and began to walk to class.He goes to school on foot because it's just down the street.While Bob was walking to school ,he saw Mrs. Smith.When Bob saw Mrs . Smith she was standing on her front porch.She was holding a broom.Mrs. Smith waved at Bob when she saw him. He greeted her her with a smile on his face and continued on his way. Another school day!

<div align="center">

(Adapted from Azar Shrampfer B.(2003)

</div>

Appendix B   (reduced)

Learners'linguistic concerns during the initial written production task(From1to33)

Participant	Lexis	Form	Mechanics/pu nctuation	Discourse	Content	Other
S1	- 'And in his way he saw his nighbour and said Hi' :I don't know how I say: eg:someone say hi and the other say too hi to greet	-'when he slept the phone start ringing' ,What is the past of ring ?	'Homework' one word or two		What does the second picture discuss?	

| S3 | - 'When he saw his' voisine' I don't know how to write 'voisine' in English, perhaps its nhebor | --I wrote'he started to eat'I'm not sure if it is correct may be it should be 'he started   eating' I don't know the rule

-'he go to bed or he went to bed'

I'm   not sure,perhaps   it should be past | | | | |

S4	I don't know how I can use the time	-The alarm o'clock 'rang' I am not sure that is the past of ring'				In general I don't write with more detail as the paragraph
S25	-I have problems with prepositions - I don't know to say the tool'name	I'm not sure if it is correct. I wrote:he was slept at 10:30.'perhaps it should be slept			I see Bob going on foot in picture 7 I don't know where?	

S26	-I don't know which step of education he is.	.				I don't know how to describe the woman in the first picture	Instead of said details I just said the actions on the picture
S27	-I don't know how to say greeting in ' an old man who wave to hi and did too'			-I don't know the spelling of the verbs		I don't know if it is morning or night in the picture.	

S28		*I have some problems to give the right tense like the verb to 'ring' ;the difference between simple past and past continuous:he couldn't hear the ring of the phone*	*-I have some vocabulary problem:took up his breakfast toock or took:*		*-I don't find the right expressions to describe the action of Mrs Smith (picture 7)*	
S29	*I don't know how to say the time*				*I don't know how to say well my ideas in English*	
S30					*I don't know how to describe the last picture*	

| S31 | | | | | *I can't find the words to describe my ideas.* | *I don't write all*
 things and exactly things |
| *S32* | *I don't know how to say the tool'name* | *-The phone was ringing at 11:30' I used the past continuous but I don't know if it is true* | | | | |

S33				-I don't know how to describe the end - Next at 10:30 he went to sleep I wrote next but I 'm not sure	-I don't know what picture 5 is describing	

Appendix C (reduced)

Noticing during the comparison stage (From 1to 33)

P		Category	Revisions
S1	-Instead of Ann I wrote his mother then his mother asked him if he finished dinner	C	-When it was 6:10 came Ann through the door

S2	-Instead of 6 : 00 pm,I wrote the time in letters	L	-He sat at the table before the dinner at 6 : 00 pm
	I think it should be better don't mention the woman who came through the door	C	-it was 6 : 00 pm, when Ann came through the door
	I intended to say tha he didn't answer the phone but I thought it wasn't necessary	C	-He was still sleeping when the telephone rang at 11:30 but he could'nt answer it
	I couldn't express entirely the picture 7		
	I should have said the time when he went to school but it was not on the picture	C	-It was morning he went to school
		C	
S3	-I wrote when :Bob was eating but in the model text says 'Bob was in the middle of dinner		-Bob was in the middle of dinner
	-I wrote he started to eat and I'm not if it I correct. I don't know the rule maybe the correct is one is 'started eating'	G	-'and started eating'
		G	

S32	-I should have written Ann came through the door but I forgot to write it:-At 6:05, Bob started eating -I think I should write Bob went to school on foot and he went to school -I couldn't write Mrs Smith because these pictures did not express it and he said bye bye to his mother	C C	-At 6:05 he sat at the table,when he was eating Ann came through the door -In the morning he went to school on foot -He saw Mrs Smith, he stand in front of her porch
S33	At picture 3 I think the woman is her mother :and her mother came to cleaned the table' At picture 4 I couldn't know that Bob was tired	C C	-While he was eating Ann came and she always discuss with him -Bob went to the bedroom to sleep because he was tired

Key :C=content,D=Discourse,   *G=grammar,*   *L=lex*