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L2 Writing as a Tool for Improving L2 Speaking Accuracy through Text-Reconstruction Tasks in a Communicative Language Classroom

NATALIA SLETOVA

1. Introduction

“How can teachers help students improve their second language (L2) speaking accuracy?” is a question that most L2 educators teaching in a communicative language classroom ask themselves every day. Although a great number of studies in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) research have emphasized the interdependence of L2 writing and speaking, they have mostly explored how speaking can be involved in scaffolding the process of writing and not vice versa, e.g., teacher and peer-feedback (Birjandi & Hadidi Tamjid, 2012; Meihami & Razmjoo, 2016; Suzuki, 2009), collaborative writing (Fernandez Dobao, 2012; Tabari, 2015; Zhang, 2018), socio-cognitive analysis of texts (Atkinson, 2014; Beach, Newell, & Vanderheide, 2016), and more.

More importantly, research of L2 writing as a scaffold on L2 speaking is still scarce; the current data either provides examples comparing learners’ linguistic performance in the two modalities (Adams, 2006; Angelovska, 2017; Ellis & Yuan, 2005), or presents qualitative analysis of expected benefits from employing writing in L2 instructional methods (Iida, 2019; Manchon & Roca de Larios, 2011; Nelson & Lu, 2008). Consequently, the consideration that L2 writing has the potential to act as a scaffold for L2 speaking accuracy in a traditional communicative language classroom has often been overlooked in the United States (Hirvela & Belcher, 2016).

Due to the main focus on oral communication, in contemporary L2 communicative classes writing is commonly assigned for practice outside of the classroom (Carter, 2007; Overland et al., 2021). Teachers who omit writing activities in classroom practice and concentrate primarily on practicing oral discourse thereby overlook the potential benefit of using L2 writing as a scaffold for L2 speaking accuracy. Additionally, L2 writing scholars tend to legitimate the field of L2 writing by distinguishing it
from general classroom pedagogy, thus discouraging the view that practicing guided L2 writing in a communicative classroom can be used for improving accuracy of oral discourse (Belcher & Hirvela, 2016). According to Kang (2020), “further empirical studies need to be conducted about ways in which writing can scaffold speaking to fully understand the nature of speaking and writing connections” (p. 263). That said, the intent of the present research is to draw SLA researchers’ attention to the untapped potential that L2 writing has on improving the accuracy of L2 oral discourse when used in a traditional L2 communicative classroom.

The benefit of written output modality over spoken output modality for improving L2 learners’ oral accuracy is particularly evident in the areas of planning and noticing. The literature review that follows will describe the latest research comparing L2 writing and speaking in the areas of planning and noticing, and how L2 writing can potentially benefit L2 speaking accuracy in a communicative classroom.

2. Review of Literature
2.1. Planning
Unlike speaking, writing typically does not require immediate production, as it usually allows time for significant pauses or longer breaks. Also, writing results in visual output that allows for a type of inspection that spoken language does not have, making it possible to go back to the written output and change it, if necessary. In contrast, speakers usually do not go back to the beginning of their verbalizations to correct their grammar or lexical choices, although they can correct themselves in the moment. Moreover, the writing process facilitates monitoring, thus mediating self-correction more readily than speaking. In speaking, self-monitoring happens simultaneously with speech production, and the speaker does not have as much time to pause and go back to what they have already said. Additionally, written communication for most writers presupposes a need to follow formal conventions for the genre of text being produced, which,

---

1 In this study, the term ‘speaking accuracy’ is operationalized as accuracy on an oral recall task. Whether improvement in accuracy on a spoken recall task can lead to better accuracy in spontaneous speech is an empirical question that is beyond the scope of the present research, although it should be investigated in the future. In the same vein, ‘writing’ is defined as performance on written recall tasks and not ‘writing’ in the sense that one is composing a written text to express meaning.
depending on the task, could lead to improvements in morpho-syntax and lexical choices compared to spoken output. Writing also allows more time for planning than speaking, which in turn leads to greater attention paid to both form and meaning (Williams, 2008). More importantly, as Belcher and Hirvea (2008) suggest, writing tasks with on-going teacher’s feedback “may lower the affective filter enough to make learners to feel freer to try new forms of the target language, and hence, gain the level of confidence that may eventually transfer to speech” (p. 3). Thus, considering the differences between the two output modalities, it is possible to conclude that if L2 learners were provided the same planning conditions to perform an oral or written task in an L2 communicative classroom, their “writing may result in better output than speaking. By better, it is usually meant that it may be grammatically more accurate or complex, or lexically more complex or varied” (Manchón & Williams, 2016, p. 567). In brief, these benefits in output can be explained by the increased time learners have for accessing their linguistic command, the additional time available for their output production, and the lesser affective filter.

A large body of research analyzing planning in L2 writing and speech (Ahmadian & Tavakali, 2010; Bui & Teng, 2019; Ellis & Yuan, 2004; Khatib & Farahanynia, 2020) has demonstrated that pre-task planning enhances grammatical complexity and fluency in L2 speaking production, while untimed and online planning positively influences accuracy, grammatical complexity, and fluency of both written and oral production. Studies comparing planning in the two output modalities are unfortunately, however, extremely rare. To the best of my knowledge, only two previous studies have analyzed the effects of no planning, untimed and timed online planning in both speaking and writing (Ellis & Yung, 2005; Kim, 2018). Both studies indicated that the no-planning condition resulted in slower output for both speaking and writing and that speaking provided more fluent responses than writing in both planning conditions. Additionally, the trade-off between fluency and accuracy was much greater in speaking than in writing, with results confirming that writing allows more time for planning and monitoring output than speaking, thus leading to better accuracy.

In brief, the research has indicated that pre-task and online planning positively influence linguistic production in both modalities. However, L2 writing tasks demonstrate better results in grammatical
accuracy and syntactic complexity in the same planning conditions due to the slower pace and differences in the cognitive processes required for the two modalities. Therefore, it can be assumed that with more time available for planning during written output than spoken output, learners may attempt to practice new or more complex forms in unfamiliar contexts. Furthermore, repeated access to these forms may provide the opportunity for learners to transfer this written output into speech.

2.2. Noticing

According to Swain’s Output Hypothesis (1993), successful L2 skill development requires noticing during output. As she explains, noticing can be prompted when learners do not know the necessary forms to express intended meaning. In other words, for noticing to occur there should be a gap in the learner’s linguistic knowledge. If learners become aware of this gap and have access to correct input, they may be able to modify their output, which could lead to learners learning the previously missing structure. Noticing can occur “at any time or interval by focalizing on the samples of input and output tasks of learners through which learners become aware of their gap in their interlanguage” (Ögeyik, 2017, p. 3). The form of noticing in which learners can compare their own interlanguage forms with the target forms and determine where the discrepancies are is called ‘noticing the gap’ (Adams, 2003; Ögeyik, 2017).

Mackey’s (2006) study demonstrates that learners who are better at noticing target features of input during classroom oral interaction with feedback produce more accurate target morphosyntactic and lexical forms in their classroom speech. Additionally, Adams’s (2003) study indicated that learners who participated in noticing sessions (reformulation tasks) incorporated many more targeted forms in their post-test written assignments than those who did not participate in noticing sessions. The author concluded that providing opportunities for learners to ‘notice the gap’ can lead to increased L2 proficiency.

Both writing and speaking require learners to produce output. Also, both modalities allow learners to use forms previously noticed in language input and that allows them a chance to start internalizing them in their L2 production. The role of writing in L2 output, however, has typically been overlooked in L2 acquisition research (Adams, 2003). In
order for learners to notice the gap in their speech, they need “sufficient amount of processing space available to hold both versions [correct and incorrect utterance] in memory and compare them” (p. 349). With the ongoing processing demands of speech on memory, it is not always possible for learners to have enough time to make a comparison. Moreover, speaking is a process that does not always allow time for monitoring and corrections. In writing, however, learners typically give increased cognitive attention to meanings and forms and demonstrate the ability to keep information in their working memory longer (Kellog, 2007).

Research investigating differences in noticing during written and spoken output in L2 (Adams, 2006; García Mayo & Azkarai, 2016; Niu, 2009) has demonstrated that speaking provides more attention to meaning while writing provides more attention to form. Adams (2006), García Mayo and Azkarai (2016), and Niu (2009) compared collaborative work of L2 learners on text reconstruction tasks (Adams, 2006; Niu, 2009), picture placement, picture difference, picture story, and dictogloss tasks (García Mayo & Azkarai, 2016) in spoken and written formats. Their findings demonstrated that the students who worked on written tasks tended to use more language-related episodes (when the learner starts questioning their accuracy of language use) that focused on lexis and forms, while spoken tasks prompted more focus on meaning. In addition, writing tasks initiated more engagement and noticing from the learners, possibly due to the higher level of attention required in writing over speaking.

Thus, considering that the spoken output modality provides more attention to meaning while the written output modality provides more attention to form, it is possible to suggest that practicing writing may help learners to ‘notice the gap,’ correct their mistakes, and potentially transfer the uptake into their speech. Sletova (2023) investigated if a ‘noticing the gap’ activity performed in writing could help improve grammatical accuracy of the spoken output modality. Beginner and intermediate learners of Russian completed 2

---

2 Dictogloss is a text reconstruction activity. It usually includes four stages: setting the stage (instructor introduces the topic and vocabulary if necessary), delivery of the text (in a written or auditory mode), reconstruction (usually in pairs or in groups of three), comparison and analysis (students compare their versions with the original and analyze mistakes (Wong & Simard, 2017)
a ‘noticing the gap’ activity within a text-reconstruction task in both modalities. The results demonstrated that only after working with the text in writing did learners of both levels of proficiency improve their grammatical accuracy in oral speech. These findings indicated that L2 writing activities do improve the accuracy of spontaneous speech although more research investigating L2 writing as a scaffold for L2 speaking accuracy was warranted.

As the literature review has demonstrated, there is strong potential for L2 writing activities to scaffold L2 speaking in a communicative language classroom. Writing allows learners to practice new forms in new contexts, and repeated use of these forms in writing leads to learning additional dimensions of words, i.e., their spelling, their inflectional morphology, and perhaps their combinability, while speaking helps more with pronunciation and word stress. Writing also enhances more ‘noticing the gap’ than speaking and provides opportunities for learners to improve their communicative fluency, accuracy, and vocabulary knowledge.

3. The Present Study
Although previous research has demonstrated that the written output modality produces better results in grammatical accuracy and syntactic complexity than the speaking modality (Ellis & Yung, 2005; Johnson & Abdi Tabari, 2022; Kim, 2018) and that L2 writing provides learners with more opportunities to ‘notice the gap’ (Adams, 2003; Mackey, 2006; Ögeyik, 2017) than L2 speaking, whether practicing L2 writing can also lead to better speaking accuracy still needs to be investigated. If writing prompts learners to increase their attention to produced output, ‘notice the gap’, modify their output, and subsequently incorporate corrected forms into their writing, it is possible to assume that this uptake can be transferred into their speech.

This study expanded on Sletova’s earlier study (2023) and, first, analyzed the potential benefits of practicing a ‘noticing the gap’ activity in writing for improving speaking accuracy using a text reconstruction task for three levels of proficiency (beginner, intermediate, and advanced), then further examined the interaction between both output modalities among the three levels of proficiency. The present study addressed the following research questions:
1. To what extent can the proposed benefits of pushed output (planning, noticing, and uptake) in written modality transfer to the spoken modality?

2. Do learners who engage in practicing ‘noticing the gap’ via written recall make more gains in oral accuracy than learners who engage in practicing ‘noticing the gap’ via spoken recall?

3. What effect does proficiency level have on the relationship between both output modalities?

It was predicted that all three levels of proficiency who engaged in writing tasks would incorporate uptake from these writing tasks in their spoken recall.

4. Methods

4.1. Participants

Beginner (n=23; age: M=21.87; SD=3.81), intermediate (n=21; age: M=21.71; SD=3.58), and advanced (n=20; age: M=21.57; SD=2.36) learners of Russian participated in the study. The beginner and intermediate groups were drawn from the intact groups at one US university. The advanced group was drawn from intact groups from two different universities. All participants had English as their first language. The two universities follow similar ACTFL-oriented proficiency curricula and placement testing. While the participants were not tested for proficiency level before the study, it was assumed that they were of similar levels due to being in class together. The beginner learners participated in the study at the beginning of their third semester of Russian, the intermediate learners – in the beginning of their fifth semester of Russian, and the advanced learners – in the beginning of their seventh semester of Russian. Additionally, pre-test questionaries indicated that, with a few exceptions, the participants generally received As or A’s in their Russian courses. To avoid any interference with the results, only learners with no knowledge of any other Slavic languages were allowed to participate in the study. The learners participated in the study voluntarily, but a $25 incentive was offered.

4.2. Materials

All texts were taken from the Russian textbook Shkatulochka (Chubarova, 2008). Each level read a different text that was chosen in accordance with their level proficiency (Appendix A). The textbook includes narrations
created as supplemental materials for each level of proficiency. The textbook was chosen because it is not commonly used in the United States, therefore, there was a better chance that the participants were not familiar with the texts presented in the book. As the posttest questionnaire indicated, none of the participants had encountered the texts before. The texts were typed in a Word document, double-spaced in Times New Roman 12-point font, and were projected on a screen during an individual Zoom meeting with the researcher. An iPhone XS was used to record oral responses. All quantitative analyses were completed in the program IBM SPSS Statistic for Mac OS Version 27.0.

4.3. Procedure
After signing a consent form in DocuSign, each participant was assigned a number. After that, participants completed an online pretest questionnaire related to their socio-linguistic background (Appendix B). At the next stage, each participant met with the researcher individually on Zoom. All instructions were read by the researcher in English, and the text version was projected for the participants for review on a computer screen. The participants were instructed to read the text carefully, because afterwards they would need to reconstruction the text in as much detail as they could.

Participants in each level were randomly assigned to one of two groups. One group for each level performed a text reconstruction task first in writing and then in speaking; the other group read the text and performed the same text reconstruction task first in speaking and then in speaking again (Table 1). Each group also completed a ‘noticing the gap’ activity after reconstructing the text the first time: Namely, the participants received the original text after the first reconstruction and compared it to the texts they had produced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficiency Level</th>
<th>Writing-Speaking condition</th>
<th>Speaking-Speaking condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginner</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the Writing-Speaking condition, participants of each level were asked to silently read the provided text based on their proficiency level in Russian during a five-minute time frame (the approximate time necessary to read each text carefully twice). After that, the text was taken away so that the participants did not have access to the text during the reconstruction phase. Next, participants were asked to reconstruct the text to the best of their abilities on a piece of paper in writing. Next, they took a picture of the text they produced and e-mailed it to the researcher. After the first reconstruction phase, participants were asked to compare their written responses with the original text. Thus, opportunities for noticing the gap were provided. When participants were done, they were asked to reconstruct the original text again but orally. Although the reconstruction tasks were not timed, the time for each reconstruction task, on average, was no more than five minutes. The ‘noticing the gap’ activity, in turn, on average, was shorter than the first reconstruction phase.

In the second condition, participants were asked to silently read the provided text in Russian during a five-minute time frame. After that, the text was taken away and participants were asked to reconstruct the text to the best of their abilities orally. After the first reconstruction phase, participants were asked to silently read the original text again trying to identify differences between the text and their reconstructed version. Participants were allowed to verbalize the differences (if necessary), but the researcher was not allowed to comment on them. When participants were done, they were asked to reconstruct the original text again orally. Participants working in the second condition did not listen their first reconstruction so that the task could be as close to a classroom task as possible. The reconstruction tasks were not timed, although the time for each reconstruction task was not more than three minutes. Additionally, the researcher did not prompt either group to write or say more.

The oral responses were recorded and then transcribed by the researcher. The written responses were typed into a Word document by the researcher for further analysis. When participants were done with the reconstruction phase in both conditions, they were asked to answer the post-test questionnaire in English reflecting on the completed task (Appendix B).
5. Data Analysis and Coding

Two trained judges (the researcher and the departmental research assistant), native speakers of Russian, were trained to code the answers for the accuracy and complexity of the narrations. All responses were analyzed by both judges until the complete agreement was reached for all variables. The overall syntactic complexity of narrations was computed by calculating the mean length of unit per T-unit for the writing tasks (Wolfe-Quintero, Inagaki, & Kim, 1998) and AS-unit for the speaking tasks (Foster, Tonkyn, & Wigginsworth, 2000) (ML\textsubscript{per} T/AS). In addition, complexity by subordination was calculated by dividing the number of dependent clauses by the number of AS-units or T-units (DC\textsubscript{per} T/AS). Lexical diversity was measured using Guiraud’s index, which was calculated by dividing the number of types (individual words) by the square root of the number of tokens (total number of words) (T/\sqrt{2W}).

For example, in the sentence Она работает ночью, спит днем, завтракает вечером, и идёт на работу вечером [She works at night, sleeps during the day, has breakfast in the evening, and goes to work in the evening], there are 12 tokens and 11 types (the word вечером is used twice).

To measure syntactic accuracy, the following error categories were analyzed: functional errors (prepositions, pronouns, conjunctions, and word order), verbal errors (subject-verb agreement, as well as conjugations), nominal errors (gender and plural number agreement in determiners and adjectives), and lexical errors (a word choice error occurs when the reconstruction uses a word in the wrong meaning). The total number of errors was divided by the number of AS-units or T-units (Err\textsubscript{per} T/AS).

The overall semantic accuracy of produced narrations was computed by calculating the number of correct and distorted propositions.

---

3 T-unit can be defined as ‘one main clause plus whatever subordinate clauses attached to it’ (Hunt, 1965, p. 20) or ‘the shortest unit into which a piece of discourse can be cut without leaving any sentence fragments as residue’ (Hunt, 1970, p. 189). Examples of T-units: 1) When you make a milkshake, you mix it in a blender 2) ‘He goes to the bookseller and gets some money’ (Foster et al., 2000, p. 362).

4 AS-unit is a single speaker’s utterance consisting of an independent clause or sub-clausal unit, together with any subordinate clause(s) associated with either (Foster et al., 2000, p. 365) Example of an AS-unit: 1) ‘That’s right; and…er… they told er… there there was not food crisis’ (Foster et al., 2000, p. 367).

5 The number of words, semantic complexity and lexical diversity of the original texts are presented in Appendix A.
(T-unit for written responses and AS-unit for oral responses) Any proposition that did not change the original meaning was counted as a correct proposition. If a proposition provided distorted information compared to the original text, the proposition was counted as a distorted proposition.

To answer the first and the second questions investigating the relationship between the two output modalities for each proficiency level, the participants' responses from both groups in both written and oral output modes (independent variables) were compared for syntactic and semantic accuracy and complexity (dependent variables) using a two-way repeated measures ANOVA. To answer the third research question analyzing the effect proficiency level has on the relationship between the two modalities, a one-way ANOVA was used. The null hypothesis postulated that there was no consistent difference or systematic variance between any two treatment situations.

Additionally, each dependent variable for all three levels of proficiency was checked for normal distribution using Shapiro-Wilk's test. The test confirmed that data was normally distributed for all variables \( p > .05 \). The Mauchly's test of sphericity assumed that sphericity was necessarily held for all six variables due to the two levels of a repeated factor for each variable. Also, the Leven's test of homogeneity of variables was conducted for the one-way ANOVA. If the Leven's test of homogeneity was violated \( p < .05 \), the Welch's test was used (no significance was found for any of the variables using the Welch's test, \( p > .05 \)). Finally, although Norouzian and Plonsky's (2021) suggest that Cohen's (1988) proportion of variance effect size cutoff points (i.e. small = .0099; medium = .0588; large = .1379) should be applied to only 'partial eta squared' values and can be decreased for those of 'eta squared', the large values of 'eta squared' (> .14) in this analysis allowed to account for the type two error.

The judges discarded three responses among the Beginner learners from the data since zero propositions were recalled. Although the three participants recalled phrases or words, they were not sufficient for recalling cohesive ideas. Although the researcher tried to provide as "safe" an atmosphere for the participants as possible, anxiety may have been a negative factor affecting participants' responses, though the researcher did not formally assess this with the participants.
6. Results
6.1. Beginner Learners

Descriptive statistics of semantic accuracy (correct (CP) and distorted (DP) propositions), syntactic accuracy (ErrperT/AS), complexity by subordination (DCperT/AS), the overall syntactic complexity (MLperT/AS), and lexical diversity (T/\sqrt{2}W) for the Writing-Speaking condition and for the Speaking-Speaking condition are provided in Table 2.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics by number of correct propositions (CP), distorted propositions (DP), syntactic accuracy (ErrperT/AS), complexity by subordination (DCperT/AS), syntactic complexity (MLperT/AS), and lexical diversity (T/\sqrt{2}W) for the beginner learners working in the Writing-Speaking condition (1) and in the Speaking-Speaking conditions (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Writing₁ (n=10)</th>
<th>Speaking₁ (n=10)</th>
<th>Speaking₂ (n=10)</th>
<th>Speaking₂ (n=10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ErrperT/AS</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCperT/AS</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLperT/AS</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/\sqrt{2}W</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To analyze the differences in improvements between the Writing-Speaking and Speaking-Speaking conditions, a two-way repeated measures ANOVA was conducted for syntactic complexity (MLperT/AS), complexity by subordination (DCperT/AS), lexical diversity (T/\sqrt{2}W), syntactic accuracy (ErrperT/AS), and for the number of correct (CP) and
distorted (DP) propositions. The two-way repeated measures ANOVA conducted for all six variables did not demonstrate a significant difference or large effect size for the number of correctly recalled propositions \(F(1,18) = .12; p = .74; \eta_p^2 = .007\), for the number of distorted propositions \(F(1,18) = 1.47; p = .24; \eta_p^2 = .075\), for syntactic complexity \(F(1,18) = .46; p = .832; \eta_p^2 = .003\), complexity by subordination \(F(1,18) = .01; p = .91; \eta_p^2 = .001\), or for lexical diversity \(F(1,18) = 1.83; p = .19; \eta_p^2 = .093\). However, when comparing the syntactic accuracy, a statistically significant difference with a large effect size \(F(1,18) = 16.83; p < .001; \eta_p^2 = .48\) between the Writing-Speaking and Speaking-Speaking conditions of the beginner groups (Fig. 1) was registered, which indicates significantly fewer mistakes in the spoken mode of recall in the Writing-Speaking condition. Interaction contrasts analysis revealed that the group working in the Writing-Speaking condition produced significantly fewer mistakes in the spoken mode recall compared to the second spoken mode recall of the group working in the Speaking-Speaking condition \(t(18) = 4.2; p < .001; d = 2.7\).

Figure 1. Changes in grammatical accuracy for the Writing-Speaking and Speaking-Speaking conditions with the 95% confidence interval for beginner learners

\[\text{Estimated Marginal Means of Err_perT/AS} \]

\[\text{Group} \]

- Writing-Speaking
- Speaking-Speaking

6 For all ANOVA and t-tests, when necessary, a Bonferroni adjustment was applied.
6.2. Intermediate Learners

Descriptive statistics of semantic accuracy (correct (CP) and distorted (DP) propositions), syntactic accuracy (ErrperT/AS), complexity by subordination (DCperT/AS), the overall syntactic complexity (MLperT/AS), and lexical diversity (T/2W) for the Writing-Speaking condition and for the Speaking-Speaking condition are provided in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Writing\textsubscript{1} (n=10)</th>
<th>Speaking\textsubscript{1} (n=11)</th>
<th>Speaking\textsubscript{2} (n=10)</th>
<th>Speaking\textsubscript{2} (n=10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>8.81</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ErrperT/AS</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCperT/AS</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLperT/AS</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/2W</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A two-way repeated measures ANOVA conducted for all six variables between the two conditions (Writing-Speaking and Speaking-Speaking) did not demonstrate a significant difference or large effect size for the number of correct propositions ($F (1,19) = .63; \ p = .44; \ \eta^2_p = .03$), distorted proposition ($F (1,19) = 1.73; \ p = .21; \ \eta^2_p = .08$), for syntactic complexity ($F (1,19) = .98; \ p = .37; \ \eta^2_p = .02$), for complexity by subordination ($F (1,19) = 1.16; \ p = .22; \ \eta^2_p = .07$), or for lexical diversity ($F (1,19) = .19; \ p = .67; \ \eta^2_p = .01$) However, a two-way repeated measures ANOVA comparing syntactic accuracy between the two groups indicated a significant...
difference with a large effect size between the Writing-Speaking and Speaking-Speaking conditions (Fig. 2), indicating significantly fewer mistakes in the spoken mode of recall ($F(1,19) = 37.65; p < .001; \eta^2_p = .67$). Interaction contrasts analysis revealed that the group working in the Writing-Speaking condition produced significantly fewer mistakes in the spoken mode recall compared to the second spoken mode recall of the group working in the Speaking-Speaking condition ($t(18) = 6.1; p < .001, c = .16$). Furthermore, the analysis of within-subject conditions indicated a statistically significant change with a large effect size in the number of correctly recalled propositions for the participants working in the Writing-Speaking condition ($F(1,19) = 16.68; p < .05; \eta^2_p = .56$).

Figure 2. Changes in grammatical accuracy for the Writing-Speaking and Speaking-Speaking conditions with the 95% confidence interval for Intermediate learners

6.3. Advanced Learners
Descriptive statistics of semantic accuracy (correct (CP) and distorted (DP) propositions), syntactic accuracy (Err_{per,T/AS}), complexity by subordination (DC_{per,T/AS}), the overall syntactic complexity (ML_{per,T/AS}), and lexical diversity (T/✓2W) for the Writing-Speaking condition and for the Speaking-Speaking condition are provided in Table 4.
Table 4. Descriptive statistics by number of correct propositions (CP), distorted propositions (DP), syntactic accuracy (ErrperT/AS), complexity by subordination (DCperT/AS), syntactic complexity (MLperT/AS), and lexical diversity (T/2W) for the advanced learners working in the Writing-Speaking condition (1) and in the Speaking-Speaking condition (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Writing₁ (n=10)</th>
<th>Speaking₁ (n=10)</th>
<th>Speaking₂ (n=10)</th>
<th>Speaking₂ (n=10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ErrperT/AS</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCperT/AS</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLperT/AS</td>
<td>8.84</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/2W</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A two-way repeated measures ANOVA conducted for all six variables between the two conditions (Writing-Speaking and Speaking-Speaking) did not suggest a significant difference or large effect size in the means for any of the six variables, i.e., the number of correct propositions ($F (1,18) = .15; p = .7; \eta_p^2 = .008$), distorted proposition ($F (1,18) = .4; p = .55; \eta_p^2 = .06$), for syntactic complexity ($F (1,18) = .11; p = .74; \eta_p^2 = .006$), for complexity by subordination ($F (1,18) = .04; p = .83; \eta_p^2 = .002$), for lexical diversity ($F (1,18) = .0; p = 1; \eta_p^2 = .001$), or syntactic accuracy ($F (1,18) = 1.66; p = .21; \eta_p^2 = .08$).

7. Interaction Across All Levels of Proficiency
A one-way ANOVA comparing groups across all three levels of proficiency working in the Writing-Speaking condition revealed that there was a statistically significant difference with a large effect size in syntactic complexity and lexical diversity between any two groups ($F (2, 28) = 19.7, p < .01; \eta^2=.68; F (2, 28) = 30.47, p < .01; \eta^2=.71$). A Bonferroni post-hoc test for multiple comparisons found that the mean value of syntactic...
complexity for advanced learners was significantly higher than for both beginner and intermediate groups ($M = 8.84, SD = 1.66; M = 5.18, SD = .84; p < .01; M = 6.51, SD = .73, p < .01$) and the mean value of lexical diversity for advanced learners was significantly higher than that for beginner learners working in the Writing-Speaking condition ($M = 4.56, SD = .43; M = 3.14, SD = .29; p < .01$)7.

Furthermore, a one-way ANOVA comparing groups across all three levels of proficiency working in the Speaking-Speaking condition revealed that there was a statistically significant difference in syntactic complexity and lexical diversity between any two groups with a large effect size ($F (2, 27) = 42.3, p < .01; \eta^2 = .75; F (2, 27) = 36.17, p < .01; \eta^2 = .73$). A Bonferroni post-hoc test for multiple comparisons found that the mean value of syntactic complexity for advanced learners ($M = 8.67, SD = .88$) was significantly higher than for both the beginner and intermediate groups working in the Speaking-Speaking condition ($M = 5.96, SD = 1.06; p < .01; M = 4.68, SD = 1.04, p < .01$), and the mean value of lexical diversity for advanced learners ($M = 4.75, SD = .53$) was significantly higher than that for beginner learners working in the Speaking-Speaking condition ($M = 2.96, SD = .28; p < .01$).

8. Post-Study Questionnaire
The post-study questionnaire was analyzed with the purpose to see whether written or/and spoken conditions provided enough opportunities for learners to acquire new vocabulary from the context. All twenty beginner learners ($n=20$) indicated that they had never previously read the provided text. Nineteen beginner learners stated that they had guessed the meaning of the words бандиты [bandits] and хулиганы [hooligans] from context. Although all nineteen learners stated that they guessed the meaning of the word полицейский [police officer], four learners had assigned a wrong meaning to the word, translating it as politician. One learner indicated that they knew all the above-mentioned words and did not have to guess anything from context. This learner was also the only one who guessed the meaning of the word опасные [dangerous] from context. Additionally, 16 learners mentioned that they did not know the

7 For comparison, the semantic complexity and lexical diversity of the original texts are as follows: beginners - MLperT/AS = 6.78; T/\sqrt{2}W = 3.71; intermediate - MLperT/AS = 8.64; T/\sqrt{2}W = 6.11; advanced - MLperT/AS = 9.83; T/\sqrt{2}W = 6.99.
word встретить [to meet] and could not guess the meaning from context. One learner noted that they had forgotten the word спать [to sleep], but the text reminded them of it. One learner indicated that they did not know the word защищать [to protect], and they did not guess the meaning of it from the text.

All intermediate participants (n=21) noted that they had not seen the provided text before the experiment. Twenty intermediate learners responded that they had not found any unfamiliar words or grammar structures in the text. One intermediate participant mentioned that they did not know the word известный [famous] but was able to guess the meaning from context. One participant mentioned that they had forgotten the words купаться [to swim] and загорать [to sunbathe] but that the text helped refresh the words in their memory.

Similar to the beginner and intermediate learners, all advanced learners (n=20) responded that they saw the provided text for the first time during this experiment. Eleven participants stated that they did not notice any unfamiliar words. Three learners noted that they did not know the word старинный [ancient] and confused it with the word старый [old]. One learner noted the text reminded them of the dative case, e.g., -памятник кому? - Ивану Федорову [- the monument to whom? – to Ivan Fedorov]. That learner also wrote that they had expected a preposition для [for] instead of на [for] in the phrase: собирала деньги на него [collected money for it]. Three participants did not know the word for printing press but guessed it from context. Two participants recalled the word напечатанный [published] after reading the text. Finally, four participants mentioned that they confused the word лист [a piece of paper] with список [list].

9. Discussion
The first and second research questions centered on the possible effects that ‘noticing the gap’ via pushed written output can have on speaking accuracy as compared to ‘noticing the gap’ by engaging in oral production. It was hypothesized that learners of all proficiency levels who engaged in L2 writing tasks would incorporate uptake from these tasks to L2 speaking, more precisely to oral accuracy.

As predicted, a statistical comparison of the results demonstrated that the groups of beginner and intermediate learners who recalled the
text in writing before speaking significantly improved their syntactic accuracy in the second spoken mode of recall, unlike the groups of beginner and intermediate learners who had worked with the text in the spoken condition twice. These results are consistent with the view stating that writing can provide more time for planning (Ahmadian & Tavakali, 2010; Bui & Teng, 2019; Ellis & Yuan, 2004; Khatib & Farahanynia, 2020) and more opportunities for learners to ‘notice the gap’ (Adams, 2003; Mackey, 2006; Ögeyik, 2017). In writing, learners typically have sufficient processing space available to hold both correct and incorrect versions in memory and to compare them. With the ongoing processing demands of speech on memory, it is not always possible for learners to have enough time to make a comparison. Moreover, speaking is a process that does not always allow time for monitoring and corrections. In writing, however, learners typically have increased cognitive attention to produced output, and have enough time to correct their mistakes. More importantly, the fact that the number of mistakes significantly decreased in the second spoken recall for the beginner and intermediate groups working in the Writing-Speaking condition, indicates that writing provides enough opportunities for learners to not only ‘notice the gap’ and modify their output, but also transfer this uptake into their speech.

Although the syntactic improvement in the advanced learners working in the Writing-Speaking condition was not statistically significant, the number of mistakes in the speaking conditions were reduced by 25% overall, while the learners who worked in the Speaking-Speaking condition did not demonstrate any improvement. The fact that the improvement in syntactic accuracy did not demonstrate statistical significance most likely indicates that the improvement of L2 learners’ oral accuracy slows down as they become more proficient, i.e., a ceiling effect. Given this likelihood, it is possible to assume that, similar to the beginner and intermediate learners working with the text in writing, the advanced learners who completed the writing tasks also had more opportunities to ‘notice the gap’, modify their output, and incorporate this uptake in their speech, than the advanced learners who worked with the text in the Speaking-Speaking condition.

Below are some examples of how the students in the writing to speaking group improved their grammatical accuracy. Novice learners improved verb conjugations, nominal declensions, and prepositions.
in the second spoken recall. For example, в ночью and в утром were corrected to ночь [at night] and утром [in the morning], or она идет спать [she goes to bed], бандиты знают его жену or он любит его жену were corrected to бандиты знают его жену [bandits know his wife] and он любит свою жену [he loves his wife]. The intermediate group working in the writing to speaking condition improved verb conjugations, prepositions, nominal declensions, and lexical choices. For example, вечером были тихие тёплые was corrected to вечер были тихие и тёплые [evenings were calm and warm], what was initially Лена и дети любили кататься became Лена и дети любили купаться [Lena and children loved swimming], работал в известной компьютерной фирме was corrected to работал в известной компьютерной фирме [worked at a famous computer firm], он на дачу в свободное время became он приехала на дачу в свободное время [he came to dacha at his free time], семья Смирновый was corrected to семья Смирновых [the Smirnov family], жили в даче became жили на даче [lived at dacha], and others. Finally, Advanced group working in the writing to speaking condition also improved verb conjugations, prepositions, nominal declensions, and lexical choices. For example, у них были много ошибок was corrected to в них было много ошибок [they had a lot of mistakes], книги в печатном станке was corrected to книги на печатном станке [books on a printing press], что было initially вся страна дарила деньги became вся страна собирала деньги [the whole country collected money], первую книгу напечатала was corrected to первую книгу напечатали [first book was printed], памятник Ивану Фёдорову was corrected to памятник Ивану Фёдорову [monument to Ivan Fedorov], держит список будущей книги was corrected to держит список будущей книги [holds a page of a future book], and many others.

Furthermore, the first spoken recall in the intermediate Speaking-Speaking group provided a significantly higher number of correctly recalled propositions than the written mode of recall in the intermediate Writing-Speaking group, although both groups were provided with sufficient time for planning and monitoring their output in both recall modes. The responses to the pre-study questionnaire indicated that four out of eleven students working in the Writing-Speaking group had had a year break before taking their intermediate level classes due to the Covid-19 pandemic. In their responses, they indicated that they had decided to take a break from classes instead of taking classes online.
Since all four students recalled the smallest number of propositions, it is reasonable to assume that in their cases the written mode of recall could not compensate for their lack of practice, which led to the smaller number of recalled propositions.

Additionally, as the analysis among the three levels of proficiency indicated, the syntactic complexity and lexical diversity of the texts produced by the intermediate learners working in the Speaking-Speaking condition were significantly higher than the syntactic complexity and lexical diversity of the text produced by the beginner learners working in the same Speaking-Speaking condition. These results suggest that, likely due to a higher level of proficiency, intermediate learners have more opportunities to concentrate on improving the syntactic complexity of produced sentences than beginner speakers and use a wider vocabulary range in their responses.

Interestingly, unlike the Speaking-Speaking intermediate group, the intermediate group working in the Writing-Speaking condition did not demonstrate a significant difference in the increase of syntactic complexity and lexical diversity when compared to beginner learners working in the same condition. These results, again, can be explained by the lack of Russian knowledge of those students who had a year break before joining the intermediate level classes due to the COVID-19, thus reducing the overall intermediate scores.

Moreover, the syntactic complexity and lexical diversity of the text produced by both advanced groups was significantly higher than the complexity of the texts produced by the corresponding intermediate groups. These results confirm that the complexity and lexical diversity of produced output increase with each level of proficiency.

Finally, the post-test questionnaire indicated that the beginner and advanced learners working in both the Writing-Speaking and Speaking-Speaking conditions remembered new words they had guessed from context. The ability to remember separate words from the text after working in both writing and speaking indicates that, even though learners pay more attention to form during written output (Adams, 2006; García Mayo & Azkarai, 2016; Niu, 2009), both writing and speaking may provide enough opportunities to notice and incidentally acquire new vocabulary. Considering that the intermediate learners did not report unfamiliar words or grammar structures in the text but only refreshed
some words in their memory, it is only possible to assume that similar to beginner and advanced learners, intermediate learners could have enough opportunities to incidentally acquire new vocabulary from texts in both conditions.

10. Pedagogical implications
The results of the study demonstrate that although a spoken mode of recall provided all learners with sufficient opportunity to improve their lexical diversity and acquire new words from the text, only the students in the Writing-Speaking condition were able to notice their mistakes, modify them, and transfer this uptake in their speech production. These results have practical implications for L2 pedagogy. In order for learners to ‘notice the gap’ and transform their mistakes, in-class activities based on guided writing can be suggested. For example, text reconstruction activities, text mapping activities, dictation, and others. To elaborate, text reconstruction and text mapping activities can be done in pairs with ongoing feedback as a review session before an exam. Also, school boards can be used to complete these activities in pairs or groups. In this case, analysis of produced texts and mistakes can be done by the whole class. Additionally, text mapping activities can be used to introduce new grammatical concepts. The activities can be introduced as pair work, group work, or working with the whole class (see example, Sletova, 2021). Dictation, on the other hand, can be used for the whole class to allow students to work on their spelling through listening. In this activity, after the dictation stage students will need to read the original text trying to identify differences between the original text and their produced output.

This experiment can also lead to filling the gap in classroom research investigating how working with texts in writing can benefit spontaneous speech. Most importantly, further research is needed to confirm the effects of guided writing activities, and whether improved accuracy in carefully curated sequences of reading-writing-speaking can then lead to improvements in linguistic accuracy in spontaneous speech.

11. Limitations
This study investigated the possibility that L2 writing could scaffold L2 speaking grammatical accuracy in a text-reconstruction task. One of the biggest limitations of this study is the small number of the participants.
Another limitation is the absence of a proficiency placement test among the participants. It is possible that not everyone in the tested groups may have been at the actual expected proficiency level. Additionally, three different texts were used across levels, which may have negatively affected the conclusions made from research question number three. Furthermore, a future study is merited to examine whether improvement in grammatical accuracy of oral recall can lead to improvement in overall spontaneous speaking ability. Also, the analysis was conducted for only one input modality (reading) given that the sample size was too small to effectively measure both the reading and listening input modalities. Thus, the relationship between L2 speaking accuracy and L2 writing with the aural input (listening) also warrants investigation. Although the researcher tried to create an atmosphere as friendly as possible during the experiment, it is also possible that affective variables such as motivation, interest, anxiety, and fear of failure affected the results.

12. Future Research Directions
The results of this study provide several opportunities for future research. First, future studies can replicate this study with a bigger number of the participants. Second, testing participants’ proficiency level can be recommended in the future. Third, future studies can use one text adjusted for different levels of proficiency. Fourth, the number of participants in the present study was too small to test the effect of L2 writing on L2 speaking accuracy for the two input modalities (reading and listening). A study with a 2 x 2 group design (reading input x written output, reading input x spoken output, listening input x written output, listening input x spoken output) would build upon this one and offer further insights. Additionally, future research could examine whether lexical and grammatical structures that correctly appeared on the oral recall task would display the same level of accuracy in a task that involves spontaneous speech. In other words, does accuracy on an oral recall task transfer over to spontaneous speech? Also, the influence of L2 writing on L2 speaking accuracy for native speakers of languages other than English could be investigated. Finally, considering that our results demonstrated that practicing L2 writing helped learners improve their speaking accuracy, subsequent research in this area could likely provide new ideas for improving methods of L2 teaching in the field of ISLA.
13. Conclusion

The results of this study support the prediction that using writing activities in a communicative language classroom can help learners ‘notice the gap’, correct their mistakes, and transfer the uptake into their spoken recall improving their speaking accuracy for all levels of proficiency. Indeed, learners of all three levels of proficiency, i.e., beginners, intermediate, and advanced, improved their grammatical accuracy in the second oral mode of recall only when written recall preceded the oral text reconstruction. Thus, although a spoken mode of recall provided learners with enough opportunity to recognize and remember new words from the text, only working with the text in writing helps students to notice their grammatical mistakes and to not use them in subsequent spoken recall.

This study contributes to the field in two major ways. First, it adds to the understudied area of literature devoted to investigating how L2 guided writing activities can be used to improve the development of L2 speaking in a communicative language classroom. Notably, its research findings support the hypothesis that using L2 writing as a scaffold for L2 speaking accuracy can be beneficial for all levels of learners. Second, the study results have significant practical implications for L2 pedagogy. Demonstrating the benefits of supplemental activities that can improve learners’ speaking accuracy contributes directly to successful L2 learning. Text reconstruction activities, text mapping activities, dictation, and other supplemental activities can be employed to fill the gap in classroom research investigating how working with texts in writing in a communicative language classroom can benefit not only spoken recall, but also spontaneous speech. Specifically, a future study that investigates whether engaging in written recall tasks will lead to better accuracy in spontaneous speech is warranted.
Appendix A: Beginner, Intermediate, and Advanced Texts

Beginner Text
Note: Spaces have been removed from between lines.

Это Кирилл. Его жена - полицейский. Она много работает. Она часто работает ночью. Вечером она идёт на работу, а утром идёт домой спать. Днём она спит, вечером завтракает, ночью опять идёт на работу. Это не только трудная, но и очень опасная работа. Все хулиганы и бандиты знают его жену. Она очень хороший полицейский, поэтому они её не любят.

Кирилл адвокат. Он встаёт утром, завтракает, идёт на работу. Иногда он встречает на работе свою жену. Это бывает очень редко.

Конечно, все хулиганы и бандиты знают его. Он очень хороший адвокат, поэтому все хулиганы и бандиты его любят. Он хорошо их защищает, потому что это его работа. Но Кирилл их не любит, потому что они не любят его жену. А Кирилл её очень любит.

[This is Kirill. His wife is a policeman. She works a lot. She often works at night. She goes to work in the evening, and she goes home to sleep in the morning. She sleeps during the day, she has breakfast in the evening, she goes to work again at night. Her work is not only difficult, but also very dangerous. All hooligans and bandits know my wife. She is a very good policeman, so they don't like her.

Kirill is an advocate. He gets up in the morning, has breakfast, goes to work. Sometimes he meets his wife at work. This happens very rarely.

Of course, all the hooligans and bandits know him. He is a very good lawyer, so all hooligans and bandits love him. He defends them well because it is his job. But Kirill does not like them, because they do not like his wife. And Kirill loves her very much].

Number of words = 122; MLperT/AS = 6.78; T/√2W = 3.71.
The Smirnov family had been living at the dacha for three weeks already. The weather was fine, there was almost no rain. Wife Lena and children went swimming and sunbathing every morning. Evenings were warm and quiet. Lena and her neighbors were drinking tea on the terrace, discussing the news and laughing. Sometimes they played volleyball. They were very happy at the dacha.

Husband Alexei worked for a well-known computer company. He had a lot of work, so he came to the dacha with a computer. Alexey got up late, drank tea alone, and sat down at the computer to work. Sometimes during the day Alexei watched TV. He especially liked sports programs and American films. After dinner, Alexei worked again, and then slept for a long time, like a happy man who had a vacation. All in all, he was also happy at the dacha.
In the center of Moscow, not far from the Lubyanka metro station, there is a monument: a man in ancient clothes holds a sheet of a future book in his hand. This is a monument to Ivan Fedorov. It was placed at the beginning of the twentieth century. For thirty years, the whole country collected money for it. Who is Ivan Fedorov and why was his monument built in the center of the Russian capital?

In the fifteenth century, the first book was printed in Europe. It became the beginning of a new era. However, in Russia, they did not know how to print books for another hundred years. Books were rewritten, and it was a very long process. In addition, the books were very expensive, and they had many mistakes. Only in the sixteenth century, the first printed book appeared in Russia. It was printed by Ivan Fedorov on a printing press, which he made himself.

Number of words = 118; MLperT/AS = 9.83; T/√W = 6.99.
Appendix B: Questionnaires

1. Pre-Study Questionnaire
Note: Spaces have been removed from between questions.

Number (given by researcher): __________________________
Date: __________________________
1. What is your age? __________________________
2. When did you begin studying Russian?
3. How many years have you been studying Russian? Have you been studying it continuously? Please mention any breaks in your study.
4. Have you studied abroad for Russian? For how long, in what program and in what city? How long ago was it?
5. What grades have you received in your Russian courses at OSU and elsewhere? Please list each course and the corresponding letter grade.
6. How much time, on average, do you devote to studying Russian every week?
7. What other foreign languages have you studied and for how long?
8. Do you have any other exposure to Russian on a regular basis? (i.e., family, friends, TV, etc.) If yes, please mention how often you interact with these people or things.
9. What aspects of Russian are the most difficult for you?
10. What strategies do you use to learn new vocabulary words?
11. Do you expect any benefits from knowing Russian for your future professional career?
12. Do you think your writing is better than your speaking in Russian or vice versa?

2. Post-Study Questionnaire
Note: Spaces have been removed from between questions.

Number (given by researcher): __________________________
Date: __________________________
1) Had you read this text before you participated in this study?
2) Did you pick-up any new words or grammar structures from the text?
3) Did the text include any unfamiliar words or grammar structures?
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