Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language

FOURTH EDITION

MARIANNE [illegible]CE-MURCIA

DONNA M. BRINTON

MARGUERITE ANN SNOW

EDITORS

NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC LEARNING | HEINLE CENGAGE Learning

Australia • Brazil • Japan • Korea • Mexico • Singapore • Spain • United Kingdom • United States

NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC LEARNING | HEINLE CENGAGE Learning

Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language, Fourth Edition
Marianne Celce-Murcia,
Donna M. Brinton,
and Marguerite Ann Snow

Publisher: Sherrise Roehr

Acquisitions Editor: Tom Jefferies

Director of Global Marketing: Ian Martin

Senior Product Manager:
Barbara Quincer Coulter

Director, Content and Media Production:
Michael Burggren

Content Project Manager:
Andrea Bobotas

Print Buyer: Mary Beth Hennebury

Cover Designer: Gina Petti

Cover Image: Joel Sartore/National Geographic Image Collection

Compositor: MPS Limited

ISBN-13: 978-1-111-35169-4

ISBN-10: 1-111-35169-4

National Geographic Learning
20 Channel Center Street
Boston, MA 02210
USA

Cengage Learning is a leading provider of customized learning solutions with office locations around the globe, including Singapore, the United Kingdom, Australia, Mexico, Brazil, and Japan.

Cengage Learning products are represented in Canada by Nelson Education, Ltd.

Visit National Geographic Learning online at **elt.heinle.com**

Visit our corporate website at **www.cengage.com**

Printed in the United States of America
2 3 4 5 6 7 16 15 14 13

16 Grammar in Second Language Writing

JAN FRODESEN

KEY QUESTIONS

- How should grammar be incorporated into writing instruction?
- How are the needs of second language writers different from those of native English writers?
- How can we apply insights from research on the role of grammar in writing to form-focused activities in the writing class?
- How should grammatical errors be viewed and treated?

EXPERIENCE

In a California elementary school, the teacher of a class of bilingual fifth-graders was preparing her students for a standardized English test. The test required that students demonstrate knowledge of English grammar rules by choosing appropriate word forms to fill in the blanks of a set of decontextualized sentences—a typical discrete-item, multiple-choice test. Up to this point in the class, the students had been creating their own illustrated bilingual storybooks about fantastical beasts, writing their texts first in Spanish, their native language, and then in English. To help her students develop their awareness of the need to meet readers' expectations, the teacher had been serving as a careful reader of their stories, letting them know whenever she had a problem understanding their meaning and providing vocabulary and grammar explanation as needed.

As the students pored over example sentences to prepare for the required exam, a task both the teacher and students found tedious (especially compared to their story-writing activity), they encountered one item in which they had to choose the correct pronoun for a subject slot. The choices were the nominative pronoun *she* and the object pronoun *her*. As the teacher was prompting the correct form for the blank, one of the students exclaimed, "But teacher, this is a bad sentence! We don't know who *she* is!"

This story, related by the teacher of this class, Barbara Hawkins, offers an excellent example of helping writers develop knowledge of grammatical systems to convey ideas meaningfully and appropriately. It illustrates how even young second language (L2) learners can discover and apply discourse-level grammatical principles, in this case making clear the referents for pronouns.

Not only *can* students of all ages learn how to use grammar appropriate to specific contexts, but a focus on form appears to be necessary to some extent for optimal L2 learning. When instruction is meaning focused only, learners fail to develop some linguistic features at target-like levels (Doughty & Williams, 1998b). And, of course, in academic or professional contexts, helping learners develop the ability to select and accurately produce structures typical of written registers and genres is an important instructional objective.

WHAT IS THE ROLE OF GRAMMAR IN L2 WRITING INSTRUCTION?

In L2 writing, the role of grammar has generally included two broad areas: (1) instruction and practice in grammatical structures; and (2) response to and correction of errors in students' texts. An example of the former is an explanation

of count and noncount nouns in English followed by exercises that give learners the opportunity to distinguish the two types of nouns and use them in a meaningful context. The second type might focus on a specific type of error in student writing, such as verb tense, or might involve attention to an individual writer's most frequent errors.

Both of these areas of grammar have been controversial in writing instruction for many years. One reason for this has been the influence of first language (L1) composition research and pedagogy. In *Research in Written Composition*, a major synthesis of writing studies published in 1963, authors Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer state that instruction in formal grammar had little or no effect on helping students improve their writing. In the decades following this report, composition instruction gradually shifted its focus first to individuals' writing processes and later to an emphasis on writing as a situated social activity. As a result, little attention is now given to language issues in L1 writing instruction other than teachers' correction of errors on student papers and referrals to tutoring centers.

The concerns that arose during the last half of the twentieth century about formal grammar instruction failing to improve students' writing development were shared by some L2 writing instructors, especially those trained in L1 composition contexts. Yet grammar instruction and practice remain a central component in many L2 writing classes. As Frodesen and Holten (2003) have discussed, L2 composition teachers hold varying attitudes about the role of focus on form; they note that L2 writing classes have tended to fall into one of two categories: "writing rich, but grammar poor" or the reverse. "Writing rich, but grammar poor" instruction has been influenced not only by L1 pedagogy and research but also by Krashen (1982), who argues that form-focused instruction is not only unnecessary but thwarts natural acquisition processes. Termed the *noninterventionist position* (Long & Robinson, 1998), the rejection of explicit focus on form has characterized for years many L2 classrooms dedicated to developing learners' communicative competence. In contrast to the "writing rich, but grammar poor" class, many "grammar rich, but writing poor" L2 writing classes have used written texts largely as a context for learning and practicing grammatical structures, and, as such, they are better described not as writing but as grammar classes.

Grammar as resource

Although they clearly offer very different types of instruction, both the "writing rich, but grammar poor" and the "grammar rich, but writing poor" classes reflect misconceptions about the role of grammar in the teaching of writing. There is a great difference between the teaching of linguistic forms apart from a meaningful context, on the one hand, and a focus on language forms to develop learners' ability to communicate meaningfully and appropriately, on the other, as Hawkins's bilingual classroom in the opening experience so aptly exemplifies. In the latter view, learners discover how grammar functions as an integral part of language use and how writers use structures to achieve specific purposes such as to emphasize or connect information. Thus, grammar serves as a resource for effective communication, not just an isolated body of knowledge. Learners come to understand grammar as an essential component of language, a system that they can explore and exploit for their communicative needs rather than as a tedious and complicated set of rules to be memorized or as a template to be used solely for identifying and correcting their errors.

With increasing research on L2 writers and their texts, we now have a great deal more evidence of the differences between L1 and L2 writers, processes, and products (Leki, Cumming, & Silva, 2008; Silva, 1993). This research has shown that English as a second language (ESL) writers do not have the same access to intuitions about language that makes overt focus on some types of grammar unnecessary for most native English speakers. Furthermore, for writers of all language backgrounds, developing proficiency in academic English involves acquiring structures that do not exist in learners' repertoire of spoken, conversational forms. As Silva (1993) concludes from his synthesis of L2 writing research, L1 and L2 writing "are different in numerous and important ways" (p. 671). Thus, while L1 composition theory and practices have certainly informed L2 writing pedagogy, teachers of L2 writers must also attend to the special language needs of their learners.

As we reflect on the role of grammar as a resource for creating and shaping effective written communication, it seems clear, then, that focus on form should be an integral part of the instructional design for L2 writing classrooms. This does not mean, however, that all kinds of grammar instruction are useful in this context. Nor does it mean that students will automatically be able to transform input received through explicit grammar instruction into productive output. Awareness of learner and contextual variables can, however, assist teachers in deciding when and how to incorporate grammar into writing instruction.

Treatment of learner error

While a focus on grammar as a linguistic resource puts a more positive face on the role of grammar in writing instruction, any discussion of this role should include attention to learners' writing errors, a significant concern for most L2 writing teachers and their students. For decades, studies and debates on the effectiveness of differing types of error correction and, indeed, of error correction at all, have been a major topic in the L2 writing literature. Central in recent debates include the exchanges between Truscott (1996, 2007), who believes that ESL research does not provide evidence showing that error correction improves writers' accuracy over time, and Ferris (1999, 2011), who, while acknowledging that the research base lacks controlled studies on this topic, nevertheless asserts that studies have indicated short-term improvement. Ferris (2011) has further pointed out that without attention to errors and explicit instruction, adult learners may fail to make progress in correcting patterns of errors in their L2 writing. Indeed, writing teachers in higher education contexts have found that many of their multilingual students enter colleges and universities unaware of frequent error patterns in their writing.

CONCEPTUAL UNDERPINNINGS

Where should teachers begin in deciding what kinds of grammar focus are appropriate and relevant for their students' needs in the writing classroom? Should we start with the learners or with structures? In thinking about any communicative activity, it is, of course, difficult to separate the learners from the goals of the task, not to mention from the other participants (e.g., readers) who may be involved. Writing is a dynamic process in which writers interact with their intended readers and draw on their knowledge of text types in the co-construction of meaning for specific purposes. From this perspective, a starting point involves not merely a choice between learners and structures but, rather, a more holistic consideration of the communicative task. Nevertheless, it will be helpful to consider some of the learner variables that affect how teachers introduce and integrate grammatical concepts into their classrooms.

Second language writer variables

Age is one of the most obvious of learner variables. This chapter began with an example of elementary school bilingual learners who demonstrated to their teacher the importance of having clear referents for pronouns, though they may not have known the terminology for such structures. In recent decades, elementary school academic language development curricula and standards in English-speaking countries such as Australia and the United States have been informed by the work of functional linguists who make explicit the language structures of school genres that young learners are expected to acquire. For example, Gibbons (2006a) describes Australian fifth-graders in a science classroom, including English learners, transitioning from journal entries of experiments in everyday language to the language of science reports, with attention to grammatical features such as the verb tenses used in these reports. In this context, grammar in writing has clearly been expanded beyond the outdated notion of teaching learners explicit rules of morphology and syntax. It begins with meaningful activities to write about and with the young writers' attempts to communicate their experience, followed by work involving models of the academic language to be mastered.

For older learners in secondary schools, higher education, and beyond, Ferris and Hedgcock (2004) note that students in ESL composition classrooms in English-speaking countries are typically a very heterogeneous population, characterized by many differences in backgrounds and abilities, including linguistic, ethnic, and cultural identities as well as cognitive and metacognitive strategy use.

All these differences can influence the ways in which a writing teacher may approach grammar-based activities in classrooms and providing feedback to individual learners.

With the ever-growing population of non-native English-speaking immigrants in English-speaking countries, differences in students' educational backgrounds and English proficiency have become extremely important in developing L2 curricula. One of the most important distinctions in types of L2 learners at higher education levels has been that between international students who have received their education in their native country prior to attending an English-medium school and U.S.-educated ESL students. (In English as a foreign language [EFL] contexts, of course, most students will have educational backgrounds similar to the international students in English-speaking countries.)

International (or EFL) students have typically learned most of their English in the classroom and generally have received considerable explicit grammar instruction. Thus, they are often able to access and explain grammar rules when doing text analysis and to use their metalinguistic knowledge to revise and edit drafts. For example, in editing sessions with teachers or tutors, they can refer to parts of speech such as articles and prepositions, clause structures such as relative or adverbial clauses, and sentence roles such as subjects or direct objects. Their writing may exhibit more non-nativelike features such as unidiomatic phrasing than the writing of permanent residents does. However, it may also demonstrate better skill in producing the complex structures typical of formal academic English.

In contrast to international students, students who have received most of their education in an English-speaking country often acquire English "by ear" from exposure to the language in oral contexts, including, of course, the classroom but in many informal conversational contexts as well (Reid, 1998b). For this reason, and because explicit grammar instruction has often not been a significant part of their English language education, the knowledge that these learners have about English grammar tends to be implicit, similar to that of native English-language speakers. They may know that an ungrammatical form "doesn't sound right" but may not be able to explain why, just as most native speakers would not be able to explain why they use the definite article *the* rather than the indefinite *a* in a given context. Drawing on this same implicit knowledge, immigrant L2 students may regard structures used in formal written English, but seldom occurring in everyday English, as incorrect or sounding "strange," just as many novice native English language writers do. Like developing native English language writers, ESL writers often inappropriately import informal oral expressions and syntactic structures into academic writing contexts (e.g., using *I mean* rather than *that is* before a clarifying statement). Permanent resident students may enter higher education institutions unfamiliar with most grammatical terminology, and they also may be less aware than international students of their error patterns in English morphology and syntax.

One other learner variable that has been discussed in relation to grammar in writing is the extent to which learners are willing to take risks in using unfamiliar structures. The tendency of writers to avoid using structures that are difficult for them was long ago pointed out by Schachter and Celce-Murcia (1977). These findings emphasize that grammatical instruction dealing with errors alone will not address the need to develop writing fluency.

Texts and contexts

While not losing sight of our learners, in this section I consider the rich variety of possibilities for language-based tasks in writing classrooms that arise from examining how writers use linguistic resources for different kinds of writing and for different communicative goals. In addition, I offer questions to consider for some of the challenges developing writers face in working with sources and in developing writing fluency and accuracy.

Written discourse can, of course, include everything from very informal language, such as that used in some email or blog posts, to the formal genres of much academic and professional writing. While in most classroom contexts instruction is focused on the more formal, academic kinds of writing, even these contexts should give students opportunities to examine and compare the grammar of formal and informal registers of written English.

With a course syllabus in hand that defines the kinds of writing students will be reading and writing, writing teachers might consider the following questions to guide their planning, selection, and creation of activities that include some focus on form.

What grammatical structures do writers use to make meaning, create connections, and express stance in particular writing tasks? As Hyland (2004b) points out in *Genre and Second Language Writing*, "The forms students need often remain elusive as they cannot make connections between the grammar they study and the meanings these items express in the context of a particular genre" (p. 68). For Hyland, the term *genre* refers to a way of grouping texts together for the purpose of "representing how writers typically use language to respond to recurring situations" (p. 4). Some examples of genres often assigned in school settings are essays, narratives, procedures, problem-solution texts, lab reports, and research papers. Each of these could, of course, be further classified into subgenres such as the argumentative essay or the history research paper. In business writing contexts, genres include memos, letters, proposals, and personnel and financial reports.

While genre-based approaches to writing involve much more than attention to language structures, some approaches, such as systemic functional linguistics (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004) and English for specific purposes (Swales, 1990), have described not only the larger structures that make up a text type, such as a chapter from a science textbook or a research paper, but also the linguistic structures involved in expressing form-meaning relationships. For example, Swales and other scholars have identified and provided explanations for patterns of verb tenses and active versus passive verb use in the different sections of research writing across disciplines.

Researchers in corpus linguistics (e.g., Biber, 1988) have identified grammatical features and clusters of features typically used in particular kinds of writing. Biber's analysis, for example, characterizes the grammar of non-narrative writing (i.e., texts that are not temporally organized) as using present tense verbs, past participle clauses, and longer and more elaborate noun phrases than those that occur in narrative communication. Reynolds (2005) found that writers in fifth-through eighth grade ESL classes differed from students in L1 language arts classes in their linguistic fluency, which he defined as "the use of linguistic structures appropriate to rhetorical and social purposes" (p. 19). Proponents of genre-based and corpus-based approaches to grammar in writing stress that a focus on language forms for particular genres should not be equated with teaching "formulas" for writing or conveying a view of written texts as static sets of language rules. Such a focus simply acknowledges that certain patterns of rhetorical strategies, such as definition, often occur in particular text types and that L2 writers, just like L1 writers, need control of the forms typically used to express these functions.

As for the role of grammar in creating connections between different parts of a text, these connections, commonly referred to as *cohesion*, contribute to coherence at many levels of text structure. Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2000) point out that, while text coherence involves top-down planning and organization, "a well-written text has to conform to more local and specific features of the text, such as . . . appropriate use of cohesive devices" (p. 152). Grammatical cohesive devices in English include personal pronouns such as *it* and *they*, demonstrative determiners and pronouns such as *this* and *these*, the definite article *the* + [noun], and logical connectors such as *however* and *thus*.

Although most L2 classes deal with these structures at various stages, the structures used to create cohesion vary depending on text types, levels of formality, and goals of information emphasis and focus, posing a significant challenge for ESL writers who may have learned a small set of connectors that they tend to overuse, such as *in addition* and *however*, or that they use inappropriately in a given rhetorical context, such as beginning a sentence with *therefore* to end a paragraph even though the sentence does not express a result. Hinkel (2002) has found that L2 writers tend to rely on simple conjunctions, exemplification markers, and demonstrative pronouns in establishing text cohesion, devices appropriate for personal narratives but less so for other writing tasks. Studies reported by Leki, Cumming, and Silva (2008) have found that L2 writers tended to use more conjunctive ties (e.g., *moreover* and *on the other hand*) and fewer lexical ties (e.g., synonyms, antonyms, and classifier nouns such as *issue* or *solution*). As learners advance in educational levels, they find that their writing tasks involve complex patterns of cohesion, often combining grammatical cohesive devices with lexical ones in structures. For example, the prepositional phrase *contrary to this widely held view* consists of a complex preposition expressing a logical relationship (*contrary to*), a demonstrative

pronoun (*this*), and a classifier noun (*view*), all of which serve as cohesive devices linking to previous information. Given the many types of cohesion in general and the complexity of the reference system in particular, L2 writers clearly need to examine how cohesion is used in actual texts and get meaningful practice and feedback with these structures.

A final consideration in the role of grammar to convey meanings and intentions is that of expressing stance and qualifying or hedging assertions. Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad, and Finegan (1999) define *stance* as the ways in which writers and speakers "commonly express personal feelings, attitudes, value judgments, or assessments" (p. 966). The type of stance most focused on in ESL writing pedagogy has been epistemic stance, which marks "certainty (or doubt), actuality, precision or limitation" (p. 972). Stance markers and hedging devices used to qualify statements include a wide range of grammatical structures: adjectives (*certain, unlikely*), adverbs (*typically, possibly*), verbs (*seems, appears*), and modals (*may, might*), among others. Hedging qualifiers also include frequency adverbs (*usually, sometimes*) and determiners (*many, some*). Studies on stance in L2 writing have identified problems with appropriate use of hedges to qualify generalizations. Hinkel (2004) noted that such problems may stem from a lack of these kinds of hedges in the writer's L1 rhetorical tradition. She also observed that L2 writers may transfer conversational strategies involving overstatement or exaggeration (e.g., *students always study hard*) that are unacceptable in formal writing. L2 writing teachers have observed that less advanced students may front their sentences with probability hedges such as *maybe* or *perhaps* (e.g., *Maybe unemployment rates will drop by the end of the year*) as a simplification strategy rather than using modal verbs (e.g., *may, might*) or introductory adjective phrases (e.g., *it is possible that*) that are more typically found in academic prose.

How do linguistic features of writing tasks (and associated readings) differ from students' everyday language and other kinds of writing? As discussed earlier in Gibbons's (2006a) study of Australian fifth-graders writing science reports, learners need opportunities to talk about and compare the language they use for their everyday interactions, including both spoken and written (e.g., text messaging) interactions, as well as the language of other kinds of writing with which they are familiar: blogs on the Internet, newspaper articles, and academic registers. Responding to this question may require some language analysis on the part of the instructor, but the question also suggests that students can themselves become explorers of language differences in different registers and text types.

What kinds of grammatical practice can help develop writers' overall fluency? Grammar also plays an important role in helping writers expand their repertoire of linguistic choices (i.e., their syntactic fluency). Hinkel (2003) presented the findings of a corpus analysis of L1 and L2 college writers' texts, which revealed that the L2 writers "employed excessively simple syntactic and lexical constructions" more often than the L1 writers did in their texts (p. 275). Silva (1993) concludes from his extensive review of L2 writing research that composition teachers need to work with their students on "potentially unfamiliar textual patterns," helping them build their lexical and grammatical resources. Thus, tasks designed to develop linguistic fluency should help learners understand the forms and functions of lexicogrammatical patterns and provide practice in which they can consider options for expressing meaning and principles for their selections. As an example, consider the ways in which writers express causality. Developing writers are usually familiar with the subordinate conjunctions *because* and *since* when combining clauses to express this relationship in sentences such as the following:

> *Because* more people in India are migrating to cities, the demand for automobiles is rising.

In academic writing, however, authors often use a variety of structures to express such meaning, including complex prepositions such as *because of* and *thanks to* and verbs that more precisely express the relationship such as *contribute, force,* or *trigger.* Such choices sometimes require complex constructions that are less familiar in everyday English, as in the following examples that paraphrase the original sentence:

> *Because* of increased migration to cities in India, the demand for automobiles is rising.
>
> Increasing migration to cities in India *has led to a* rising demand for automobiles.
>
> A rising demand for automobiles in India *has been triggered by* increased migration to cities.

In these examples, we see that the choices for expressing causality may require denser nominalizations (*increasing migration to cities in India*), prepositions that collocate with particular verbs (*to* with the verb *lead*), or a passive verb (*has been triggered*) when the result is expressed in the subject phrase (*rising demand for automobiles*). While these examples are all simple sentences (in terms of having only one clause), their structure is much more complex than the original complex sentence with the *because* clause.

Writers' choices of structures will depend on many factors, including the topic, the writer's stance toward the topic, and the writer's familiarity with a variety of structural options in academic English.

What kinds of grammar focus can help writers develop their ability to paraphrase and summarize source materials? In many composition classes, especially those focused on academic English, writing assignments require analysis and synthesis of a variety of source materials. Some writers who perform well in writing independent of source materials (for example, in producing a personal narrative) may encounter considerable difficulty in accurately and appropriately paraphrasing and summarizing ideas from source materials.(See also Weigle, this volume.)

Research on ESL writers' paraphrase and summary strategies has shown that they often depend on "patchwork" and near-copying strategies, resulting in unacceptable textual borrowing (Keck, 2006; Pecorari, 2003). While the processes of paraphrasing and summarizing are complex acts, drawing on background/content knowledge, rhetorical skills, and vocabulary knowledge, the ability to change and manipulate lexicogrammatical structures (e.g., changing word forms and using appropriate syntactic collocations) also contributes to this important academic skill. Simply telling learners to "use your own words" or having them study examples of "bad" and "good" paraphrases fails to provide the kinds of guided scaffolding that developing writers need to produce acceptable paraphrases and summaries. Writing instructors should consider guided vocabulary and grammar "pre-paraphrasing" activities for specific writing assignments and for developing learners' lexicogrammatical knowledge base. As illustrated in the Classroom Applications section of this chapter, teachers can ask students to rewrite sentences using a specific word or phrase not in the original that will require changing the syntax of the sentence (e.g., changing the reporting verb *told* to *said*, which will prompt a *that*-clause complement rather than an object + infinitive clause):

> The project director *told them to review the plans.* (*told* → *said*)
>
> Rewrite: The project director *said that they should review the plans.*

How can the teacher help writers develop grammatical knowledge for linguistic accuracy and strategies for effective editing? The special needs of ESL writers in achieving grammatical accuracy have been the focus of much L2 writing research and grammar-based teaching materials for decades. Silva (1993) concludes that L2 writers may need to draft in stages, separating revising (rhetorical) work from editing. For the most part, this is an area of concern for all writers beyond elementary school level. The learner variables described in this chapter, as well as others, will play an important role in determining what kinds of explicit instruction and activities are most appropriate. As Little (1994) has stated, a high level of correctness is required for effective communication in formal written discourse, and native as well as non-native English speakers often use explicit knowledge, either from memory or reference books, when they are planning, monitoring, and editing formal written discourse. In general, the teacher will want to assess a group's instructional needs or review common errors such as noun number, incorrect verb forms, or modals used for the wrong purposes. In the next section, I offer some specific suggestions for this type of focus.

Whatever the instructional objectives, the goal of developing writing proficiency should be at the forefront in making decisions about an explicit focus on grammar. In general, learners can benefit from activities that help them understand the role of grammatical structures in expressing meaning and creating connections. It bears repeating that an excessive focus on error not only promotes a limited perception of the role of grammar in communication but may create—or reinforce—negative attitudes about this very important component of L2 writing instruction.

CLASSROOM APPLICATIONS

Using grammar terminology in the writing classroom

Since terminology can be useful in providing learners with feedback on error patterns in their writing, teachers may need to assess individual learners' knowledge of basic grammatical terms. The instructor could give students a list of grammatical and syntactic terms (noun, subject, preposition, etc.) and ask the students to indicate in various ways (e.g., stars, checks, and question marks) the ones they know, the ones they have heard of but do not really understand, and the ones with which they are totally unfamiliar.

There will, of course, be some basic terms that the teacher will want all students to be familiar with to help them develop both fluency and editing skills. Terminology in general should be kept as simple as possible. For example, progressive verbs, gerunds, and present participles in adjective and adverb phrases might be distinguished as *–ing* verbs, *–ing* nouns, and *–ing* adjectives or adverbs, respectively. Infinitives could be referred to as *to* + verb. Relative clauses could be referred to as *which/who/that* adjective clauses. Such designations link grammatical functions with actual morphemes or words that students will see in writing so there is less need to memorize terms.

Text-based activities: Noticing and text analysis

Writers at all levels of proficiency can benefit from learning how grammatical features and grammatical systems are used in authentic written texts. On the one hand, text-analysis tasks can help learners who are familiar with prescriptive grammar rules but who still have problems understanding and appropriately using grammatical oppositions such as present perfect and past tense verb forms. On the other hand, text analysis can also benefit learners with a mostly implicit knowledge of grammar rather than an explicit rule-based knowledge; these writers often need to learn more about the ways in which various genres of written English differ structurally from oral English forms. (See also McCarthy & O'Keeffe, this volume.) Text-based activities emphasize the interactions of reading and writing for learners and focus attention on form-function relationships and motivations for choosing particular structures.

In selecting a grammar focus, the writing teacher should consider the proficiency levels of students and the course objectives and writing tasks. The level of difficulty of a grammatical feature should not be far beyond the learners' developmental stages; for example, students struggling to produce well-formed relative clauses with subject relative pronouns (e.g., *the teacher who called me . . .*) will have difficulty with a lesson on object pronoun relative clauses (*the teacher to whom I gave my address*). This is not to say that new structures should never be introduced, but some consideration should be given to students' readiness to give attention to specific structures.

The sources of authentic texts will vary depending on the writing-course syllabus. The teacher can examine assigned texts to see what kinds of grammatical structures, contrasts, or systems are dominant and which contain forms that students will be able to use in their own writing.

In academic writing courses, assigned readings typically include examples of the kinds of writing expected of students. In these courses, the instructor will want to consider what grammatical features characterize these writings. This is true even for the academic writing required of younger learners. For example, descriptive science writing at the elementary level could require modifying phrases after nouns (e.g., a lizard *with a big head*) and possessive phrases (e.g., the *lizard's* tail) (Schleppegrell, 1998).

Assigned novels and short stories can also offer good opportunities for grammar-focused activities. Students can identify grammatical features such as adjective word order, article usage, or sentence types and, in some cases, compare these structures to their usage in other kinds of writing.

The following considerations may serve as guidelines for selecting grammatical points.

- The grammatical features should be appropriate for students' developmental levels.
- The grammatical features should reflect students' writing needs for the course or for future writing.
- When possible, assigned course readings should be sources of text analysis so that grammar focus is integrated with other prewriting activities.

- The lessons should generally be kept brief, especially for less advanced writers.
- The instructor may want to enhance the texts by underlining certain elements or making them boldface, especially those that are not very salient for some learners.

Productive tasks should follow text analysis so that writers have opportunities to practice the explicit knowledge gained from noticing grammatical features in written texts and so that teachers are able to assess what students have learned from the text-analysis tasks.

Sample text-analysis lessons

The following are a few examples of lessons that focus on grammatical features in texts. For each, assume that the guidelines just discussed have been considered.

Tense and time frame shifts. L2 writers are often confused about the motivations for verb tense shifts and believe that they should not change verb tenses (e.g., from present to present perfect) or time frames (e.g., from present to past). Following a review of the reasons why writers shift verb tenses and time frames, the teacher can give students a passage with selected verbs underlined and numbered. Students identify the tense and time frame (e.g., past progressive tense, past time frame) for each underlined verb and explain any verb tense shifts (e.g., to support a claim about the present with examples from the past). They also note adverbs or adverb phrases that signal time frame shifts (e.g., *last year*). As a follow-up, students examine a text they have written recently to identify tense shifts and reasons.

"Unpacking" meanings in sentences in context. When writers encounter densely packed information in their reading assignments, rephrasing the information in less complex ways can help them not only with their reading but also with productive writing tasks, including paraphrasing. Schleppegrell (2009) offers an excellent illustration of this activity using a sentence from an 11th-grade history book:

> The destruction of the buffalo and removal of Native Americans to reservations emptied the land for grazing cattle.

The abstract nominalizations in the subject can be unpacked by teachers (and advanced learners) and expressed as several clauses to interpret the causal meanings, to supply the previously stated information, and to demonstrate how the phrase is used as a linguistic resource for developing an explanation. Schleppegrell offers this paraphrase of the nominalizations in the subject:

> Settlers and hunters killed all the buffalo, and the government forced all the Native Americans to leave their lands and move to reservations.

As a class activity, advanced students could work in pairs or groups to deconstruct the meanings of abstract noun phrases, rewriting them as clauses. Later they might look at their own drafts and consider the reverse process, condensing clauses into abstract noun phrases with modifiers to create links to previous text.

While some may object to the nominalized style of much academic language, English learners continually encounter these and other complex structures in their reading, and these structures are often important in establishing cohesion. In activities that promote noticing structures and the discourse motivations for them that differ from everyday language, learners can build linguistic resources and make selections appropriate for a specific rhetorical context.

Identifying cohesive devices. Using an assigned reading or other passage, the instructor could lead students in identifying the different kinds and chains of cohesion (pronouns, demonstrative pronouns, sentence connectors, lexical cohesion, etc.). Figure 1 provides a brief example, with the cohesive words and phrases in italics.

Another task for developing understanding of cohesive devices asks students to consider several syntactic structures with essentially the same meaning and to choose the structure that best links new information to what has been stated previously. This type of exercise focuses students' attention on how features such as pronouns, partial repetition, and passive voice interact to create information flow.

In the example in Figure 2, students are asked to indicate the best choices with check marks. This activity emphasizes the importance of context in making grammatical choices and shows how cohesion and coherence result from presenting information that is familiar to the reader at the beginning of the sentence, followed by the new information the writer wants to convey.

Text	Examples of cohesive devices
It appears that human beings are unique in *their* ability to keep time to music. *This ability* may result from evolutionary adaptation. *In addition, musical timing* may be related to the importance of *timing* in speech sounds. *For example,* music scientist Aniruddh D. Patel notes that the difference between *a B and a P* in English is a difference in *timing* produced by the *sound.*	Lexical cohesion: *ability, musical timing, timing, a B and a P, sound* Reference words: *their* (human beings), *this* (ability), *the* (sound) Sentence connectors: *in addition, for example*

Figure 1. Examples of cohesive devices (adapted from Belluck, 2011).

To create such mini-exercises, the teacher could select from a text two sentences in which the second one is linked to the first by grammatical cohesion. The second sentence would then serve as one of the two choices (a) or (b); the teacher can simply re-order the information in the original sentence to produce the other option.

Comparing language differences across genres or text types. Students can examine two texts on the same topic but written in different genres to identify what grammatical or lexicogrammatical features distinguish them. Typically these will be texts for different audiences, such as a newspaper article on medical research for a nonspecialist audience contrasted with a medical journal article for specialists in a particular field. For texts whose levels of formality differ distinctly, such as a film review in an informal blog contrasted with one published in a newspaper, differences could include sentence structure types, use of first person, verb types (e.g., one-word vs. phrasal verbs; active vs. passive voice), and nominalizations.

Readings with authentic or fictional oral English, such as interviews or plays, can be rich sources for discussion of differences between spoken and written English, such as the use of fragments in spoken English versus complete sentences in formal written English.

Expressing stance: Hedging. As noted earlier, increasing attention has been given to the ways in which writers qualify assertions. Following instruction on the types of hedging structures, students can look for words and phrases that writers use to qualify their assertions in a variety of texts.

Advanced writers can investigate the use of hedging devices in different genres and disciplines using corpus-based resources, including corpora created from texts in their disciplines and concordances freely available on the Internet, such as the Corpus of Contemporary American English.[1]

Choose the structure that best links new information to old information.

Decades ago, climatologists predicted that the continual warming of Earth's surface, commonly known as "the greenhouse effect," could have dramatic consequences.

1. ___ (a) The polar ice caps have been melting at a much faster rate than in the 1970s.
   ___ (b) One consequence has been the melting of the polar ice caps at a much faster rate than in the 1970s.
2. ___ (a) This rapid melting has, in turn, caused a rise in ocean levels.
   ___ (b) A rise in ocean levels has, in turn, been caused by this rapid melting.

Figure 2. Sample mini-exercise in coherence.

Guided production activities

Appropriate guided-writing activities can provide practice in noticing and using language structures that learners find difficult to produce or that they may not produce at all. Some of the guided-writing activities here offer follow-up practice to text analysis activities. Others target kinds of writing tasks that pose challenges to L2 writers, such as paraphrasing from sources or, as in the first sample activity, improving grammatical accuracy.

Dictation. Especially useful for less advanced students, dictation can be an effective way to familiarize students with the ways in which grammar and vocabulary interact in common collocations as well as to address errors in writing that may result

in part from mismatches between learners' aural perception of English forms and standard English grammar and spelling.

In one dictation procedure, the instructor reads aloud a short text several times, first at a normal pace with the students just listening and then with pauses after each phrase to allow students to write. During a third reading, at a normal pace, students review their texts and make corrections. The teacher then shows students the passage so that they can check their versions with the original and edit them further if needed. If the activity's main objective is error detection and correction, the instructor could give more specific directions, such as to put a circle at the ends of all words with missing *–s* third person singular or *–ed* endings. If the goal is to familiarize writers with particular grammatical features, students could be asked to highlight or underline them; the class could then discuss meanings and/or forms.

Creating cohesion. Following cohesion text analysis, the instructor can give students short passages in which the last sentence needs a cohesive phrase to link it to the preceding sentences. Here is an example:

> During the last decade, the use of cell phones while operating a motor vehicle has been a topic of increased concern. In particular, the sending or reading of text messages while driving is regarded as extremely distracting; such activities increase the risk of serious accidents. One experiment showed that texting while driving resulted in greater safety risks than driving drunk. _____, many people, especially teenagers, continue to send and check messages while driving.

In this example, students are asked to supply both a logical connector (e.g., a preposition such as *despite*) plus a reference phrase (e.g., *the dangers of cell phone use*). For less advanced learners, the instructor could create logical relationships that are easier for students to interpret. For example, a final sentence that expresses a result (*because of . . .*) or an addition (*in addition to . . .*) might be less difficult for students to complete. Instructors could also provide several choices of logical connectors and classifier nouns for the reference phrase and have the students select the best ones.

Writers can then look at their own drafts to see if there are places where cohesive links are needed or where existing ones might be revised to be clearer. For example, a phrase such as *these problems* might need a modifying phrase (e.g., *these problems with cyber-bullying on social networks*) to more clearly connect the new information to the preceding text.

Fluency development: Sentence combining. Sentence-combining tasks can help writers develop their repertoire of linguistic strategies for a number of purposes, including highlighting key information, subordinating less important information, and improving overall syntactic fluency. Sentence combining also serves to familiarize students with word co-occurrences needed for academic writing.

One of the most useful applications of sentence combining for advanced ESL writers involves work on revising drafts. With assistance, students can identify passages in their writing in which sentence combining could result in a better flow of information through clearer connections between ideas. As one example, when learning to reference sources by introducing authors and their work, developing writers may use separate sentences such as:

> Oliver Sacks is a neurologist. He wrote the article "Brilliant Light: A Chemical Boyhood." In this article, he describes how his "Uncle Tungsten" influenced his love of science.

A more experienced writer of academic prose would subordinate some of this information:

> In "Brilliant Light: A Chemical Boyhood," neurologist Oliver Sacks describes how his "Uncle Tungsten" influenced his love of science.

In this way, sentence-combining exercises can focus on particular rhetorical moves that students will need to master in academic writing. These moves include introducing sources, focusing information to emphasize key points in structures (e.g., subjects, verbs, and main clauses), and subordinating and embedding less important information (e.g., via modifying phrases and adverb or adjective clauses). To demonstrate this technique, the instructor could select a set of sentences from a student paper for the class to work together on combining. Sentence-combining work could be especially helpful in contexts in which instructors or tutors can meet individually with students for draft revision.

Guided paraphrase. One of the most important skills that students must develop for academic writing is the ability to paraphrase source materials to support claims and develop ideas. ESL/EFL writers often lack the facility with vocabulary and syntax to rephrase ideas in their own words; most experienced teachers are familiar with the distorted paraphrases that result when novice writers "slot" synonyms from a thesaurus into the original sentence without adjusting the grammar.

When we consider the strategies that experienced writers use in paraphrasing, some of them include the following grammatical or lexicogrammatical resources:

- Knowledge of word forms; ability to choose which form is needed for a particular context once a paraphrase has been started (e.g., *contribute* → *contribution; dramatic* → *dramatically*)
- Knowledge of different lexicogrammatical forms that express similar meanings (e.g., *because, as a result of*)
- Knowledge of syntactic collocation patterns such as functions of noun phrases (NPs) (e.g., *told* as a reporting verb followed by NP [someone] + NP [something])
- Knowledge of grammatical collocations such as verbs/adjectives + prepositions or verb + noun + preposition (e.g., *be concerned about, have an influence on*)

Writers can develop knowledge and facility in transforming structures by building word-family knowledge using charts such as in Figure 3, in which the instructor provides one or more forms of a word from an assigned text and students must fill in other forms that exist. More advanced learners can discover for themselves which forms exist and which do not. For less advanced learners, or to save time, instructors can shade the slots that will not have a word filled in.

Verb	Noun	Adjective	Adverb
	communication		
		successful	
imitate			
	comparison		
			precisely

Figure 3. Word-family exercise chart.

For each of the following, provide a synonym for the underlined adjective that is appropriate for the noun that follows it (the first one is done for you).

1. an important finding *significant*
2. potential problems _____
3. obvious differences _____
4. a rational excuse _____

Figure 4. Synonym exercise.

Students can practice substituting the correct forms for synonyms, given exercises such as the one in Figure 4, which draws its vocabulary from Hinkel's (2004) list of the most common academic adjectives and nouns.

In cued paraphrase exercises, writers transform sentences or parts of sentences from assigned readings using cues as the first step. The cues, which may be words or phrases, are designed to require syntactic restructuring in the paraphrase. Here is an example based on a sociology text about bystander intervention (Darley & Latané, 1973) with a possible transformation:

> Original: Even if a person defines an event as an emergency . . . *(decides)*
>
> Rewrite: Even if a person decides that an event is an emergency . . .

As students further transform the structure resulting from the guided paraphrase cues, changing vocabulary and structures more fully so that the final version is not too close to the original, this activity becomes a true composing task. Students should then work at transferring these strategies to future paraphrasing tasks.

Treatment of error

The discussion of grammar in writing in this chapter has emphasized the multidimensional aspects of grammar and the importance of form-focused instruction that does not center solely on errors. Grammar issues related to errors will,

however, arise in almost every ESL/EFL writing class and for ESL writers in mainstream classes as well. Teachers' classroom experiences as well as research have indicated that ESL writers expect and appreciate assistance in improving their language accuracy.

As much as possible, instructors want to focus work related to error correction on the kinds of accuracy problems students encounter in their writing. While this suggests attention to individual students' writing errors, it is often the case that a group of writers will have common problems at the word and sentence levels. Thus, instructors may want to consider not only a *reactive* focus on language errors but also a *proactive* one that targets common writing errors such as verb tenses, subject-verb agreement, noun number, and word forms. As Ferris (2011) noted, even those who oppose error correction by teachers acknowledge that "there may be a legitimate role for strategy training and grammar instruction as an alternative means to helping students edit their writing" (p. 122).

In form-focused instruction related to errors, it is important that student writers consider *why* accuracy is an integral part of effective communication. Some students may regard the need for linguistic accuracy as relatively unimportant or rely on tutors or teachers (or perhaps classmates) to correct their language errors. So initially, the teacher may want to discuss why attention to accuracy in grammatical structures is important in meeting reader expectations for a variety of contexts, both academic and professional.

Editing strategies and techniques. The benefits of focused work on diagnosing errors and developing editing strategies will certainly vary for students, depending on many complex variables involving the learners, the teacher's knowledge and experience in pedagogical grammar, and the writing context. Depending on the students' levels and course objectives, the following kinds of activities may be help students to focus on linguistic accuracy:

- Diagnostic essays administered at the beginning of a class help instructors identify both individual writers' error patterns and errors common to a group of writers, which can then be the focus of explicit instruction during the course.
- Following review of a grammatical structure, students can edit short texts with specific kinds of errors (e.g., plural nouns lacking *–s* endings and noncount nouns with plural marking).
- The instructor can collect examples of the same type of error, such as verb tense errors, taken from student writing and ask students to identify and correct them as a group activity.
- For errors with a great deal of variation, such as word choices, the instructor can provide explanations of the common sources for such errors. Students can then assess whether these sources are ones they may need to check in their drafts.

Most ESL writers need to devote considerable time and effort to becoming good editors. Otherwise, many will fail to benefit from classroom exercises and practice or even from individual conferences. Students should be encouraged to explore different strategies to find ones that serve them effectively.

Teacher feedback on errors. Another significant issue related to language errors in writing is, of course, teacher feedback on student writing. The following are some general guidelines and suggestions for providing feedback on grammar.

- At the beginning of a course, the teacher can provide students with an error-analysis sheet based on in-class writing that identifies types and error patterns.
- The teacher should use indirect feedback to correct errors, which is generally more useful (and often more desired by students) than the direct correction of errors. Indirect feedback could involve one or more of the following: putting a check in the margin of the lines where errors occur; underlining or highlighting selected errors; coding errors in the margins, above selected errors, or through track changes with symbols such as *vt* for verb tense, *wf* for word form, *art* for article; and attaching a sheet to the writer's draft with a list of several structural errors along with suggested Internet resources to consult for more information on the grammatical system or feature.
- The teacher should not provide feedback on all errors in any one piece of writing—this can be overwhelming to students. Instead, he or she should focus on those most in need of attention. Deciding which errors most

deserve attention requires consideration of many student variables (e.g., metalinguistic knowledge and proficiency level) and the instructional situation. Errors to be pointed out may be those representing an individual's frequent error patterns, those that most seriously affect communication, those that are socially stigmatizing (e.g., use of double negatives), or those that the teacher has focused on in class work.

- While the bulk of teacher feedback on errors should occur in later stages of the writing process, the teacher can alert students to areas of concern in early drafts also so that all the error feedback is not given in the last draft, when many students find they lack sufficient time to address it effectively.

If the teaching environment permits conferencing with students outside of class, conferences are excellent opportunities to provide individual help. Alternatively, the teacher can hold mini-conferences with individuals or small groups in the classroom. In conferences, the teacher can demonstrate directly the difficulties a reader might have as a result of the grammatical errors in the students' writing. This setting allows the teacher to act as a collaborator rather than as an error detector/corrector. He or she can help students identify errors that create reader confusion or misinterpretation, explore the strategies for editing that best fit the writers' learning styles, set goals for improvement, and assess progress in these goals. Students can also provide insight into the sources of error, ones that a teacher might not even have considered, such as interference from a third language or an inaccurately formulated "rule." When students are able to analyze their error sources, the teacher can more effectively suggest editing strategies.

FUTURE TRENDS

ESL/EFL writing pedagogy will certainly continue to change as the result of new research in related areas such as L2 acquisition, rhetoric and composition, linguistics, education, and psychology. And sociopolitical and sociolinguistic developments will no doubt cause us to reconsider long-held views about language and language teaching. Increased globalization and the development of World Englishes are increasingly challenging long-held notions about Standard English(es). The growing non-native English-speaking immigrant populations in English-speaking countries, especially in institutions of higher education, raise questions about what the expectations about "linguistic correctness" should be, even in formal written English. At the advanced academic and professional levels of writing, researchers and educators are increasingly considering the ways in which multilingual writers are contributing to the creation of literary, journalistic, and academic genres and, as such, are changing how we view what is appropriate in different contexts.

Rapidly developing computer technology and applications of corpus linguistics offer resources for form-focused language instruction that were undreamed of in decades past. In particular, corpus linguistics findings have revealed the complex interrelationships between grammar and the lexicon and the variation of lexicogrammatical patterns across registers. All these areas raise issues that writing teachers will need to be aware of and reflect on in making decisions about the role of grammar in their writing classrooms.

CONCLUSION

This chapter's discussion of grammar in writing supports the view that L2 writers need to pay attention to form in developing writing proficiency. Exploring the ways in which writers use language in various genres and text types to create meanings, connections, and voice, combined with meaningful productive practice, can help L2 writers develop their linguistic resources and gain a better understanding of how to use them. In the case of error correction and feedback, L2 writing teachers can help students understand the role of accuracy in effective communication and develop editing strategies that they can carry forward beyond their classroom tasks.

SUMMARY

- Given the important role of grammar as a resource for effective communication, focus on form should be an integral part of the instructional design for L2 writing classrooms.

- Learner variables to be considered in designing grammar-based activities include age and educational backgrounds in learning English.
- The specific objectives, readings, and writing tasks in a composition class will influence greatly how grammar can be integrated with writing.
- Because grammar interacts with the lexicon in important ways, focus-on-form instruction should integrate grammar and vocabulary when relevant.
- Both text analysis and the use of corpora and concordances in class will enhance productive practice and offer learners opportunities to develop grammatical awareness.
- The treatment of error remains an important concern in L2 writing instruction, especially for writers at more advanced levels; instructors can help L2 writers to be responsible for the discovery and correction of their frequent error patterns.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. In what ways has the role of grammar in writing instruction been characterized? How do the different attitudes about grammatical instruction in composition reflect different ways of defining what grammar means?
2. How can grammar instruction be considered compatible with approaches that focus on writing as a process or with writing as a social activity?
3. What is the role of text analysis in developing grammatical competence in writing?
4. If one of your students expressed disappointment that you did not correct all the errors in his or her final drafts, how would you respond?
5. What are some advantages of teacher-student conferences in helping students with grammatical problems in writing?

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES

1. Evaluate one or more grammar-oriented exercises in an ESL composition textbook or workbook. Use the following criteria:
   a. What do the objectives of the exercises appear to be? Do you think they are pedagogically sound?
   b. Is the exercise text-based? If not, do you think it is still appropriate for its purpose?
   c. Does the language seem authentic?
   d. If the exercise is included in a content-based or rhetorical framework (e.g., as part of a unit on persuasive writing), is it clearly and appropriately related to the discourse of that context?
   e. If the exercise is not part of a larger writing context, for what aspect of writing instruction do you think it would be appropriate?
   f. Does the level of difficulty seem appropriate for the intended learners?
   g. Based on the previous criteria and any others you think relevant, summarize the strengths and weaknesses of the exercise or exercises.
2. Write a reflective essay or journal entry on your own experiences with grammar in writing as a second/foreign language learner. To what extent was grammar associated primarily with diagnosing and correcting errors in your own second/foreign language writing? To what extent were you aware of the ways in which expanding your grammatical knowledge helped you improve your linguistic resources to express your ideas?
3. Examine several ESL/EFL compositions that have frequent and varied grammatical errors. For each composition, identify two of the most frequent or serious errors. Using the suggestions in the chapter, describe exercises or activities that will help the writer to address these grammatical problems.
4. Interview ESL writing teachers about the techniques, both oral and written, that they have used to provide feedback on grammatical errors in their students' writing. During what stages of composing processes do they address errors? Which error feedback and/or correction techniques have they found to be most effective? What student variables have affected the success of techniques used?

FURTHER READING

Byrd, P., & Reid, J. (1998). *Grammar in the composition classroom: Essays on teaching ESL for college-bound students.* Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

This is a collection of essays offering theoretical discussion and practical information for incorporating

grammar in writing classes. It emphasizes learner-based approaches and selection of grammatical features based on corpus text analysis for teaching academic writing.

Ferris, D. (2011). *Treatment of error in L2 student writing* (2nd ed.). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

This volume provides a comprehensive overview of research on error feedback and other forms of grammar instruction. It discusses how teachers can prepare themselves to treat student error, describes error correction options, and other error treatment options such as revision and peer editing.

Frodesen, J., & Holten, C. (2003). Grammar in the ESL writing class. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 141–161). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

This chapter discusses the role of grammar in writing instruction for various stages of writing processes and offers practical suggestions and activities for the writing classroom.

Hinkel, E. (2004). *Teaching academic ESL writing: Practical techniques in vocabulary and grammar.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

This book reviews and discusses grammatical and lexicogrammatical structures important for academic writing instruction. It offers techniques for teaching writing using corpus-based material, including discourse functions such as text cohesion and hedging.

Schleppegrell, M. J. (2004). *The language of schooling.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

The author argues for an explicit focus on language in literacy development across disciplines and provides a functional description of school-based genres, describing how grammatical features construct texts in school genres, such as the academic essay, and in disciplinary genres.

ENDNOTE

[1] The Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) can be found at http://corpus.byu.edu/coca/