



A Review of Research on Languaging in Second Language Acquisition

Li Xin

Ocean University of China

Email: ovo87299@gmail.com

DOI: [10.33329/rjelal.14.1.379](https://doi.org/10.33329/rjelal.14.1.379)



Article info

Article Received: 20/02/2026
Article Accepted: 19/03/2026
Published online: 31/03/2026

Abstract

In recent years, languaging has garnered increasing scholarly attention as a pivotal construct in second language acquisition (SLA) research and pedagogy. Rooted in sociocultural theory, this paper offers a comprehensive review of the conceptualization and typology of languaging, while systematically tracing its theoretical underpinnings. It organizes the existing empirical literature around four principal dimensions: (1) the contribution of languaging to the acquisition of specific linguistic features; (2) its role in supporting L2 writing development; (3) its integration into diverse instructional frameworks; and (4) the learner-internal and contextual factors mediating its effectiveness in L2 learning environments. Beyond synthesizing the extant research, the paper identifies unresolved issues and conceptual gaps, advocating for a more dynamic, context-sensitive perspective on languaging as it unfolds in real-world educational settings. Future studies are encouraged to investigate the interactive languaging processes involving both learners and teachers, with particular emphasis on the co-construction of meaning in instructional discourse. Moreover, there is a continued need for longitudinal, fine-grained qualitative research that explores languaging within ecologically valid classroom contexts.

Key words: languaging; oral languaging; written languaging; second language acquisition.

1. Introduction

With the paradigmatic shift in SLA research from cognitive to sociocultural frameworks, languaging has attracted growing attention for mediating learning through language use (Swain & Lapkin, 1998; Suzuki, 2009; Ishikawa, 2013). Grounded in Vygotsky's (1986, 1987) sociocultural theory, research has

reconceptualized speaking and writing as cognitive tools for articulating thought, externalizing mental processes, and transforming tacit knowledge into explicit representations. Swain (2006) introduced "languaging" to describe meaning-making and knowledge construction via language, emphasizing its mediational role in cognitive development. Metalinguistic discourse –

linguaging about language – is thus a key mechanism for L2 learners to consolidate and deepen linguistic competence.

Since its conceptualization, languaging has been empirically examined across a wide range of instructional contexts, with accumulating evidence attesting to its positive role in facilitating L2 learning and development (e.g., Ishikawa & Révész, 2024). Despite these advancements, fundamental questions remain: What precise cognitive and pedagogical functions does languaging fulfill within SLA? How can it be systematically integrated into instructional practice to maximize learner engagement and optimize linguistic outcomes? To address these unresolved issues, the present paper offers a comprehensive synthesis of the theoretical underpinnings, typological dimensions, and empirical applications of languaging in SLA. It further identifies critical research gaps and delineates future directions, with particular emphasis on the need to explore how languaging manifests within authentic classroom interactions involving both learners and instructors. In doing so, this study seeks to inform the development of cognitively grounded and dialogically oriented pedagogical practices in contemporary second language education.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Definition and Classification of Languaging

Initially associated with oral discourse, languaging was defined by Swain (2006) as spoken language regulating L2 learners' cognitive development. Scholars have identified two oral subtypes: cooperative dialogue and private speech. Cooperative dialogue refers to interactive, problem-solving conversations where interlocutors co-construct meaning and negotiate linguistic forms (Swain & Watanabe, 2019), enabling learners to scaffold each other's cognition and deepen linguistic understanding. Private speech – self-directed verbalizations – helps learners regulate cognition and behavior,

rooted in Vygotsky's theory as overt or subvocal speech for attention guidance, performance monitoring, and autonomous problem-solving (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006).

Suzuki (2009) extended languaging to written forms in his doctoral research, defining "written languaging" as learners reflecting on and articulating language-related thoughts through writing (Suzuki, 2009; Niu & You, 2020). Such reflections are called "metanotes" – any written language (formal or informal) used to analyze or regulate linguistic choices (Ishikawa, 2013).

Suzuki and Storch (2020) note that L2 languaging can be spontaneous (e.g., self-talk during tasks, peer interaction) or researcher-elicited (prompted oral/written explanations of linguistic reasoning). Based on form and elicitation, three research types emerge: (1) collaborative dialogue, (2) self-directed speech (spontaneous or elicited), and (3) written languaging.

2.2 Theoretical Framework of Languaging

The construct of languaging is deeply rooted in Vygotsky's (1986, 1987) sociocultural theory (SCT), which posits language as a fundamental mediational means in the development of human cognition. From this perspective, thought does not preexist independently of language; rather, it is shaped and formed through linguistic mediation. In Vygotsky's view, the internalization of socially mediated language enables individuals to regulate both thought and behavior, thereby fostering higher-order cognitive development (Vygotsky, 1987; Lantolf & Poehner, 2023).

Drawing on these theoretical insights, Swain (2006) advanced the notion that language functions not merely as a medium of communication but also as a tool of the mind. She argued that both speaking and writing serve as means through which learners mediate and restructure their cognitive activity. Specifically, she maintained that engaging in languaging –

whether oral or written – during language learning tasks promotes L2 development by externalizing mental activity and transforming it into a tangible product that can be subsequently reflected upon.

Swain identified a twofold mechanism through which languaging contributes to learning. First, learners externalize their thoughts through language, thereby rendering implicit knowledge explicit. Second, these externalized forms—whether spoken utterances or written metanotes – become artifacts that learners can return to, modify, or further elaborate, resulting in recursive cycles of reflection and learning. In this sense, languaging is both a process and a product: it not only facilitates the construction of meaning in real time but also generates linguistic output that can serve as the basis for further cognitive and metacognitive engagement (Swain, 2006).

2.3 Empirical Studies on Languaging

As noted in previous sections, a growing body of second language acquisition (SLA) research has provided substantial empirical evidence supporting the facilitative role of oral languaging in language development (Suzuki & Storch, 2020). Building on Suzuki's (2009) pioneering work, subsequent investigations have gradually extended this line of inquiry to explore the pedagogical efficacy of written languaging, with findings increasingly indicating its potential to enhance learners' metalinguistic awareness and promote L2 development.

To obtain a comprehensive overview of the empirical landscape, the present study conducted a systematic literature search targeting studies published between 2009 and 2025. Using the Web of Science Core Collection database, the keywords "languaging" in combination with "second language acquisition" or "second language learning" were employed. This initial search yielded eight relevant publications. To ensure the inclusion of additional pertinent studies, the reference lists

of the retrieved articles were further examined. Empirical studies that explicitly focused on the application of languaging within L2 learning contexts were selected based on their methodological rigor and thematic relevance. Ultimately, a total of 18 empirical studies were identified. These studies collectively address diverse dimensions of languaging in SLA and can be classified into several recurrent research themes, which will be systematically reviewed in the subsequent sections.

2.3.1 Languaging in the Acquisition of Specific Linguistic Features

Empirical research shows that peer-mediated, task-based cooperative dialogue creates a social environment for co-constructing learners' zones of proximal development (ZPD), a key SCT concept. Within this space, languaging – especially dialogic engagement – enables learners to externalize thoughts, deepen linguistic understanding, reorganize existing knowledge, and facilitate lexical and grammatical acquisition. For example, Sato and Angulo (2020) found that in collaborative writing, most learners used L1 not just as a shortcut but as a strategic tool to elaborate concepts, connect prior and new vocabulary, and discuss part-of-speech form and meaning (nouns, verbs, adjectives). Through L1, learners initiated conversations, tested linguistic hypotheses, evaluated solutions, and co-constructed meaning for deeper learning. However, participants were mostly advanced L2 learners, raising questions about applicability to lower-proficiency learners.

Toth et al. (2020) found that learners completing reading tasks frequently verbalized grammatical and semantic content, using existing knowledge to interpret novel structures. While this suggests languaging aids acquisition in collaborative dictation, reading, and translation, written languaging's effectiveness (vs. oral) remains debated, especially for L2 grammar. Ishikawa (2018) reported that learners using written languaging

in cooperative dictation showed greater delayed grammatical post-test gains, indicating written reflection enhances rule retention. Ishikawa and Suzuki (2016) found that learners using written languaging after reading about the English subjunctive scored higher on grammar tests than those doing traditional exercises or no languaging. However, Ishikawa (2013) noted that metanote use during translation improved grammar scores but not significantly more than no metanotes, questioning written languaging's consistency.

These mixed results suggest structured grammar tests may not fully capture actual grammatical competence (vs. task-specific performance). Future research should explore written languaging's nuanced role in acquiring diverse grammatical features across task types and target languages, expanding input and output modalities to clarify cognitive and affective mechanisms.

2.3.2 Languaging in L2 Writing

Empirical research on languaging in L2 writing can be categorized into text-oriented and process-oriented approaches. Text-oriented studies often adopt pretest–posttest designs, engaging learners in multi-stage writing tasks such as composing a draft, comparing it with model texts, or revising based on feedback. These studies provide evidence that written languaging can enhance the quality of written texts (e.g., Suzuki, 2009). Controlled experimental studies have further compared the relative effects of written languaging and indirect written corrective feedback (WCF) on revision quality (Fukuta et al., 2019), as well as the impact of written languaging under direct versus indirect WCF conditions (Niu & You, 2020). While most findings support the efficacy of written languaging in promoting accuracy during revision, results remain inconclusive regarding the optimal feedback type. Limited attention has been given to the role of written languaging across multiple rounds of revision (e.g., Moradian & Nasab, 2019), and further

research is needed to explore its effects on content development and to clarify the potential of oral languaging based on written feedback in improving overall writing quality.

In contrast to the outcome-oriented focus of text-based approaches, process-oriented studies have sought to uncover the cognitive and metacognitive mechanisms through which languaging mediates L2 writing, with particular emphasis on the dynamics of cooperative dialogue and private speech during the composition process. These studies typically segment writing into three interrelated phases—planning, drafting, and revising—and examine how learners' verbalizations during each phase contribute to the regulation of cognitive activity. For instance, Storch and Alshuraidah (2020) observed that peer-to-peer dialogue not only enabled learners to articulate their understanding of peer feedback but also fostered greater awareness of their own linguistic shortcomings, thereby scaffolding higher-order thinking and strategic language use. Similarly, Watanabe (2020) highlighted the significance of private speech—defined as self-directed talk that remains audible or subvocal—as a tool for cognitive monitoring and regulation. Learners who engaged in private speech while writing independently were better able to notice gaps in their knowledge, recall relevant rules, and integrate new input into their compositions, suggesting that intrapersonal languaging serves functions analogous to those of social dialogue.

While both dialogic and intrapersonal languaging contribute to the regulation of cognitive and linguistic activity, they differ in their interactive orientation: cooperative dialogue involves mediation through interlocutors, thereby enabling the co-construction of meaning, whereas private speech functions as an internalized cognitive tool that supports self-regulation and autonomous problem-solving. Nonetheless, both forms of languaging reflect the broader

theoretical claim—articulated by Swain (2006)—that verbalizing language-related problems and potential solutions, whether collaboratively or individually, deepens understanding by transforming tacit knowledge into explicit awareness. Thus, regardless of its modality or format, languaging represents a fundamental mechanism through which L2 learners engage with language not only as a communicative medium but also as a cognitive artifact for constructing and consolidating linguistic knowledge.

2.3.3 Languaging in L2 Instructional Approaches

In recent years, an emerging line of inquiry has explored the role of languaging within the frameworks of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) and Concept-Based Language Instruction (C-BLI). These studies commonly regard languaging as an externalized manifestation of cognitive activity, functioning as a diagnostic tool to assess learners' internalization of linguistic and conceptual knowledge, thereby serving as an indirect measure of instructional effectiveness. For instance, Basterrechea and Leeser (2019) investigated how learner proficiency influenced the quantity, type (lexical or grammatical), and outcome (correct, incorrect, or unresolved) of language-related episodes (LREs) involving the English third-person singular marker, during a dictogloss task administered to twelve pairs of adolescent EFL learners in a CLIL context. Their findings demonstrated a positive correlation between learner proficiency and both the frequency of LREs targeting the grammatical feature in question and the proportion of correctly resolved grammatical LREs. Nonetheless, the study's reliance on a standardized grammar post-test that was not specifically aligned with the languaging content raises concerns about the validity and sensitivity of the assessment in capturing the instructional impact.

In a more recent study, Qin et al. (2023) conducted a five-week investigation integrating a Schema for a Complete Orienting Basis of an Action (SCOBA) with languaging activities to examine the internalization process among 53 Chinese university-level EFL learners who received instruction on English modal verbs through a C-BLI approach. The results indicated that in the SCOBA drawing task, learners at higher proficiency levels tended to generate more abstract, systematic, and imitated representations of conceptual understanding, whereas learners at lower levels produced visualizations that were more concrete, fragmented, and emulated. In terms of oral languaging, both groups largely abandoned their prior reliance on simplified "rule of thumb" heuristics following the instructional intervention, with no substantial qualitative differences observed between the groups apart from a higher frequency of languaging units among more proficient learners. Additionally, written languaging performance exhibited more pronounced pre- to post-intervention changes in the lower-level group, particularly in their appropriation and application of SCOBA-related concepts. While these studies yield valuable insights into learner performance under different pedagogical models, they tend to overlook crucial mediating factors such as the instructional role of teachers, the dynamics of student-student interaction, and the influence of teacher-learner exchanges during the languaging process.

2.3.4 Factors Influencing the Effectiveness of Languaging in SLA

Previous studies have shown that the effectiveness of languaging in SLA is influenced by learner factors, including L2 proficiency, learner emotions, attitudes, language aptitude and other factors. Specifically, within the context of cooperative dialogue, a positive association has been observed between learners' second language proficiency and both the quantity of languaging episodes produced and the accuracy of subsequent revisions

(Basterrechea & Leaser, 2019). In addition, drawing upon the broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions (Fredrickson, 2001), Simard and Zuniga (2020) found that affective expressions embedded in written languaging were not only linked to error rates but also predictive of successful revision outcomes, with positive emotions correlating with greater revision success.

Given that written languaging entails a process of self-directed problem-solving wherein learners must independently identify and address linguistic difficulties, it has been hypothesized that learners with higher language aptitude – particularly those demonstrating greater grammatical sensitivity and inductive learning ability – may derive greater benefit from such activities. However, findings from recent studies (Ishikawa & Suzuki, 2023; Ishikawa & Révész, 2024) complicate this assumption. Spearman correlation analyses revealed that language analytic ability bore a stronger relationship to learning outcomes in conditions where learners did not engage in written languaging than in those where such engagement occurred. This unexpected pattern led the researchers to propose that written languaging may, to some extent, compensate for lower aptitude by scaffolding learners' noticing and reflection processes, thereby diminishing the relative influence of analytic ability on L2 development.

In parallel with learner-related factors, contextual variables have also been found to moderate the efficacy of languaging. These include the nature of the learning task and the interactional dynamics among learners (Storch & Alshuraidah, 2020; Rouhshad & Storch, 2016). For instance, Storch and Alshuraidah (2020) compared the quantity and quality of languaging episodes generated during two widely used instructional activities in L2 writing – collaborative writing and peer response. Analysis of the transcribed interactions revealed that collaborative writing elicited a higher number of languaging

episodes, suggesting that task design directly influences learners' metalinguistic engagement. Similarly, Rouhshad and Storch (2016) examined the interaction patterns of the same pairs of intermediate ESL learners across two modalities: face-to-face and computer-mediated collaboration (via Google Docs). Their findings indicated that the mode of interaction significantly affected the nature of collaboration, with face-to-face interactions fostering higher levels of collaboration and deeper engagement with language, whereas the online environment tended to elicit more cooperative but less linguistically focused exchanges.

Despite these valuable insights, relatively little attention has been devoted to examining how individual learner differences—such as motivational orientation, metacognitive strategy use, and self-regulation—interact with engagement in languaging processes. Future research is therefore warranted to systematically investigate how these internal characteristics mediate the cognitive and affective dimensions of languaging, with the ultimate aim of optimizing its pedagogical application in diverse L2 learning environments.

3. Future Directions

The foregoing discussion has outlined recent advancements in the application of languaging in second language acquisition (SLA) and has identified several limitations within the extant literature. Building upon these insights, the following four areas are proposed for future investigation in order to deepen and expand the field's theoretical and pedagogical development.

First, while many studies use standardized grammar tests (Ishikawa, 2018), future research should integrate contextualized, authentic communicative tasks to enhance ecological validity and improve real-world grammatical accuracy and performance.

Second, in L2 writing instruction, future studies should explore oral/written languaging's mediational role across pre-writing, drafting, and revision in classrooms. Most research focuses on final products; examining dynamic languaging functions will yield richer pedagogical insights. Languaging research should also expand beyond writing to listening, reading, and translation to clarify its broader applicability.

Third, existing research is learner-centered, neglecting teachers' role in L2 instruction. Future studies should examine teachers' languaging practices, how they scaffold learner languaging, and how languaging enhances classroom interaction. More attention should be paid to teacher-student/student-student dynamics and their impact on languaging quality/quantity.

Fourth, most studies focus on languaging's effects on vocabulary/grammar outcomes (Ishikawa, 2018), ignoring cognitive/affective processes. While some L2 writing research explores process (Storch & Alshuraidah, 2020; Watanabe, 2020), little is known about how individual language skills develop via languaging. Learner-internal variables (aptitude, emotions, strategies) are underexplored; future research should examine their interrelationships with languaging engagement.

Finally, with regard to research methodology, the overwhelming reliance on quantitative approaches has limited our understanding of the nuanced and process-oriented nature of languaging in SLA. There remains a pressing need for more qualitative, longitudinal case studies capable of capturing the developmental trajectories learners experience as they engage with specific L2 learning tasks. Existing case studies are often short in duration, typically spanning only two to six weeks (e.g., Toth et al., 2020), which constrains their ability to detect longer-term patterns and effects. Therefore, future research

should prioritize diachronic designs that track the evolving impact of languaging over extended periods and across varied instructional contexts, thereby offering more comprehensive insights into its role in L2 development.

4. Conclusion

This study has critically examined the current state of practical applications of languaging in second language acquisition (SLA), offering valuable insights that may inspire foreign language teachers, researchers, and learners to reconsider the intricate relationship between language and thought. By synthesizing recent findings and identifying key areas for further inquiry, this research provides theoretical and pedagogical guidance that may inform future developments in L2 teaching methodology. The application of languaging not only facilitates learners' internalization of linguistic knowledge but also fosters the development of communicative competence through metalinguistic reflection and strategic language use.

To advance the theoretical and practical utility of languaging in SLA, future research should move beyond controlled experimental contexts and engage more deeply with authentic classroom environments. Greater emphasis should be placed on the role of individual learner differences—such as language aptitude, emotional states, and learning strategies—as well as on the multifaceted functions of teachers within the languaging process. Furthermore, large-scale quantitative investigations, complemented by longitudinal case studies, are needed to capture both the immediate and sustained effects of languaging on language learning. Such methodological diversification will be essential in advancing a more comprehensive understanding of languaging as a dynamic, context-sensitive, and learner-centered pedagogical tool in L2 education.

References

- Basterrechea, M., & Leaser, M. J. (2019). Language-related episodes and learner proficiency during collaborative dialogue in CLIL. *Language Awareness, 28*(2), 97–113.
- DiCamilla, F., & Lantolf, J. (1994). The linguistic analysis of private writing. *Language Sciences, 16*(3–4), 347–369.
- Ellis, R. (2004). The definition and measurement of L2 explicit knowledge. *Language Learning, 54*, 227–275.
- Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist, 56*(3), 218–226.
- Fukuta, J., Tamura, Y., & Kawaguchi, Y. (2019). Written languaging with indirect feedback in writing revision: Is feedback always effective? *Language Awareness, 28*(1), 1–14.
- Ishikawa, M. (2013). Examining the effect of written languaging: The role of metanotes as a mediator of second language learning. *Language Awareness, 22*(3), 220–233.
- Ishikawa, M. (2015). Metanotes (written languaging) in a translation task: Do L2 proficiency and task outcome matter? *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, 9*(2), 115–129.
- Ishikawa, M. (2018). Written languaging, learners' proficiency levels and L2 grammar learning. *System, 74*, 50–61.
- Ishikawa, M., & Révész, A. (2020). L2 learning and the frequency and quality of written languaging. In W. Suzuki & N. Storch (Eds.), *Languaging in language learning and teaching: A collection of empirical studies* (pp. 219–240). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Ishikawa, M., & Révész, A. (2024). Written languaging, language aptitude, and L2 learning through dictogloss tasks. In S. Li (Ed.), *Individual differences and task-based language teaching* (pp. 144–160). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Ishikawa, M., & Suzuki, W. (2016). The effect of written languaging on learning the hypothetical conditional in English. *System, 58*, 97–111.
- Ishikawa, M., & Suzuki, W. (2023). Effects of written languaging on second language learning: Mediating roles of aptitude. *Modern Language Journal, 107*, 95–112.
- Lantolf, J., & Poehner, M. (2014). *Sociocultural theory and the pedagogical imperative in L2 education: Vygotskian praxis and the research/practice divide*. Routledge.
- Lantolf, J., & Poehner, M. (2023). Sociocultural theory and classroom second language learning in the East Asian context: Introduction to the special issue. *Modern Language Journal, 107*, 3–23.
- Lantolf, J., & Qin, L. (2018). Sociocultural theory: Its philosophical foundation, disciplinary features, paradigm and method. *Foreign Languages and Their Teaching, (01)*, 1–18.
- Lantolf, J., & Thorne, S. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Oxford University Press.
- Moradian, M. R., & Nasab, M. H. (2019). Revisiting the role of indirect written corrective feedback in the light of written languaging. *Teaching English Language, 13*(2), 79–95.
- Niu, R., & You, X. (2020). Effects of indirect corrective feedback with and without written languaging on L2 written accuracy: A multitask intervention study. *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher, 29*(4), 343–351.
- Qin, L., Ouyang, X., & Ren, W. (2023). Decoding EFL learners' internalization of English modal verbs in concept-based language instruction: Integrating SCOBAs with languaging. *Modern Language Journal, 107*, 24–45.
- Rouhshad, A., & Storch, N. (2016). A focus on mode: Patterns of interaction in face-to-face and computer-mediated context. In M. Sato & S. Ballinger (Eds.), *Peer interaction and second language learning: Pedagogical potential and research agenda* (pp. 267–289). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Sato, M., & Angulo, I. (2020). The role of L1 use by high-proficiency learners in L2 vocabulary development. In W. Suzuki & N. Storch (Eds.), *Languaging in language learning and teaching: A collection of empirical studies* (pp. 41–66). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Simard, D., & Zuniga, M. (2020). Exploring the mediating role of emotions expressed in L2 written languaging in ESL learner text revisions. In W. Suzuki & N. Storch (Eds.), *Languaging in language learning and teaching: A collection of empirical studies* (pp. 287–307). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Storch, N. (2013). *Collaborative writing in L2 classrooms*. Multilingual Matters.
- Storch, N., & Alshuraidah, A. (2020). Languaging when providing and processing peer feedback. In W. Suzuki & N. Storch (Eds.), *Languaging in language learning and teaching: A collection of empirical studies* (pp. 111–128). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Suzuki, W. (2009). *Languaging, direct correction, and second language writing: Japanese university students of English* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto).
- Suzuki, W., & Itagaki, N. (2009). Languaging in grammar exercises by Japanese EFL learners of differing proficiency. *System*, 37(2), 217–225.
- Suzuki, W., & Storch, N. (2020). *Languaging in language learning and teaching: A collection of empirical studies*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Swain, M. (2006). Languaging, agency and collaboration in advanced second language proficiency. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Advanced language learning: The contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky* (pp. 95–108). Continuum.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together. *Modern Language Journal*, 82(3), 320–337.
- Toth, P., Moranskii, K., Shaffer, A., & Mattson-Prieto, R. (2020). Languaging and grammatical terminology. In W. Suzuki & N. Storch (Eds.), *Languaging in language learning and teaching: A collection of empirical studies* (pp. 55–67). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language*. MIT Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1987). *The collected works of L. S. Vygotsky: Thinking and speaking*. Plenum Press.
- Watanabe, Y. (2020). Talking to self while writing: Second-language writers' languaging processes and reflections. In W. Suzuki & N. Storch (Eds.), *Languaging in language learning and teaching: A collection of empirical studies* (pp. 198–215). John Benjamins Publishing Company.