ROSÂNGELA GUIMARÃES SEBA

FROM COLLABORATIVE WRITING TO READING COMPREHENSION: A CASE STUDY ON FOCUS ON FORM THROUGH COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUE AS A MEANS TO ENHANCE READING COMPREHENSION IN ENGLISH

NITERÓI
2008

ROSÂNGELA GUIMARÃES SEBA

FROM COLLABORATIVE WRITING TO READING COMPREHENSION: A CASE STUDY ON FOCUS ON FORM THROUGH COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUE AS A MEANS TO ENHANCE READING COMPREHENSION IN ENGLISH

Dissertação apresentada ao Curso de Pós-Graduação em Letras da Universidade Federal Fluminense, como requisito parcial para obtenção do Grau de Mestre em Letras. Área de Concentração: Estudos de Linguagem. Subárea: Lingüística Aplicada ao Ensino/Aprendizagem de Inglês como Língua Estrangeira.

Orientador: PROF. DR. NELSON MITRANO NETO

Niterói
2008

Ficha Catalográfica elaborada pela Biblioteca Central do Gragoatá

ROSÂNGELA GUIMARÃES SEBA

FROM COLLABORATIVE WRITING TO READING COMPREHENSION: A CASE STUDY ON FOCUS ON FORM THROUGH COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUE AS A MEANS TO ENHANCE READING COMPREHENSION IN ENGLISH

Dissertação apresentada ao Curso de Pós-Graduação em Letras da Universidade Federal Fluminense, como requisito parcial para obtenção do Grau de Mestre em Letras. Área de Concentração: Estudos de Linguagem. Subárea: Lingüística Aplicada ao Ensino/Aprendizagem de Inglês como Língua Estrangeira.

Aprovada em 26 / 03 / 2008

BANCA EXAMINADORA

_____
Prof. DR. NELSON MITRANO NETO - Orientador
Universidade Federal Fluminense (UFF)

_____
Prof. DR. REJANE TEIXEIRA VIDAL
Universidade Federal Fluminense (UFF)

_____
Prof. DR. JANAÍNA DA SILVA CARDOSO
Universidade Estadual do Rio de Janeiro (UERJ)

Niterói
2008

To my husband, who always believed in me, even
when I did not believe in myself.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

"It is through others that we develop into ourselves"

Vygotsky, 1981, p.161

ABSTRACT

Recent research in second language acquisition has acknowledged the importance of verbal interaction in the development of competence in the target language. Grounded in sociocultural theoretical framework (Vygostky, 1978) and based on the works of Swain and her associates (1985-2006), the present study aimed to investigate the effectiveness of collaborative dialogue with a conscious and spontaneous focus on form for the improvement of reading comprehension skills in English. According to Swain (2000), collaborative dialogue is knowledge-building dialogue (with others and/or with the self) which construes language not only as communication, but as a cognitive tool. It refers to spontaneous learners' talk about language in their attempt to solve a linguistic problem as they work collaboratively in small groups. Two voluntary EFL adult learners of an English for Academic Purposes (EAP) course from a university in the State of Espírito Santo, Brazil with an intermediate level of English proficiency participated in the research. Data were collected over a period of four regular classes (2h each), in which participants worked collaboratively on producing and reformulating tasks. Microgenetic qualitative analysis of the collaborative dialogue between the participants provided evidence of the focus of learners' negotiated interaction, and the writing and reading strategies they used while working on tasks. The findings confirm the postulates of Vygotsky's (1978) sociocultural theory about human cognitive development through social interaction, and corroborate Swain's (1985) Comprehensible Output Hypothesis which claims that the act of producing language (speaking and writing) may be a source of language learning. There seems to be evidence to suggest that collaborative dialogue with learner-generated attention to form and lexis may lead learners to a deeper understanding of their production, and to greater awareness of writing and reading strategies. Thus, the current research study seems to indicate that, at least in certain teaching and learning contexts collaborative dialogue with spontaneous focus on form through writing tasks in dyads or in small groups may facilitate the process of reading comprehension.

Key words: collaborative dialogue, interaction, focus on form, reading.

RESUMO

Pesquisas recentes sobre o processo de aquisição de segunda língua têm reconhecido a importância da interação verbal no desenvolvimento da competência do aluno na língua alvo. Fundamentado na teoria sociocultural (Vygotsky, 1978), e baseado nos trabalhos de Swain e seus colaboradores (1985-2006), o presente estudo buscou investigar a eficácia do diálogo colaborativo com foco consciente e espontâneo na forma no processo de leitura em inglês. Segundo Swain (2000), o diálogo colaborativo constitui-se como um diálogo de construção do conhecimento (com os outros e consigo mesmo) sendo a linguagem não apenas um meio de comunicação, mas uma ferramenta cognitiva. Refere-se à conversa espontânea dos alunos sobre a língua alvo em suas tentativas de solucionar problemas lingüísticos, enquanto trabalhando colaborativamente em pequenos grupos. Duas estudantes de nível intermediário de inglês do curso de inglês para fins acadêmicos (EAP) de uma universidade no Estado do Espírito Santo participaram da pesquisa. Os dados foram coletados durante um período de quatro aulas regulares (2h cada), nas quais as alunas trabalharam colaborativamente em tarefas de produção e reformulação de um texto em inglês. A análise qualitativa microgenética do diálogo colaborativo entre as participantes forneceu evidências sobre o foco das interações negociadas, bem como das estratégias de produção e de leitura utilizadas durante as tarefas. Os resultados confirmam os postulados da teoria sociocultural de Vygotsky (1978), e corroboram a Hipótese da Produção Compreensível de Swain (1985), segundo a qual, o ato de produzir (linguagem escrita ou falada) pode ser uma fonte de aprendizagem. O estudo sugere que o diálogo colaborativo com foco espontâneo na forma pode conduzir o aprendiz a uma compreensão mais profunda da sua produção, bem como a uma maior conscientização das estratégias utilizadas nos processos de composição de texto e de leitura em língua estrangeira. Conclui-se, então que, em certos contextos de ensino e aprendizagem, o diálogo colaborativo com foco espontâneo na forma através de tarefas escritas em pequenos grupos pode facilitar o processo de leitura.

Palavras-chave: diálogo colaborativo, interação, foco na forma, leitura.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

CLT = Communicative Language Teaching

EAP = English for Academic Purposes

EFL = English as a foreign language

ELT = English language teaching

ESL = English as a second language

ESP = English for Specific Purposes

FFI = Form-focused instruction

L1 = First (native) language

L2 = A foreign or second language

LREs = Language related episodes

NNS = Non-native speaker

S1 = Student 1 (the first participant of the present research study)

S2 = Student 2 (the second participant)

SLA = Second language acquisition

TESOL = Teaching English to students of other languages

UFES = Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo

ZDP = Zone of proximal development

1 INTRODUCTION

Second language acquisition (SLA)[1] and language teaching have long been considered as distinct areas of inquiry in the field of Applied Linguistics. In recent years, however, there has been greater overlap between these two areas. There seems to be a growing conviction that the research efforts undertaken in the field of SLA can inform language pedagogy. In fact, these studies have attempted to change several concepts related to TESOL. They have offered a rich variety of aspects and descriptive accounts some would argue as having helped language teachers better analyze their classroom experiences, understand their learners and the learning process, and improve their teaching practices. Consequently, throughout history, the teaching of English has undergone several major revolutions. Many teaching methods have been tried out, studied, modified and revised. Nevertheless, for all these years, grammar has been viewed as the central part of Linguistics, and as an important element in language teaching and learning. However, there seems to be conflicting opinions on what grammar is and how it should be approached. Traditionally, grammar is understood as a set of arbitrary rules that govern language use, including primarily morphology and syntax. As part of this long-standing view, language teaching has centered around sentence-level explicit analysis and instruction. The goals of students in this type of approach is to learn about the language in order to pass examinations, rather than to use the language for communicative purposes.

Modern linguists, however, recognize that "grammar is a complex system, the parts of which cannot be properly explained in abstraction from the whole" (Greenbaum & Quirk, 1990, p.11). These parts or components include phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics. With the advent of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), which is fundamentally concerned with making meaning in the language, not only a renewed emphasis on semantics, but also a growing interest in the pragmatic and cultural aspects of language is observed. As Larsen-Freeman

---

[1] Second Language Acquisition (SLA) refers to both foreign and second language acquisition. Although recognizing Krashen's distinction between systematic, conscious "learning" and informal, unconscious "acquisition", in this study, the terms "acquisition" and "learning" will be used interchangeably.

(1997) points out,

> If the goals of language instruction include teaching students to use grammar accurately, meaningfully, and appropriately, then a compelling case can be made for teaching grammar. Instead of viewing grammar as a static system of arbitrary rules, it should be seen as a rational, dynamic system that is comprised of structures characterized by the three dimensions of form, meaning, and use.

Because grammar is at the core of every human activity (writing a letter, talking on the phone, prescribing medicine, buying a book, praying, etc) without grammar, we can communicate effectively only in a limited number of situations, and sometimes communication is not possible at all. However, although recognizing that grammar is a dynamic force which allows people to communicate, it has also been observed how difficult it is to teach grammar to foreign language students. In fact, it has been a great challenge for language teachers who have long created methods of teaching that would be both attractive and effective to learners. According to Brown (1994, p.351-354), "there is still a good deal of current debate on the particular approach that teachers should take in offering grammatical instruction (…) Should grammar be presented inductively or deductively? Should we use grammatical explanations and technical terminology in a CLT classroom? Should grammar be taught in separate 'grammar only' classes? Should teachers correct grammatical errors?" Teachers and researchers may not have found all the answers yet, but it is true that much has been discussed and written about the role of grammar in second/foreign language pedagogy. This has, in turn, led to a reaction against the heavy emphasis on fluency, and on the use of meaning-focused tasks advocated by communicative language teaching. Indeed, the highly communicative framework which dominated the field of foreign language teaching in the 70's and 80's provided language teachers with the mistaken idea that grammar instruction had no place in a communicative classroom. The assumption was that learners would acquire the grammar of the target language and vocabulary naturally, in the same way as children acquire their first language. Consequently, explicit grammar teaching and correction of learner errors were completely neglected in those days.

Extensive empirical research in Canadian French immersion content-based programs (which have been considered a successful model of communicatively oriented classrooms), however, have demonstrated that a great amount of language

input is not sufficient for the acquisition of grammatical accuracy. Studies undertaken by Swain (1985) in the eighties as part of a larger program of research, for example, investigated the language proficiency of Canadian immersion students whose first language was English, and who had been learning French in a school setting for seven years. The findings demonstrated that in spite of the fact that those students had received plenty of language input, they still had problems with certain aspects of the target language system, mainly morphology and syntax. In other words, they successfully achieved fluency, but failed to develop accuracy. Swain (op.cit) concluded that although comprehensible input (Krashen, 1985) is necessary for language learning, it is through the output - "students' meaningful production of language" (Swain, 2000, p.99), i.e., talking and writing, that the learner is forced to pay conscious attention to the form of the messages. It also became evident that instructed learning and corrective feedback might be required if students' goal is to attain a high level of competence and performance in the target language (Ellis, 1995).

Thus, recognizing that grammar, i.e. some type of focus on form, "exists to enable us to 'mean', and without grammar it is impossible to communicate beyond a very rudimentary level" (Nunan, 1991), researchers have been investigating the effectiveness of form-focused instruction[2] in communicative classrooms (Lightbown & Spada, 1990; White, 1991; Swain, 1985, Doughty and Williams, 1998; Fotos and Ellis, 1991). But although these studies have greatly contributed to the field of English Language Teaching (ELT), there is a consensus in the literature that more research is needed in the field.

Among the many studies on form-focused instruction, perhaps the most interesting ones are those that, in the light of Vygotsky's (1978) socio-cultural theory of learning, have taken into account the value of meaningful social interaction for SLA (Swain 1985, 1998, 2000; Donato, 2000; Ohta, 2000; Van Lier, 2000; Swain & Lapkin, 1998). These researchers claim that as a result of peer-collaborative work and corrective feedback through task performance learners may achieve a higher level of language competence.

According to Swain (2000), while engaged in interaction, learners not only

_____

[2] The term is used in this study following Spada's (1997, p.73) definition: it refers to "pedagogical events which occur within meaning-based approaches to L2 instruction but in which a focus on language is provided in either spontaneous or predetermined ways."

acquire comprehensible input (Krashen, 1985) but especially use the target language to *output.* She notes that

> the importance of output to learning could be that output pushes learners to process language more deeply – with more mental effort – than does input. With output, the learner is in control. In speaking or writing, learners can 'stretch' their interlanguage to meet communicative goals (Swain 2000, p. 99).

Thus, informed by socio-cultural theory, SLA researchers have recently focused their attention on learner talk during task performance in pairs/groups (Kowal & Swain,1994, 1998; Vidal, 2003; Swain & Lapkin, 1998. 2002; Swain, 1998, 2000, Storch,1998). These authors recognize that SLA research should go beyond *what* the student produces (i.e. input and output). In fact, studies should focus on *how* the learner interacts with others through a collaborative activity so as to get evidence that it serves language learning. In Swain's words,

> if one accepts a Vygotskian perspective that much learning is an activity that occurs in and through dialogues, that development occurs first on the inter-psychological plane through socially constructing knowledge and processes, then it must be that a close examination of dialogue as learners engage in problem-solving activity is directly revealing of mental processes. The unit of analysis of language learning and its associated processes may therefore more profitably be the dialogue, not input or output alone" (Swain, 1995, p.142).

It may thus be argued that some kind of focus on form is not only beneficial, but especially necessary for L2 learners to acquire the language. In addition, it could be claimed that language learning occurs through verbal interaction. Thus, grounded in sociocultural theory (Vygotsky, 1978) and based on the works of Swain and her associates (1985-2006), the current study analyzed how dialogic interaction which includes peer feedback during two collaborative writing tasks enhances reading comprehension of a text in English. The present research objectives were to investigate the focus of students' interaction and to seek evidence that collaborative dialogue[3] resulted in increased reading comprehension on the part of the learners.

My motivation for investigating this topic stemmed from two sources. The first arose from the readings and discussions about the   instructed-second   language

_____

[3] The concept of "collaborative dialogue" is used in this study according to Swain (2000), and will be explained in the "Theoretical Framework" section.

acquisition research informed by sociocultural theory, mainly the works of Swain (1985-2006) and her colleagues, which have greatly influenced my pedagogical practices in a more reflective way. The second was my personal teaching experience with EFL students in post-secondary and tertiary institutions in Vitória, Espírito Santo, Brazil. In these environments, where students are adults with a common academic or professional interest in learning English, an English for Specific Purposes (ESP) approach is the most motivating and effective. Thus, various ESP courses, more specifically EAP (English for Academic Purposes) are offered by tertiary institutions to those who have a clear conviction that English is necessary for their careers. The primary purpose of such training is to prepare students with limited English proficiency to deal with the linguistic demands of higher education in their subject area. At the end of the course, it is hoped that learners will have developed sufficient skills in academic English to enable them to continue studying independently through the medium of English.

The courses offered by these institutions usually have the following profile:

- Unconventional (often short-term) skills-based course (focused on the teaching of reading) with clearly defined objectives;

- Fixed (small) teaching staff – experienced ESP instructors who share the same assumptions and principles about language teaching and learning;

- Use of the native language (Portuguese) in spoken classroom discourse – English is a means to other ends;

- Learner-centered classes with emphasis on collaborative (communicative) tasks

- Average number of students in the classroom – 20 to 25. All students in the classroom follow the same academic discipline or belong to the same professional field.

As a longtime teacher of ESP, I am constantly confronted with the challenge of providing my students with the tools which will enable them to become efficient L2 readers in a short period of time. Such emphasis on the teaching of reading in English might be justified by the fact that most of these students' subject literature is not available in their mother tongue, and they cannot wait for these materials to be translated.

ESP students are generally adults with a clear reason for learning English. Consequently, the majority is instrumentally motivated towards learning the language. However, from my experience, I have noticed that despite the fact that they all have studied English in secondary school, and that, being adults, they also have well-developed reading strategies in their L1, our students often complain about their inability to understand authentic materials written in English. They recognize the meaning of some words in a sentence, some main ideas superficially, but they usually cannot understand the text in its totality. This would suggest, despite Alderson´s (1984)[4] arguments to the contrary, that these students have a language problem, (i.e., dependent on linguistic competence), rather than a reading problem (dependent on cognitive processes). In fact, in my opinion, and in the opinion of a number of Brazilian ESP teachers with whom I have discussed this matter, the greater problem our students face lies in the language itself with its structural features, textual relationships and stylistic devices.

Therefore, I strongly believe that by taking into account the learner's perspective, instead of the teacher's, in other words, by considering how L2 learners progress from production to comprehension through collaborative dialogue (Swain & Lapkin, in press), this investigation and the results gained should contribute to a better understanding of the foreign language learning process, and to improving current teaching practices. I understand that a basic issue in modern education for Brazil is to help individuals become more independent in how they think, act and learn, and thus produce active, participant citizens. Thus, by investigating students while working as real partners to solve their language problems in the classroom without the teacher's or researcher's intervention, this study should also provide insights into the value of collaborative work and autonomous learning in EFL environments.

This dissertation comprises six chapters, including the present one which is the introduction to the study, in addition to the references and appendices. Thus, this chapter defines the topic, presenting the rationale for this research. It also provides the main objective, discusses my motivation, and outlines the research questions. Chapter Two develops the theoretical framework on which this study was based,

---

[4] In his classical article, Alderson (1984) raises the question whether reading in a foreign language is a language problem or a reading problem. He concludes that it is both. Much depends on the students' level of L2 development.

including an overview of Vygotsky's sociocultural theory and its influence on L2 classroom-based research, approach and tasks. Chapter Three elaborates on the methodology applied in the current research, addressing the purpose and research questions, explaining the context for the study, and the population involved. It also presents the data collection instruments and procedures. Chapter Four provides a qualitative analysis of the data and a discussion of the findings. Chapter Five addresses the conclusion, the pedagogical implications and limitations of the study. In addition, the chapter provides suggestions for future investigations in the area of form-focused instruction and collaborative dialogue in EFL contexts. Chapter Six presents the final remarks.

2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The present chapter aims at discussing some theoretical perspectives on which this study was based. The following items are considered:

2.1 FORM-FOCUSED INSTRUCTION IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING AND LEARNING

For over the years, in their attempt to find out how languages are learned, several SLA researchers have investigated the effectiveness of form-focused instruction (FFI) in L2 classrooms. Some (Krashen,1985; Prahbu,1987; Corder,1967, for example) hold the view that, in common with first language acquisition, second language learning occurs automatically, as a result of "the opportunity [learners] are given to interpret, to express, and to negotiate meaning in real-life situations" (Savignon, 1983, p.vi). On these grounds, they reject formal, intentional and explicit form-focused teaching. For these scholars, "people of all ages learn language best, inside or outside a classroom, not by treating the languages as an object of study, but by experiencing them as a medium of communication", as Long and Robinson (1998, p.18) note. This perspective has been strengthened by Krashen's (1982, 1985, 1999) distinction between learning and acquisition, and by the idea that language cannot be taught, but it can only be acquired unconsciously in naturalistic settings. For Krashen (1985, p.1), learning, i.e. "the conscious process that results in 'knowing about' the language" cannot turn into acquisition. People acquire languages by understanding messages, i.e. by receiving what he calls "comprehensible input". Although Krashen's ideas have greatly influenced the field of second language

pedagogy, especially in supporting the Communicative Approach, he has been strongly criticized for failing to propose hypotheses which can be empirically tested.

In contrast, other SLA researchers adhere to the position that instruction does make a difference in L2 acquisition (Long, 1991; Long & Robinson, 1998; Ellis, 1998; Doughty & Williams, 1998, Spada, 1997; Swain, 1985, among others). Thus, as Ellis (1998, p. 42) explains, the focus of research has changed from whether or not formal instruction is effective to L2 learning to what type of form-focused instruction works best in classroom contexts and how it should be approached. The "reawakening of interest in this issue" is attributed to Long (1991), as Doughty & Williams (1998, p.3) point out. Long (ibid) distinguishes two broad types of form-focused instruction: *focus-on-formS* and *focus-on-form*. The first refers to the traditional notion of instruction emphasizing the elements of grammar in isolation from context or from communicative activity. The latter, on the contrary, refers to the explicit, but reactive and unplanned focus on form during communicative interaction.

Vidal (2003, p.15) stresses the importance of recognizing the distinction between the concepts of *focus on form* and *focus on meaning* (the exclusively communicative instruction, without attention to form) if L2 classroom learning theory and/or language teaching practice are to be considered. Long (1991) makes this distinction very clear. In fact, *focus-on-form* instruction keeps the balance between *focus-on-formS* and *focus-on-meaning* instructions. As Long and Robinson explain (1998, p.22) "fortunately, the choice is not limited to either a focus on forms or a focus on meaning (…) A third option (…) is *focus on form* which involves "alternating in some principled way between a focus on meaning and a focus on form" (Long, op.cit., p.47). In this perspective, teachers and students, in a communicative classroom environment, attend to form incidentally, i.e. only when necessary – when they perceive linguistic problems in comprehension or production.

Spada (1997) proposes the term *form-focused instruction* (FFI) to differentiate her approach from Long's *focus on form.* She defines FFI as "pedagogical events which occur within meaning-based approaches to L2 instruction but in which a focus on language is provided in either spontaneous or predetermined ways" (p.73). Ellis (2001, p.15) notes that the term *focus on form* appears to have been reconceptualized by Long and Robinson (op.cit) to comprise not only the "occasional", but also the "planned component" as well. He observes that in one of the examples given of how focus on form may be approached by language teachers,

Long and Robinson (1998, p.25) suggest an activity in which input flood, and input enhancement are evident. This clearly indicates, as Ellis (2001,p.15) notes, that preselection of specific form for treatment is considered.

Ellis (2001, p.1-2) defends both approaches (incidental and planned) to form-focused instruction, and explains that for him, FFI is a "is a cover term for a variety of other terms that figure in the current literature – 'analytic teaching (Stern, 1990) 'focus-on-form' and 'focus-on-forms' (Long,1991), corrective feedback/error correction, and 'negotiation of form' (Lyster & Ranta, 1997)". However, unlike Spada's, Ellis' definition includes both traditional and communicative approaches to teaching.

Because there is not a consensus in the literature about the terms to refer to L2 grammar instruction (for example, *form-focused instruction* can include, according to Ellis' view stated above, *focus-on-formS* and a *focus-on-form* approach to language teaching/learning), Doughty & Williams (1998, p.4) prefer to avoid the term FFI, and suggest a new acronym, FonF, because they believe that "there is, as yet, no serviceable adjectival modifier when the intended meaning is *focus-on-form instruction."* Thus, in their reconceptualized version of FonF, Doughty and Williams (1998) agree with Long and Robinson (1998) that the need for learner engagement with meaning should precede attention to the linguistic code, and that learner attention to form should be drawn briefly and unobtrusively. However, they also agree with Spada (1997) and Ellis (2001) that focus on form may be either reactive (incidental) or proactive (planned). Ellis (ibid.) explains that the great acceptance of a proactive approach to FFI by many L2 researchers is justified by their need to undertake experimental studies, since specific language features for analysis should be selected in advance.

In this study, which attempted to examine how negotiated interaction with a conscious and spontaneous focus on form through collaborative dialogue may enhance reading comprehension in English, the term *form-focused instruction* was used following Spada's (op.cit) definition presented above.

Despite the great controversy concerning the concept of FFI, there is a consensus in the literature that, in order to help students develop both fluency and accuracy in the target language, some kind of focus on form is necessary and useful at some point in the teaching/learning process. However, as Doughty and Williams

(1998, p.11) point out,

> … there is not, as yet, and probably never will be, any *single* solution to the intriguing problem of how to implement focus on form in communicative classrooms. Nonetheless, there are certain emerging pedagogical principles that can inform decisions about FonF implementation. At this point, it is our belief that the *ideal* delivery of focus on form is yet to be determined.

2.2 THE ROLE OF INTERACTION IN LANGUAGE LEARNING – A SOCIOCULTURAL VIEW

Much has been discussed and written about the role of interaction in language teaching and learning. Indeed, this has been the focus, under different perspectives, of many theoretical and empirical studies (Lantolf, 2000, Allwright, 1984; Swain, 1985, 1998; Breen and Candlin, 1980; Long, 1981; Ohta, 2000; Seliger,1977,1983; van Lier,2000).

Interactionist theories can be classified into two broad categories, namely *cognitive interactionist* and *social interactionist theories* (Ellis, 1995b; Mitchell & Myles, 2002). According to the cognitive interactionist theory, language acquisition must be the result of the complex interaction between environmental factors and the internal mechanisms of the learner. In contrast, the underlying assumption of the social interactionist theory is that cognition and language are collaboratively constructed and reconstructed through social interaction. More recently, however, there seem to be many overlaps between these two perspectives. As Pica (1996, p.17) argues,

> … the field of SLA has come a long way from looking at interaction and L2 learning from the perspective of social interaction alone. Now that many of the more cognitive constructs of L2 learning have been operationalized, they too can be studied within an interactionist perspective and implemented with these social dimensions.

Interaction may be defined as "reciprocal events that require at least two objects and two actions. Interactions occur when these objects and events mutually influence one another" (Wagner, 1994, p. 8). In more social terms, interaction is "the process by which the partners in a conversation reach agreement" (Lynch, 1996, p.3).

The view of social interaction as the fundamental learning environment for human cognitive development is strongly inspired by the work of Vygotsky (1978), a

Russian psychologist (1896-1934). During the years immediately following the Russian Revolution, at a time when psychologists were trying "to derive social behavior from individual behavior" (Vygotsky,1981,p.164), Vygotsky set himself the task of reformulating psychology on Marxist foundations (Wertsch, 1985). In fact, he created a completely new and scientific approach to psychology. His work was the foundation for what has become known as "the sociocultural theory of mind." Influenced by Marx and Engels, he aimed at developing a framework which would not only contribute to a better understanding of human nature, but also to help improve human situation. As Cole and Scribner (1978, p.9) point out, "the broad spectrum of Vygotsky's work clearly shows his concern with producing a psychology that would have relevance for education and medical practice". In fact, his theories were a response to the needs of the new socialist society – "the elimination of illiteracy and the founding of educational programs to maximize the potential of individual children" (id.ibid). Vygotsky had been a literature teacher before working as a psychologist, and wrote many articles on the problems of education. Likewise, as the founder of the Institute of Defectology in Moscow, Vygotsky saw in the various physical and mental disease of individuals an opportunity not only to study those problems, but especially to help solve them. In collaboration with Leontiev (1981) and Luria (1976), his students who later developed and refined his work, Vygotsky sought to find out how humans, in their short life spans and in the varied contexts of culture and history, intellectually advanced so far in such diverse directions, being influenced by nature and, in turn, actively changing nature, thus creating new conditions for his existence (Vygotsky, 1978). In order to arrive at an adequate answer, Vygotsky examined the interrelations between thought and language. However, he contended that it would be necessary to look not only at individuals but also at the social and cultural environment with which they interact in the course of their development. Thus, influenced by Marx, Vygotsky reaffirmed the role of history and social components in the development of consciousness. As he points out,

> The nature of the development itself changes, from biological to socio-historical. Verbal thought is not an innate, natural form of behavior, but it is determined by historical-cultural process and has specific properties and laws that cannot be found in the natural forms of thought and speech. Once we acknowledge the historical character of verbal thought, we must consider it subject to all the premises of historical materialism, which are valid for any historical phenomenon in human society. (Vygotsky, 1986, p.94)

Vygotsky's studies earned him the reputation of a "revolutionary scientist" (Wertsch, 1985). Unfortunately, his work was banned by Stalin and suppressed for 20 years. It only became available to the English speaking world in the 1960's with the translation of his monograph "Thought and Language" some decades after his untimely death. Vygotsky was unable to complete his work, but his ideas are strikingly relevant today, especially the interrelationship of language and thought, the evolution of language and the role of social context in the development of human mind. Cole and Scribner (1978, p.6) argue that "in stressing the social origins of language and thinking, Vygotsky (…) was the first modern psychologist to suggest the mechanisms by which culture becomes a part of each person's nature".

Vygotsky's sociocultural theory has given support to important research studies in the field of second language acquisition. It also provides the framework for the concept of learning adopted in the present study. According to Vygostky, knowledge is acquired through a dialectic interaction between the individual and his social context in a historical process, mediated by symbols, by means of instruments and signs (auxiliary devices). In Vygotsky´s view, it is through language that it becomes possible to achieve development and learning. Language is then considered not only as a means of communication, but it is the main instrument for the mediation of psychological activity. It is, above all, a "tool for thought". As Ohta (2000, p.54) notes,

> ...social processes allow the language to become a cognitive tool for the individual. [The two] planes of [psychological] functioning are dynamically interrelated, linked by language which mediates social interaction on the interpsychological plane [between individuals] , and mediates thought on the intrapshychological plane [within the individual].

Although Vygotsky's work mainly concerns child first language acquisition, it might also conceivably be applied to adult second language teaching and learning. In this sociocultural approach to mind development, second language learning originates in collaborative dialogues through social interaction between small groups of individuals (frequently dyads) which are then internalized as *inner speech* and appropriated by the learner (Vygotsky, 1978). From this viewpoint, interaction does not serve only motivational functions; it is crucial for cognitive change and growth. Therefore, the difference between Vygotskian view of interaction and other theorists

which also consider interaction as important to second language acquisition is that for Vygotsky, learning occurs in the interaction, not as a result of it.

In support of the claim that "interaction itself constitutes the learning process, which is quintessentially social rather than individual in nature" (Mitchell & Myles, 2002, p. 144) many language teachers and theorists have argued that formal education practices should support socially interactive learning environments. This way, the language classroom plays a very important role in the process of language learning. It is in this environment that the learner not only gradually constructs his own knowledge, but also helps others construct their own. Thus, the language classroom becomes a community of learning. As Ohta (2000, p.51) points out,

> language acquisition is realized through a collaborative process whereby learners appropriate the language of the interaction as their own, for their own purposes, building grammatical, expressive, and cultural competence through this process.

In the light of the sociocultural theory, collaborative problem-solving tasks, students' output, and meaningful peer/peer interaction are certainly important elements for second language acquisition. They are mechanisms through which the knowledge of the target language moves from the interpsychological plane (between individuals) to the intrapsychological plane (within the individual). This process, which involves the transformation (not the transfer) of "socially rooted and historically developed activities" into a psychological phenomenon is called *internalization*. In Vygotsky's view, internalization consists of a series of transformations denominated *microgenesis*, i.e. "cognitive development that occurs moment by moment in social interaction" (Ohta, op.cit., p.54).

One of the central notions of the sociocultural theory, which is of potential relevance to SLA is that real learning, i.e., the internalization of the social interactive processes, takes place in the *Zone of Proximal Development,* also known as *Zoped* or *ZPD*. This is defined by Vygotsky (1978, p. 86) as

> the distance between the actual development level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers.

In other words, development, in Vygotsky's sense, is not learning to do something new, but taking over the control of something you can already do in

concert with somebody else. This concept of guided assistance or support also known as *scaffolding* (Lantolf, 2000, p.17) is very significant for the context of L2 teaching/learning, because it involves not only the assistance provided by a more experienced person (teacher, native speaker, classmate, for example) to a novice, but especially because it stimulates the development of learner autonomy. The stages of development through which the individual moves throughout his life in order to gain control over his own social and cognitive activities are referred to as object-, other- and self-regulation (Wertsch, 1979). Object-regulation and other-regulation refer to the situations in which the individual has not developed the cognitive skills necessary to perform certain actions by himself; he is either controlled by the environment (object-regulation) or by a more capable person (other-regulation). Self-regulation, on the contrary, refer to the stage of cognitive development in which the individual is capable of controlling both his actions and the environment. Thus, to be a self-regulated L2 learner, i.e., "an advanced speaker/user of a language means to be able to control one's psychological and social activity through language" (Lantolf, 2000, p.6). In this process, teachers have an important role to play. In the sociocultural perspective, teaching means assisting and guiding learners through dialogic communication (Vygotsky, 1978) to do what they are not able to do alone, but especially providing them with the necessary tools and encouragement to become autonomous. In Vygotsky's views human development is a socio-genetic (historical) process of change which is both evolutionary and revolutionary and in which "humans are active, vigorous participants in their own existence" (id.ibid, p.123). Knowledge is social in nature and is constructed through a process of collaboration, interaction, and communication among individuals in social settings. At each stage of development, however, they "acquire the means by which they can competently affect their world and themselves" (id.ibid). As Swain (in press, p.156) contends,

> the environment provides the opportunities for learning, but it is the learner, with his or her history, in his or her immediate environment, who has options and makes choices. This is the learner as agent: as an individual who perceives, analyzes, rejects or accepts solutions offered, [and] makes decisions.

This social constructivist perspective, therefore, views learners as actively engaged in making meaning, and learning as a process, not as the product of teaching. Knowledge is constructed by the individual through his interactions with his

environment. Since learning is co-constructed through discursive practices, or collaborative dialogue (Swain,2000), the process of knowledge construction can be directly observed (Donato, 1994). Through the analysis of learners' collaborative dialogue in classroom settings the researcher may gain rich insights into the social construction of knowledge (Swain, 1995,1998; 2000; Donato, 1994; Ohta, 2000).

Certain relevant SLA studies which have concentrated on gathering evidence peer/peer negotiated interaction with a focus on form is conductive to learning are presented next

2.3 SOCIOCULTURAL APPROACH TO SLA RESEARCH ON FORM-FOCUSED INSTRUCTION

Vygotsky's sociocultural theory was created almost eighty years ago, but it may still be influential for many SLA research studies today. Researchers such as Swain (op.cit) Ohta (op.cit), Allwright, (1984); van Lier (2000), Donato (2000,2004), Long (1981, 1996), Pica (1994), for example, seek to understand how it is that interaction promotes SLA in classroom settings. Allwright (1984, p.156) considers interaction as "the fundamental fact of classroom pedagogy [because] everything that happens in the classroom happens through a process of live person-to-person interaction."

One of the areas of SLA research that has attracted considerable interest is learner-learner and small-group work interaction. Studies have given support to the claim that learner active classroom participation, an essential feature of Communicative Language Teaching, is paramount to language acquisition. As Williams (1999, p. 584) points out,

> this moves classroom interaction beyond mere group work in which learners work in physical proximity but may not consistently derive the greatest benefit from working together. By involving learners actively in their own learning in a supportive environment, proponents of collaborative learning believe that educational outcomes can be improved.

Thus, various aspects of classroom interaction, for example, the quality and quantity of learner talk, the effects of task types on L2 interaction, the role of peer-

peer feedback, among others have been the focus of instructed SLA research (Ellis, 1995a).

Several researchers have investigated peer-peer interaction in the performance of communicative tasks with a focus on form. For example, Kowal and Swain (1994) report that students focused their attention and discussion on the form of the message they were constructing as they collaborated with one another to perform a dictogloss[5] task. According to Kowal and Swain (op. cit), this type of task encourages students not only to talk about their own production (output), but also to consciously reflect on it as they talk (metatalk). The participants were 19 students from a mixed-ability grade 8 French immersion class in Canada. Four dictoglosses were given to the students over a period of two months. However, only students' metatalk during the third dictogloss task was audio-taped and transcribed for analysis. The data were coded for critical related episodes (CLREs). According to Swain and Lapkin (2002, p. 104), a language-related episode may be defined as "any part of a dialogue where students talk about language they are producing, question their language use, or other- or self-correct their language production." Results interestingly indicated that although the teacher's purpose was to promote, by means of the dictogloss, a discussion about the use of the present tense in French, because of their immediate needs, the students also focused on other topics and language features. In other words, as Kowal and Swain (1994, p.80) point out, "the teacher's specific goals were redefined by the students as they worked through the task."

More recently, a study by Swain and Lapkin (op.cit) investigated the nature of learner-learner talk associated with two contrasting communicative task types (the jigsaw and the dictogloss) similar in content. The researchers' goal was to encourage students to focus on form as they jointly performed both tasks. The participants were tape-recorded as they did their task. Transcripts were then analyzed for language-related episodes (LREs). It was anticipated that, since the dictogloss provides content in the form of a native speaker text, this type of task

---

[5] The dictogloss is a teaching procedure that involves the reading of a short text at normal speed to a group of language students. As the text is being read, learners take notes and then, in pairs or in small groups they strive to reconstruct the text from their shared resources. Each group should aim at producing a grammatically accurate and cohesive passage, but not a replication of the original text. Finally, the whole class analyzes and corrects the different texts produced by the groups.

would provide more opportunities for focusing on form than the jigsaw. Nevertheless, contrary to the researchers' expectations, results indicated that in carrying out either task, students focused equally on form as they collaboratively produced their work.

Williams' (1999) study aimed to examine whether or not L2 learners spontaneously initiated episodes involving attention to form in their interaction with other learners, and to describe the types of forms they attended to. Eight voluntary students of various proficiency levels from an intensive English program in the United States ranging in age from 18 to 28 participated in the research. The students were audio-taped daily as they were involved in group work during a 45-minute class period for eight weeks. Transcripts of students' talk in a variety of communicative activities were analyzed through Swain and Lapkin's (1995) notion of language-related episodes. The emergence of a LRE indicated that learners had focused on form. Overall, the results revealed that, among other things, most LREs were concerned with vocabulary, rather than with grammatical issues.

Finally, another research which deserves to be mentioned in this section, especially because it directly inspired this case study research, is that conducted by Swain & Lapkin (in press) who investigated how language production mediates comprehension. They wanted to demonstrate that "at least some language learning proceeds from production to comprehension, rather than what is usually argued, from comprehension to production". Four of twelve "average" students in a grade 7 French immersion class were video taped as they participated in the research. Two students (Emma and Sue) worked individually; the others, Jim and Anna, worked together on a multi-stage task. The data collection procedure unfolded over a period of two school weeks, covering the following stages: (1) completing a dictogloss story task; (2) comparing their written stories to a reformulated version; (3) responding to a stimulated recall task; (4) revising their stories independently four days later; (5) responding to an individual interview. Three examples of the transcribed data were presented and qualitatively analyzed in the manuscript of the study. The authors explain that these examples were selected "because they were representative of many of the excerpts from the protocols and because their analysis illustrates instances of learners moving from production to comprehension" (p.7). Emma, for example, explained that she was able to produce her story, although she had not understood the meaning of a sentence. Her comprehension developed through her interaction with the reformulated text, herself and the researcher. The authors

emphasize, however, that they make no claim that all learning proceeds from production to comprehension. But they "do wish to claim that one way in which language is acquired is through use: by producing language we can find out what it means, and of what it consists" (p.27).

The studies briefly reviewed above demonstrate that peer-peer interaction with a focus on form may contribute to language learning. Informed by Vygotsky's framework, an extensive body of research has been conducted in the field of second language acquisition. However, several researchers claim that more studies are still needed. "Our hope", Lantolf and Appel (1994,p.27) point out, " is that second language researchers will begin to explore the potential that sociocultural theory and Vygotskian research methodology have for developing an even fuller understanding of second language phenomena".

2.4. FROM *COMPREHENSIBLE OUTPUT* TO *LANGUAGING*

The field of SLA was dominated, in the early 1980's, by the concept of input - "the language which the learner is exposed to (either written or spoken) in the environment" (Lightbown & Spada, 1999, p. 176). According to the *input hypothesis* advocated by Krashen (1985), languages are acquired in only one way – by exposure to *comprehensible input.* In other words, learners acquire a foreign/second language by hearing and understanding messages that are slightly above their current target language level (i+1). However, although many language teachers and researchers support the view that comprehensible input is necessary for language acquisition to occur, they argue that comprehensible input is not sufficient to promote acquisition. Swain (1985) for example, found that learners exposed to comprehensible input for a long time still had problems with certain linguistic aspects of the target language. She concluded that although comprehensible input is essential for language learning, it is not the only thing the students need. She argued that the importance of language output - "students' meaningful production of language" (Swain, 2000, p.99) should also be recognized, and proposed *the comprehensible output hypothesis* (Swain, 1985) which states that learners need opportunities to produce (to speak and write) the target language ('to output') accurately and appropriately. According to Swain, interaction not only provides learners with the opportunities to acquire comprehensible input (Krashen, 1985), but

especially to output. Thus, the output hypothesis claims that the act of producing language (speaking and writing) may be a source of language learning.

Swain (1995) hypothesizes that output serves three main functions in SLA: noticing, hypothesis testing, metatalk::

1. Noticing / Triggering (consciousness-raising function) – output might create awareness of language knowledge holes and/or gaps, that is, producing language may cause learners "to notice what they do not know or know only partially" (Swain, 1995, p.126). This awareness may trigger cognitive processes that might generate linguistic knowledge that is new to the learner or consolidate his/her own existing knowledge, consequently leading to modified output (Swain & Lapkin,1995). When learners, engaged in collaborative tasks, notice a language problem and attempt to solve it, they are forced to move from a semantic analysis of the language (prevalent in comprehension) to a syntactic processing needed for accurate production (Swain, 1995, Kowal & Swain, 1997, Swain & Lapkin, 1995). The process of noticing can occur through learner's own reflection or through triggers provided by others.

2. Hypothesis testing – When learners notice the gap in their knowledge, they may turn to others or to their own linguistic resources, and work out a solution - they formulate and test alternative ways of saying/writing what they want to say/write. As Swain (1995, p.131-132) notes, "learners may use their output as a way of trying out new language forms and structures as they stretch their interlanguage to meet communicative needs: they may output just to see what works and what does not".

Usually, learners receive feedback for testing their hypothesis from external sources (teachers, dictionaries, a more expert peer, grammar books, for example). Receiving corrective feedback or negative evidence from peers in collaborative work may be facilitative to L2 acquisition. Ohta (2001) demonstrates that if the correct language form is provided during negotiation, learners may have the opportunity to compare their own production to that of another. This may stimulate hypothesis testing. Schachter (1991) notes that due to the feedback learners receive, they abandon their wrong hypotheses and immediately formulate new ones. Therefore, feedback is regarded as necessary to push learners to improve the accuracy of their output in order to make themselves understood.

3. Metatalk - (reflective, metalinguistic function) This refers to the fact that in trying to solve a problem in their output learners may consciously reflect upon the nature of the language system. Producing language output requires learners to pay conscious attention to the form of the messages. According to Swain, such reflection might lead to acquisition because it makes noticing and hypothesis testing more explicit to the learner. In short, metatalk is "language used consciously to reflect on language use" (Swain, 1998, p.68).

To sum up, noticing a language problem through interaction 'pushes' learners to consciously reflect on the nature of the language system as well as to formulate and test hypothesis about the target language. Thus, the kind of output that promotes acquisition, in Swain´s (1985, p.252) view, "extends the linguistic repertoire of the learner as he or she attempts to create precisely and appropriately the meaning desired." In other words, output will aid acquisition only when the learner is pushed. "Being pushed in output", Swain (op.cit, p.249) argues, "is a concept parallel to that of the i+1 comprehensible input. Indeed, one might call this the 'comprehensible' output hypothesis ". This view changes the concept of output from being understood as an outcome, a product, " a word that evokes an image of language as a conveyer of a fixed message (what exists as thought)", (Swain, in press, p.147), to output being considered as a verb, a process, the act of producing language. However, as Swain (2000) points out, "the continued use of the terms 'input' and 'output' has recently come under question". Thus, in the light of Vygotsky's sociocultural theory of mind which considers dialogic interaction as central to human development, Swain (2000) coined the term *collaborative dialogue* to replace *output.* Swain (in press) claims that this construct of *collaborative dialogue* allows us to move beyond the "conduit metaphor" suggested by the terms *input* and *output.* Collaborative dialogue is knowledge-building dialogue (with others and/or with the self) which construes language not only as communication, but as a cognitive tool. It refers to spontaneous learners' talk about language in their attempt to solve a linguistic problem as they work collaboratively in small groups. Verbalization was another term used by Swain, but she argues that this word has "been subject to misinterpretation (…) – people often assume that 'verbalizing' refers only to speaking, rather than to both speaking and writing" (Swain, in press, p.147). Then, the term *languaging* emerged.

For Swain, *languaging* occurs

> precisely when language is used to mediate problem solutions, whether the problem is about which word to use, or how best to structure a sentence so it means what you want it to mean, or how to explain the results of an experiment, or how to make sense of the action of another (Swain, in press, p.148-149).

Because "languaging about language [with others and/or with the self] is one of the ways we learn a second language to an advanced level" (Swain, in press, p.149), teachers have been encouraged to involve students in tasks which engage them in collaborative dialogue. In Swain's (2000, p.113) words,

> When a collaborative effort is being made by participants in an activity, their speaking (or writing) mediates this effort. As each participant speaks, their 'saying' becomes 'what they said', providing an object for reflection. Their 'saying' is cognitive activity, and 'what is said' is an outcome of that activity. Through saying and reflecting on what was said, new knowledge is constructed.

2.5. COLLABORATIVE TASKS AND THE NEGOTIATION OF FORM AND MEANING THROUGH PEER-PEER INTERACTION

From a sociocultural perspective, as pointed out in the previous sections, language learning is a collaborative process in which a more knowledgeable individual, "the expert", helps another, "the novice" to acquire that knowledge. While Vygotsky (1978) applied this notion of *scaffolding* or assistance in the zone of proximal development to adult and child relationships, SLA researchers have investigated a similar process occurring among adult learners. As Donato (1994, p.41) points out, "collaborative work among language learners provides the same opportunity for scaffolded help as in expert-novice relationships in everyday setting." The concept of scaffolding has, therefore, been reported in several classroom-based SLA research. Results have demonstrated that adult learners assist one another as they interact (Swain, 1985, 1998, 2000; Swain and Lapkin, 2002; Storch,2001; Kowal and Swain, 1994; Donato, 1994; Otha, 2000; 2001). Ohta (2000), for example, investigated the nature of scaffolded help provided by peers, the mechanisms through which this help is provided, and the impact of effective peer scaffolding on

the acquisition of certain grammatical structures. The study focused on the recorded and transcribed protocols of two non-native Japanese students ("Hal" and "Becky") involved in three different grammar-focused classroom tasks (a role-play, a translation and an interview). Overall, the findings, explained by reference to Vygotsky's sociocultural theory, suggested that "as a result of assistance, not only did Becky's performance improve, but Hal became less responsive to her bids for help, withdrawing support as Becky increased in ability to come to her own solutions" (Ohta, 2000, p.76).

Another study grounded in Vygotsky's theoretical framework that analyzed peer assistance is that of Donato (1994). The study investigated the interactions of a group of three students of French at an American university. It aimed to illustrate how these students co-construct language learning experiences and how L2 development occurs on social plane. Findings indicate that collaborative work provides peers the same guided support as the one found in most expert-novice interaction. According to Donato (op.cit, p. 46), collective scaffolding occurs in group work wherein "the speakers are at the same time individually novices and collective experts, sources of new orientations for each other, and guides to this complex linguistic problem solving".

Thus, emphasizing how individuals learn from each other, Vygotsky's theory is often used to explain the benefits of small group work. However, although much has been investigated and discussed about group work in L2 classrooms, Kowal and Swain (1994) contend that the substance of the interactions needs to be more deeply investigated. Speaking, according to Vygotsky (1978), is the completion of thinking, not merely a transmission of messages. It is a building process. Therefore,

> …when we are participating in a dialogue, discussion or conversation…we are not simply saying what is going on but we are *creating* what is going on. We are not looking simply to passively discover what is inside, we are looking to create what neither is inside nor outside but what is socially available to be created. We are builders, we are creators, we become poets! (Newman, 1999, p. 128)

This "building" of meaning in a dialogic interaction is not regarded as an individual activity. It is rather a process of producing shared knowledge and understanding. This comes about as learners are engaged in collaborative tasks which provide opportunities for production and reflection on language use (Swain,

1995). According to Swain (2001), collaborative tasks which require written output from students (jigsaw, reformulation, dictogloss, for example), are conductive to learning. Besides, task-based instruction has real-world relevance, encourage communicative interaction and is certainly more motivating (Prabhu, 1987).

Tasks can be defined in a number of ways. Nunan (1989, p.10), for example, views a communicative task as "a piece of classroom work which involves learners in comprehending, manipulating, producing or interacting in the target language while their attention is principally focused on meaning rather than on form". However, Swain (2001) argues that this definition is "too limited" and contends that "a task can equally as well be focused on form". When learners, through negotiation, attempt to solve a linguistic problem, they may focus on form – "the form that is needed to express the meaning in the way they want to convey it". Thus, "they use language to negotiate 'about form'" (Swain, 1995). Gass (1997) also agrees that negotiation of form and meaning are not easily separable in interactions. Hence, many researchers prefer to use the term *negotiated interaction* to refer both to negotiation of form and meaning.

Pica (1994, p.495) defines negotiation as "the modification and restructuring of interaction that occurs when learners and their interlocutors anticipate, perceive, or experience difficulties in message comprehensibility". In other words, negotiation is the type of communication in which learner's attention is focused on solving a communication problem. Long (1981,1983) describes this process as negotiation of meaning. Three of the most important strategies for the negotiation of meaning are confirmation checks, clarification requests, and comprehension checks.

Despite the large number of studies in SLA research which has focused on negotiation of meaning, there is some debate concerning its pedagogical value in classroom interaction. Swain (1985), for example, argues that mutual comprehension can be achieved even though the message is grammatically incorrect and the language used is sociolinguistically inappropriate. She points out that the notion of negotiation of meaning

> needs to be extended beyond the usual sense of simply 'getting one's message across'. Negotiation of meaning needs to incorporate the notion of being pushed toward the delivery of a message that is not only conceived, but that is conveyed precisely, coherently and appropriately" (Swain, 1985, p.248-249).

Lyster and Ranta (1997), consider the distinction between negotiation of form and negotiation of meaning to be an important issue in classroom interaction. Whereas negotiation of meaning refers to the process speakers use to increase message comprehensibility, negotiation of form is closely associated with the provision of feedback and, consequently, has a more pedagogical function.

Of particular interest to certain researchers on negotiation is the value of students' native language (L1) as a resource. Studies adopting a sociocultural theoretical perspective have suggested that students' native language has an important scaffolding role in L2 classrooms. Swain & Lapkin (1998, p.333), for example, incidentally found that L1 was a "mediational tool fully available to [learners], to regulate their own behavior, to focus attention on specific L2 structures, and to generate and assess alternatives". It is important to note, however, that supporters of this view, i.e. of the bilingual approach to language learning, do not approve of the indiscriminate use of students' native language in the L2 classroom. In fact, many research studies have focused on the specific classroom situations in which L1 should or should not be used. Atkinson (1987, p.243) claims that L1 can be used for giving instructions, checking comprehension and helping learners cooperate with one another. Cook (2001, p.410) concluded that students use their L1 for scaffolding and for cooperative learning with classmates. According to Auerbach (1993, p.9), the use of L1 can be effective in language classrooms, and may be necessary in certain situations. This is the case of most English for Academic Purposes (EAP) programs in Brazil in which students are required to learn English in order to increase their knowledge of their academic field. Because they may never actually have to speak the target language, and both teacher and students share the same L1(Portuguese), a cross-lingual strategy (Stern, 1996, p. 279-299) is generally adopted in EAP classes, although translation is used mainly as an activity. This means that learners receive input in L2, but English is known through their L1. The directions, discussions, exercises, explanations and students' collaborative dialogues during interactions are performed in Portuguese. Though EAP teachers recognize the importance of intralingual strategies to the teaching of general English and to some English for Specific Purposes (ESP) courses, their decision in favor of the crosslingual strategy relates directly to students' needs and goals and the context in which the program takes place. Therefore, in this study, focus was given to the interaction between non-native English speakers working together on a classroom

task and spontaneously negotiating form in their native language because this is a common practice in Brazilian EAP contexts.

2.6. FROM COLLABORATIVE WRITING TO READING COMPREHENSION – A RATIONALE.

Several research studies have demonstrated that increased reading results in improved writing. In academic contexts, reading and writing are usually combined to create activities such as note taking, summarizing, translating, for example. Thus, writing has basically been used as a post-reading activity to measure comprehension.

In the majority of Brazilian EAP contexts, reading is the most important foreign-language skill for students to develop. Because their main goal is to read and fully understand authentic academic materials written in English, EAP students are required to write in English hardly at all in their academic years. Consequently, these students' writing is poor, and usually they feel demotivated when tasks which require their focusing on writing and on the formal features of the target language are assigned. On the other hand, in their enthusiasm to embrace the principles of the Communicative Approach, many EAP teachers have emphasized in their classrooms the development of top-down (or reader-driven) processing skills too much over the bottom-up (or text-driven)[6], and thus have failed to help their students to develop accuracy, and to have a greater understanding of how the target language works. Both perspectives are recognized as important and necessary for effective comprehension. Good readers simultaneously make use of both types of cognitive processing. When these two processes interact with each other, successful reading comprehension can be facilitated (Carrel & Eisterhold, 1988).Good readers also consciously select a set of strategies to process information from a text ,and match

_____

[6] The terms "bottom-up", "top down" and "interactive" are used as metaphors to describe the reading comprehension process. "Bottom-up models suggest that all reading follows a mechanical pattern in which the reader creates a piece-by-piece mental translation of the information in the text, with little interference from the reader's own background knowledge (…) Top-down models assume that reading is primarily directed by reader goals and expectations (…) Inferencing is a prominent feature of top-down models, as is the importance of a reader's background knowledge(…) The simple idea behind [interactive models of reading] is that one can take useful ideas from a bottom-up perspective and combine them with key ideas from a top-down view." (Grabe & Stoller, 2002, p.32-33).

appropriate strategies to each reading situation. Reading comprehension strategies have thus received increasing focus in L2 reading research. It has been recognized in the literature that L1 reading strategies can be transferred to L2 reading processes especially for adults who are literate in their native language. However, studies on L2 reading have also demonstrated that a limited L2 linguistic competence interferes in students' ability to transfer the strategies from L1 to L2 (Clarke, 1984; Alderson, 1984). Therefore, for effective L2 reading, students should make use of strategies which activate higher-level cognitive processing as well as strategies which help them increase their knowledge of grammar and vocabulary. However, as Widdowson (1980, p.65) points out, the "teaching of a language should involve not simply the teaching of its grammar but also the teaching of how the grammar is used in the business of actual communication". From this perspective, as a type of grammar teaching, focus on form as suggested in this study seems to be a good alternative for integrating grammar and vocabulary (form and lexis) into the process of reading comprehension through writing in a communicative way. Therefore, this study places writing (production) in the service of reading comprehension. In fact, writing becomes a tool of understanding as students use it to clarify their own thinking, organize their thoughts, and reflect on the language choice made. According to Widdowson (1992, p. 161),

> The abilities of reading and writing are alternative realizations of the same underlying interpreting ability (…) In this view, the activity of writing makes overt strategies of interpretation which the practiced language user brings to bear when he reads. The written work required of the learner (…) therefore, is a means of getting him to participate in the development of a general ability which underlies reading.

The integration of the writing and reading processes however, becomes more effective if learners are engaged in collaborative work. According to Vygotsky (1978), students perform significantly better at higher intellectual levels when involved in collaborative situations. Weissberg (2006, p.16) notes that this view of learning has led L2 teachers to "focus on collaborative learning as one way to promote the speaking-thinking-writing connection." This seems to indicate that the process of writing (and consequently of reading) is best developed through dialogic interaction.

Despite the recent emphasis on collaborative learning, most studies have concentrated on investigating teachers' and learners' talk in classroom interaction. Research aimed at understanding peer discourse particularly in small group work or

dyadic interaction are limited in number. In addition, the nature of this interaction and the type of assistance provided by peers in collaborative work need to be more fully investigated (Ohta, 2000). As Donato (2004, p.284) puts it, "ironically, although research and theroy on interaction is vast in the field of additional language acquisition, relatively few studies specifically take into account the collaborative aspects of learners' jointly constructed activity". It must also be emphasized that microgenetic analysis of adult L2 learners' talk in interaction (or collaborative dialogue) is still exceedingly rare (Markee, 2000).

Although several studies have been conducted in Canadian French immersion programs to investigate the process of L2 learning through interaction, Kowal and Swain (1994) admit that more research is needed to investigate students' behaviour and the substance of their interaction as they complete an assigned task, i.e. whether learners attend to form, fuction or meaning.

While research studies on form-focused instruction through L2 learners' interaction via collaborative dialogue have been conducted mainly in second-language immersion programs and in general foreign/second language courses, there seems to be little, if any research in EAP (reading) contexts in Brazil. Therefore, framed within Vygotsky's sociohistorical theory, this qualitative study is an attempt to examine through microgenetic analysis the effects of collaborative dialogue with a conscious focus on form performed during collaborative writing tasks in enhancing reading comprehension between EAP students at tertiary level in Brazil. Thus, as a contribution to the field, it is hoped that the present study may bring further evidence that "at least some language learning proceeds from production to comprehension" (Swain and Lapkin, in press, p.5).

3 RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 PURPOSE AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The purpose of the present study was to investigate how collaborative dialogue, performed in L1, which includes peer-feedback during collaborative writing tasks in English, enhances L2 reading comprehension.

The following questions have been set for the dissertation to address:

- When asked to perform writing tasks collaboratively in English, do students *language* (Swain, in press) about L2 form [7]?

- If so, how does it help them understand an authentic text in English?

The study consisted of two research phases: a pilot study and the actual research work. The reason for applying a pilot investigation prior to the research proper was due to the fact that I wanted to certify that the methodology and the analytical model would be suitable for the main research study, and to anticipate possible problems.

3.2 THE PILOT STUDY – A BRIEF COMMENT

The pilot for the current study was carried out in the month of February, 2007 at an ESP (reading) classroom in a private English course in Vitória, ES, Brazil. The group involved consisted of four voluntary adult learners (two female and two male), all belonging to the same ESP classroom. Their level of English-language proficiency may be considered intermediate, and all the students shared the same cultural and social background. These students' immediate need was to be able to read and

---

[7] In this study, "form" refers to pronunciation, spelling, lexis or any aspect of English morphology, syntax and discourse.

understand texts written in English in order to pass the entrance examination of a private college in Vitória.

The objectives of the pilot study centered on the analysis of the focus of students' collaborative dialogue as they performed written tasks in dyads, and on the investigation of the effects of their negotiated interaction on the comprehension of an academic text in English. Covering a period of three classes (2h each), the data were collected through verbal protocols in view of taking into consideration the LREs (Swain & Lapkin, 1995), reading comprehension exercises and an evaluation report based on students' experiences of working collaboratively and of comprehending an English text. Procedures were the same as those in the main research. They consisted of four stages: two writing tasks – text production and text reformulation; a reading comprehension session, and the final session in which the written feedback was provided. The findings indicated that in carrying out the tasks collaboratively, the students spontaneously engaged in dialogue which mediated their language learning. They actively participated in the activities, trying to solve their problems without any external intervention. There were no fixed expert/novice relationships. Both contributed to the discussion, providing useful feedback to one another. Scaffolding during peer interaction might have promoted learner development. Analysis of the transcripts revealed that there was a greater focus on lexis during text production, being a focus on form more intense during the reformulation stage. Results might have been affected by the nature of the tasks (Vidal, 2003). Because the students were only required to organize ready-made sentences, they did not have to work on verbs, word order, and collocations, for example. In order to produce their text coherently, they were more concerned with the meaning of unfamiliar words, and concentrated on the use of linkers. During the reformulation stage, however, the students had opportunities to reflect on, analyze and better understand the formal aspects of the target language. It became clear that when comparing their passage to the original text, the students had rich insights into the process of language production. These strategies might have contributed to a better understanding of a written text.

The reading comprehension exercise demonstrated that the students were finally successful in the task. By answering the questions in their native language, the participants proved they had fully understood the passage. From their evaluation

report it became evident that they enjoyed working collaboratively, and were proud of their success without the teacher's/researcher's intervention.

Results finally indicated that collaborative dialogue which includes peer feedback during a collaborative writing task might have allowed ESP students to move from production to comprehension (Swain & Lapkin, in press). On the whole, it became evident that the purpose of the pilot study had been justified. The methodology, data collection instruments and procedures proved to be effective. Used in parallel with relevant theoretical sources, the pilot study data provided useful insights into the issues being studied, besides helping me in the determination of the research design, which is explained next.

3.3 RESEARCH DESIGN

This investigation was a case study designed to explore L2 readers' collaborative dialogue in an academic writing and reading context from a qualitative research perspective. A case study is the preferred methodology among researchers when "one aspect of a problem [needs to be] studied in some depth within a limited time scale" (Bell,1999, p.10). According to Yin (2003, p.9), a case study is an inquiry which "investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real life context; when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident, and in which multiple sources of evidence are used."

This study was more concerned with "insight, rather than statistical analysis" (Bell, op.cit., p.07), and has been designed to bring about details from the viewpoint of the participants by using multiple sources of data which were analyzed interpretatively. The research investigated a contemporary phenomenon within a real-life context. There is no doubt that negotiated interaction and collaborative work are part of our daily lives, especially of our professional and educational environments. As a central element in L2 communicative classroom tasks, collaborative dialogue provides an authentic context for language learning.

The nature of the questions posed justified an exploratory, descriptive case study in which the researcher did not attempt to control or manipulate the phenomenon under investigation. The consideration of such characteristics (the degree of focus on a contemporary event within a real-life context, the type of research questions posed, and the extent of control the investigator has over the

actual behavioral event) motivated the development of this case study design, based on the theories and guidelines provided by Yin (2003), although references are made to other authors.

As Nunan (1992, p.81) argues, "the issue of making generalizations from instances is complex", and case studies are particularly suited where "the problem of external validity is less significant than in other types of research". This is why, in this study, there was no interest in generalizing the findings to other people or other situations. As Stake (1988:256) points out, " for the time being, the search is for an understanding of the particular case, in its idiosyncrasy, in its complexity."

3.4 RESEARCH SITE AND PARTICIPANTS

The selection of the research site and participants for the current research was based on two qualitative sampling strategies: "strategy sampling by convenience" and "strategy sampling by criterion" (Patton, 2002). The participants were recruited at the English Language Department of the Federal University of Espírito Santo (UFES) where I had worked as an instructor for three years. This represented a convenience sampling. The second reason for selecting the participants was based on the fact that they had the expected profile for the research: they were EAP adult students and they had an intermediate level of English proficiency – none had lived abroad. This represented the criterion sampling.

The research was conducted at the Federal University of Espírito Santo (UFES) in Vitória, ES, Brazil, in an English for Academic Purposes (EAP) context. In addition to the regular course which prepares learners to become English teachers ("Letras"), the Department of English Language at UFES offers different EAP courses to students from the various departments, mainly Computer Science, Economy, Business Administration, Social Sciences, Biology, Statistics, Physics, Chemistry and Library and Information Science. These courses (or disciplines), which are part of the curriculum, and, therefore, compulsory, usually comprise a total of 60h, covering a period of one regular school term.

The group involved consisted of two voluntary adult female students belonging to the same English for Academic Purposes (EAP) classroom. Their level of general English proficiency may be considered intermediate. None has lived abroad. These

students' immediate need was to be able to read and fully understand academic texts written in English. The first participant (S1), aged 27, had completed English and Spanish courses in a private language institute and was taking French. She worked for Cia. Vale do Rio Doce in Vitória. The other participant (S2), a 31-year old civil servant, had also finished her English course and was also taking French. These two students were close friends. Although these students had studied English, both felt far from confident with the level of English proficiency attained. However, they rarely used English in real-life situations except for reading texts for job and/or academic related activities. This is particularly true in EFL contexts where opportunities to interact with native speakers are limited. Consequently, the students were very much motivated to participate in the research. They considered this an extra opportunity to practice and improve their English.

As EAP learners, the participants were used to working collaboratively in small groups or in pairs, and to verbalizing their thoughts through classroom panel discussions. Thus, the process of dialogic interaction was familiar to them.

3.5 DATA COLLECTION

3.5.1. Data collection instruments

No single source of evidence has a complete advantage over the others, and the importance of multiple sources of data to the reliability and construct validity of the research is well established in the literature (Andrade,1997; Gil,1996; Yin,2003; Stake,1995, Patton,2002; Merriam, 1998). This is why different research instruments were used: pre-test results, transcripts of students' collaborative dialogue (or verbal protocols), reading comprehension exercises, and students' final evaluation reports.

The verbal reports, or protocols as they are known, are similar to think-aloud protocols. However, in this study they were collected during the task, not after it, and involved a discussion between the participants rather than an individual report on thought processes. The advantage of using this procedure is that it seems to create a more natural context for data collection since it demonstrates the actual thinking going on during collaborative discussions. Thus, as Swain (2006) puts it, verbal protocols "should be understood as part of the learning process not just as a medium of data collection (…) They are a process of comprehending and reshaping

experience – they are part of what constitutes development and learning." Taking into consideration Swain's view of verbal protocols, this research aimed to analyze participants' verbal protocols in an attempt to identify the focus of their negotiated interaction. In addition, the protocols allowed for the register of students' perception on their difficulties and the processing strategies used in writing and reading situations as they collaboratively worked on tasks. Recent studies in the field of reading have demonstrated that collaborative discussions have been successful in helping learners improve comprehension abilities (Pressley & Afflerbach, 1995; Anderson & Roit, 1993; Palincsar & Brown, 1984, Brown, 1980). Faced with reading difficulties, students tend to think aloud, talk to themselves or to make their thoughts public while sharing ideas in small groups. According to Vygotsky (1978), speech is an important mediating tool for human cognitive development. As reading comprehension is conceptualized as a problem-solving activity (Nuttal,1996) that involves thinking processes, reading tasks which stimulate learners to discuss their ideas in a collaborative environment of a small group may significantly contribute to the improvement of students' reading comprehension abilities in the target language (Hosenfeld, 1984). In addition, and most importantly, collaborative dialogue, a dialogue in which learners are engaged in "solving linguistic problems and building knowledge about language" (Swain,2006), may enhance students' reading comprehension in the target language if their reading problems refer mainly to language difficulties. As Pressley (2000, p.551) points out, "if [lower]-level processes are not mastered (…), it will be impossible to carry out higher order processes that are summarized as reading comprehension strategies". Thus, collaborative dialogue with conscious and spontaneous focus on form through collaborative writing tasks may be not only "a source of language learning" (Swain, 2000), but also a tool for reading comprehension improvement.

The study was restricted to learner-learner interaction with no teacher/researcher intervention. Therefore, students' attention to form was spontaneous, and arose according to their own needs. As Donato (1994, p.39) points out,

> studies of verbal interactions in which participants are observed in the process of structuring communicative events jointly, and according to their own self-constructed goals, will provide important insights into the development of linguistic competence.

3.5.2 Data collection procedures

A basic cycle of data collection covered a period of four classes (2h each) consisting of the following stages:

1. Pre-test - (day 1)
2. Collaborative writing task 1 (day 2) – text production
3. Collaborative writing task 2 (day 3) – text reformulation
4. Reading comprehension exercise (day 4)
5. Evaluation report (day 4)

The following procedures for data collection were used:

1. At the first meeting, the two voluntary students selected were introduced to the research. They were informed about the study, their own roles in the process, writing and reading tasks, and introduced to the researcher who audio-taped their collaborative dialogue during the whole process, but did not interfere in their work.
A pre-test (Appendix A) was administered to the participants in order to verify their level of reading proficiency in English, as well as to investigate the strategies they used while working collaboratively on tasks, and their interest in the topic.   The participants were required to work individually and no dictionary use was allowed.

2. The task :

Procedures:

a) Pre-writing: (brainstorming) - This consisted of a discussion based on the title and general topic of the text the students would work with in order to activate their prior knowledge, and to create certain expectations about the reading. The text used was authentic, i.e., not written for pedagogical purposes; developed for native speakers, and specifically related to participants' area of specialization.

b) Collaborative writing task 1 (Appendix B) based on Widdowson's (1980, p.75-85)

gradual approximation exercises ("discourse composition"), a strategy which

> begins by providing exercises within the scope of the learner's (limited) linguistic competence in English and then gradually realizes its communicative potential by making appeal to the other kinds of knowledge that the learner has. Thus, the starting point is the sentence and the end point is discourse … (p.76-77)

In devising this specific exercise, as Widdowson (id. Ibid) suggests, I have decomposed the original text into 30 basic propositions which I believed carry the main information in the passage. They were presented in an scrambled order. The students, then, were instructed to arrange these scrambled statements in the appropriate order and combine them where necessary to make a paragraph. They were also required to arrange the four paragraphs in the most appropriate order to form a complete passage. It is important to emphasize, however, that it was not the purpose of the task to have the students reproduce the original passage, but rather to have them spontaneously compose their own texts by means of their own linguistic resources. The students were audio-taped as they talked in their L1 to solve their language problems during this activity. Widdowson (op. cit, p.83) contends that the different versions produced by the pairs should be recognized, and suggests the use of L1 during the discussions. Unlike Swain and Lapkin's (1995) study however, in this investigation, the use of a dictionary, a grammar book and students' own classroom notes was allowed, but there was no teacher/researcher intervention. The idea was to stimulate learners to try to solve their problems on their own.

Although participants' main goal was to develop reading skills in English, this writing task is justified by the fact that it was

> used to make [the student] aware by experience of how English sentences can be put to relevant communicative use, actually to involve him in the discovery of how discourse is realized through the particular medium of the English language. This awareness, this discovery, is as crucial to comprehension as to composition: both of these activities are aspects of the communicative competence, of the basic process of interpretation which underlies all language use (Widdowson, op.cit., p.84).

c) Collaborative writing task 2 (Appendix C): Reading, noticing and rewriting - The students were instructed to read the text they had jointly produced, and to compare it to the original version, noticing the differences between both texts. The next step

was to rewrite their compositions, making the necessary corrections, following their peers' feedback. This type of "reformulation" [8] technique aimed "to demonstrate how [students'] own discourse [could] be further elaborated" (Widdowson, 1980, p.83) allowing them to notice and reflect on language use, and therefore, to come to a deeper understanding of the English language (Swain & Lapkin, 2002).Again, students' collaborative dialogue performed in their native language was audio-taped for further analysis. There was no researcher/teacher intervention at this stage either.

d) Post-writing: Reading comprehension exercise (Appendix D) In order to verify whether the negotiated interaction during a collaborative writing task enhanced reading comprehension, the students were asked to read the original passage again, this time with the aim of answering comprehension questions in their L1. As already cited, the use of mother tongue as a learning strategy is a common practice in EAP contexts. Finally, the students were invited to write an evaluation report based on their experience of working collaboratively and of comprehending an English text (Appendix E).

_____

[8] "Reformulation" is a technique which consists of a native speaker's rewriting of an L2 learner's written production in a way that the content and ideas are preserved, but which is presented in a native-like manner. In this study, the original, authentic text was used as a reformulated version.

4. DATA ANALYSIS

The present study, which was grounded in sociocultural theoretical framework (Vygotsky,1978), used microgenetic analysis of students' collaborative dialogue in order to examine the focus of their negotiated interaction. In addition, the microgenetic analysis employed also allowed me to directly observe the writing and reading strategies the students negotiated through collaborative dialogue which might have helped them better understand an authentic English passage. As Ohta (2000, p.54) puts it, "microanalysis of learner discourse in its sequential context allows the researcher to examine this process in flight." Thus, the language of the protocols was expected to reflect the on-going mental process of meaning construction and of reading comprehension.

4.1 PROCEDURE

In order to find answers to the first question posed, i.e., to investigate the focus of students' negotiation through collaborative dialogue, transcripts of the peer/peer talk during the classroom sessions (both writing and comparing/rewriting stages) were analyzed and compared for language-related episodes (LREs). According to Swain & Lapkin (1995, p.378) these LREs or aspects which generated the negotiations are defined as episodes

> in which a learner either spoke about a language problem he/she encountered while writing and solved it either correctly (…) or incorrectly (…); or simply solved it (again, either correctly or incorrectly) without having explicitly identified it as a problem.

In this study, the LREs which entail a discussion of lexis, therefore classified as "Lexis-based LREs" involve focusing on synonyms, word choice, unknown word/expressions, and new meanings of familiar word/expressions. The "Form-based LREs", on the other hand, involve focusing on any grammatical feature: spelling, pronunciation, morphology, syntax and discourse.

Responses to the second research question, i.e. how collaborative dialogue helps students better understand an authentic English passage, was found through the analysis of verbal protocols taking into consideration the strategies used by the

students during collaborative work, their written feedback on task performance and the results of their pre-test compared to their answers to the reading comprehension exercises. In addition, the type of assistance (or scaffolding) the participants provided each other during task performance was briefly considered.

In order to confirm the findings, thus ensuring more reliable data-based conclusions, the sources of evidence were triangulated on the same set of research questions. Yin (2003, p.99) avers that without "multiple sources, an invaluable advantage of the case study strategy will have lost".

It is important to mention that although the students produced written texts, it was not the purpose of this investigation to analyze these compositions.

The analysis of the data regarding each research question follows.

4.2. DATA PRESENTATION

Several studies informed by sociocultural theory have concentrated on gathering evidence that negotiated interaction through collaborative dialogue may be conductive to learning. For Swain (1998, 2000), Swain & Lapkin (2002), Lantolf (2000) for example, dialogue (with others and with the self) represents language learning in progress. According to Swain (1985, 1995, 2000), second language learning is more efficient if the students notice specific features of the target language, formulate and test hypotheses and consciously reflect on, and *language* (with others and with the self) about language use. Thus, the results of the data analysis which correspond to the first research question of the current study are demonstrated below. The complete data from the recording sessions can be found in Appendix F, though.

4.2.1. <u>Research Question 1:</u> When asked to perform writing tasks collaboratively in English, do students *language* about L2 form?

A) <u>Samples of LREs from collaborative writing task 1 – text production:</u>

- <u>Lexis-based LREs</u> (synonyms, word choice, unknown word/expressions and new meanings of familiar word/expressions)

The following are examples of episodes concerned about <u>word meaning:</u>

Episode 1:

(006) S2: O que é "outsourcing" ?

(007) S1: Não sei não... mas é um adjetivo – olha só: "outsourcing firm". Na verdade, é...

(008) S2: e deve ser positivo, é claro! Mas... procuro agora no dicionário, ou deixa pra lá?

(009) S1: na verdade, não interfere em nada; a gente pode ver depois.

(010) S2: é melhor mesmo, porque nesse dicionário aqui, nem tem!

In the above episode, S2 explicitly asks for the meaning of an unknown word. Although S1 cannot supply the correct answer, by activating her prior knowledge, she recognizes it is an adjective, a modifier. S2 then infers from the context that it might be a positive adjective. It is interesting to note that S2 seems to recognize S1 as "the expert" and the leader. She expects S1 to give the directions. However, she makes her own decision, and before S1 replies that understanding the meaning of that specific word is not important for the general comprehension of the sentence, she looks it up in the dictionary (without success). Hence, she agrees to postpone solving the problem.

Episode 2:

(018) S2: o que que é essa frase 4? Não entendo nada!!!

(019) S1: nem eu!! Agora temos mesmo que ver no dicionário! Se é que tem essa palavra! Vamos procurar "un-heard". Vê aí.

(020) S2: tá aqui. É... "unheard... unheard of" – inédito.

(021) S1: ótimo

This time, however, it becomes evident that understanding the meaning of the expression is essential. The students decide then to use the dictionary. Problem successfully solved.

Episode 3:

(130) S1: tá… então… "HCL employs 20 percent of its workforce overseas"

(131) S2: "overseas" ?

(132) S1: "overseas" é "fora"   no exterior.

(133) S2: você sabe tudo, hein???

(134) S1: é porque eu trabalho com isso. Tenho que ler muita coisa em inglês.

(135) S2: não me lembro mais de muita coisa que aprendi. Tenho que ler mais... essas aulas aqui são boas. A gente usa mesmo os textos de nossa área. Acho isso legal.

In the episode above, S2 signals her incomprehension of the word "overseas" by means of a clarification request. She is then surprised because S1 immediately provides the right answer, i.e. again, S2 recognizes S1 as "the expert". S1, however, explains that she has improved her proficiency in English due to the fact that she reads many texts in English at work. Turn 135 demonstrates that S2 is aware that reading is one of the ways to improve her proficiency in the target language. She also refers to the EAP classes as positive. Thus, the collaborative work provided S2 not only with the opportunity to reflect on the target language use, but also to evaluate her own learning process and behavior as a student.

- <u>Form-based LREs:</u> (grammatical features – spelling, pronunciation, morphology, syntax and discourse).

Episode 1: verb tense and aspect / spelling

(037) S2: tá, mas olha só! Tá falando do passado e os verbos estão no presente. Será que foi de propósito? Vamos mudar.

(038) S1: então tá. Então... o passado de "rate" é... é regular, não?

(039) S2: acho que é regular. Então é "rated"…(...)

(...)

(041) S2 : então... se a gente vai colocar no passado, temos que mudar "choose" também. Será que é regular? Não me lembro... "choose"....

(042) S1: sabe que não me lembro também ? "choose….acho que é "choosed", não sei, mas tá estranho.... hum.... "choose... choose.... é... "choose, chose, chosen", isso! Isso mesmo! Então é "chose"! põe aí.

(043) S2: ok. Então ficou.... hum… " at HCL, an extraordinary process of upward evaluation was implemented last year". Ponto. "Every employee rated their boss, their boss's boss, and three other company members they cho…." Como é que se escreve mesmo? Com um "o" só?

(044) S1: é. Agora eu acho que vem a 11 que é a avaliação de 360 graus.

This is a very interesting excerpt. The students were given ready-made sentences and were required to arrange them in their most appropriate order to form

a paragraph. However, by analyzing the sentences, the students noticed that one of them clearly referred to a past event. They mistakenly concluded that the verbs in the following sentences might have been written in the wrong form on purpose, and decided to change them. In order to keep cohesion in the sentence, S2 suggested using the verb "choose" also in the past tense, but she was unsure whether the verb is regular or not. Turn 042 illustrates S1's interaction with herself. By means of her intuition, she recognized that the alternative she had offered was not appropriate and, by activating her prior knowledge, she had an insight and "solved" the problem. In fact, the students think they have come to the right conclusion (which they have not). Fortunately, they notice their mistake in the reformulation stage. As she attempts to write the sentences, however, S2 questions the spelling of the word "chose", and S1 correctly prompts the answer.

What this collaborative dialogue (and others identified in the study) reveals is that although "it is often assumed that subjects will simply adopt the orientation prescribed by the researcher" (Roebuck, 1998, p.23), it is also true that, as human beings, they do have their own decision-making power and intentions. This gives support, according to the Activity theory (a component of Vygotsky's sociocultural theory) to the claim that "tasks do not result in homogeneous activity" (Roebuck, op.cit, p.xiii).

> Task and activity are both part of experimental and instructional conditions" (…) [However] the task represents what the researcher (or instructor) would like the learner to do, and activity is what the learner actually does. That is, activity is how learners construct the task.
> (Roebuck, op cit, p.23)

From this perspective, therefore, students' behavior during task performance is not predictable. Why did the students in this study decide to question the researcher's orientation? Why didn't they explicitly ask the researcher (who was in the room) about their doubt? If there were other participants in the study would they have behaved the same way? Obviously, analyzing participants' general behavior during collaborative work is beyond the scope of the present research. However, it is relevant for this study the fact that the students did focus on form in a context in which they were not expected to do so. They identified a language problem, formulated and tested hypothesis, noticed it during the reformulation stage, discussed about it and finally solved it. Their collaborative dialogue during this

process clearly allowed them to better understand the ideas contained in the original text.

The following episodes illustrate participants' concern with <u>pronunciation</u> (one in which incorrect feedback is provided, and the other which S1 provides S2 with the correct pronunciation of the word in question). Although developing speaking skills is not one of the main objectives of an EAP course, students are usually interested in learning the correct pronunciation of certain words in English. In these specific excerpts, the concern with this feature was due to the fact that S2 was reading the sentences aloud as they were organizing them. Because this is a NNS/NNS peer interaction, not always the correct feedback is provided as it can be observed in the episode below. However, although "not surprisingly, interlanguage talk is less grammatical than teacher talk" (Ellis 1995b, p.599 - referring to Pica and Doughty's, 1985, and Porter's, 1986 studies). Ellis (ibid) contends that, according to Porter (ibid), "exposure to incorrect peer input may [not] lead to fossilization" Ellis (id.ibid.) points out that Porter's findings indicate that "in general (…) learners do not appear to be unduly disadvantaged by exposure to deviant input from other learners."

Episode 2:

(063) S2: hum hum.. vou escrever aqui. "That's not all" ponto. "Every em.. employ..." Como é que se lê isso?
(064) S1: "employee", / Ιμ´πλOI / acho que é assim... empregado.
(065) S2: ok.... "employee" (repeating the word with the incorrect pronunciation).

As S2 reads the sentence aloud, she notices that she does not know how to pronounce the word "employee" and explicitly asks for assistance. Immediately, although not sure about it, S1 supplies the answer. Trusting in S1's competence, S2 repeats the word without questioning (unfortunately, it's incorrect).

In the episode below, S2 is not aware of the gap in her interlanguage – she mispronounces the word "management", which immediately prompts S1 to repeat the word with the correct stress.

Episode 3:

(083) S2: então.... começa com a 2, é claro! "You can't become a manager at HCL until.... courses…" aí continua com a 1 "The group of courses… expectation ma<u>na</u>gement"
(084) S1: <u>ma</u>nagement (correcting S2's pronunciation).

What is possible to observe from the above excerpts is that S1 clearly assumes the role of the predominant "expert" – even though she is not always sure of the appropriate target language feature and/or rule, she never fails to provide assistance either when explicitly required or when she feels it is necessary. On the other hand, it is also evident that S2 identifies S1's role as more proficient and treats her as such.

There follows examples of episodes in which the use of <u>relative pronouns</u> was the feature of concern.

In episode 4 below, the choice for the relative pronoun "that" is justified by S1 and accepted by S2.

Episode 4:

(011) S1: ok, então vamos juntar as frases. Acho que podemos juntar a 8 com a 10 e usar.... "that" porque tá falando de Nayar.
(012) S2: hum hum. Então vai ficar assim: "Vineet Nayar is the president of India's 30,000 employee HCL technologies that is creating an IT outsourcing firm". Acho que ficou bom.
(013) S1: Também gostei. Qual é a próxima, então?

Episode 5:

(055) S2: tá, mas não vamos repetir a palavra "ticket", né?
(056) S1: não... a gente pode colocar um conectivo.
(057) S2: sim, então coloca "which"
(058) S1: tá bom. "that's not all. Every HCL employee can at any time create an electronic ticket which will flag anything the employees think requires action in the company."

In this episode, it is S2 who suggests the use of the relative pronoun "which" and S1 accepts it. However, the following episode illustrates a case in which the

students express doubt about the use of the same pronouns they had used before without having identified them as a problem, as demonstrated in episodes 4 and 5 above.

Episode 6:

(090) S1: .... então vamos lá. 16. "Nayar aims to build an organization full of highly-skilled employees" Ponto.

(091) S2: ponto, não. A gente junta com a 18 e põe "which". Esse é o conectivo pra pessoas, né? Tira Nayar.

(092) S1: tá.... "and which".... "which" não é pra coisas? ... "and that"... não, "that" é que é pra coisas, não?

(093) S2: acho que é.... deixa eu ver.... agora não tô lembrando não. Deixa "which" mesmo.

(094) S1: a gente usou "which" aqui pra "tickets". Hum hum... "tickets" é coisa.... "full of highly-skilled employees which will be dedicated..." acho que seria "whose"

(095) S2: não… "whose" é "de quem". "who" é quem.

(096) S1: tá… então vamos deixar "which" mesmo. Acho que serve pros dois.

(097) S2: "Nayar aims to build an organization full of highly-skilled employees which can better focus on customer success". Tá bom; Vamos em frente.

In this excerpt, S1 takes on her position as "the expert", stimulating S2 to go on with the task, and providing an alternative. S2, however, reacts and disagrees with S1 by using a very strong reply: "ponto, não", thus assuming momentarily the role of the "expert". She then suggests joining the sentences by the use of a relative pronoun instead. But, noticing a gap in her interlanguage, she requests for confirmation (and reassumes her role as "novice"). S1 agrees at first, but then, she expresses doubt if it should be "which" or "that" and, by activating her prior knowledge, she tries a few hypotheses, but does not come to a solution. In turn 093, S2 expresses the same doubt, and suggests keeping "which". What this episode demonstrates is that the students were aware that a gap existed in their interlanguage, but they did not have the knowledge to solve the problem.

In this episode, as previously mentioned, the discussion raised a doubt that did not exist before. In turns 011, 012, 013 (episode 4) for example, both students agreed that they had made the right decision concerning the choice of the pronoun "that". Likewise, turns 055, 056, 057 and 058 (episode 5) demonstrate that when joining sentences 28 and 24, the students used "which" automatically, without

questioning. S1 refers to this specific sentence in turn 094, when she compares it to the one in question. From this comparison, she realizes that "which" is used for "things" - but does not solve the problem yet. She then suggests "whose", but, by making use of translation, S2 replies that this is not appropriate, and provides another alternative – "who". Both students do not recognize this as the correct form and decide to keep "which" justifying their choice by saying that this pronoun can be used both to "things" and "persons". This is an example of a problem incorrectly solved. In this situation, feedback from the teacher or from the researcher could have been very useful, but the participants were expected to work without this type of interference. Fortunately, however, before they finish their work, they wisely decide to write down all their doubts in order to check with the teacher later, as demonstrated on page 61.

These episodes are also good examples of how, by formulating and testing hypothesis in order to solve their problems, the students construct knowledge through collaborative dialogue.

Episode 7: word meaning / verb form:

(065) S2: ok. "Every employee can at any time create an electronic ticket which will flag…. " flag" não é bandeira?
(066) S1: "flag" é bandeira…. Mas "will flag"… aqui… aqui é verbo.
(067) S2: então deve ser sinalizar
(068) S1: que vai sinalizar tudo que os funcionários acham que precisa da ação da companhia. Tá certo.

Lexis and form are negotiated in this episode. S1 explicitly asks for the new meaning of a familiar word. S2 recognizes that the word functions as a verb in the sentence. Based on S1's feedback, S2 has an insight. By making use of translation, S1 agrees with S2 and they successfully solve their problem.

Episode 8 : verb form

(101) S2: hum... "Nayar aims to build an organization full of highly-skilled employees which will be dedicated to creating customer value". "creating"?   "-ing" não é gerúndio? Estranho! "serão dedicados a criando"????
(102) S1: É... tinha que ser "create". Acho que tá errado aqui. Vamos deixar "create"

(103) S2: mas será que tem erro assim nas frases? É pra gente consertar? Ela não falou nada!

(104) S1: vai ver foi de propósito. É só pra ver se a gente nota....

(105) S2: tá. Então vamos corrigir.....

This is also another example of the unpredictable behavior of the participants. Again, a doubt was raised concerning the task, but although I was present in the room, the students decided not to ask me, and followed their own decisions. Both students notice the use of the *-ing* form, and, by making use of translation, they recognize that it does not make sense in Portuguese. As they do not know the rule in English, and therefore cannot understand why this verb form was used, they opt to change it according to their native language, and believe their choice is correct. Students' error clearly resulted from their mother tongue interference, or transfer. As Ellis (1995, p.336) notes, "transfer in learning occurs when the learner uses the L1 in the attempt to develop hypothesis about L2 rules" (Ellis, 1995b, p.336). In this case, the process may be considered a "negative transfer" because the influence of L1 resulted in non-target like L2 production.

The following episodes illustrate a case in which <u>discourse</u> is the feature of concern. In their attempt to write a cohesive text, the students negotiate the use of referents and linkers.

Episode 9 : referent

(137) S2: ficou bom. E aí, termina com a 20. "He wants to make HCL"...

(138) S1: péra aí… agora não pode começar com "he" – acho que temos que colocar o nome dele.

(139) S2: é... senão não fica claro. "ele" quem? Vamos escrever "Nayar" no lugar de "he". Pronto. Acabamos então.

Episode 10: referent / linker

(121) S2: sim... fica bom. "Nayar believes in the winners"

(122) S1: já sei. Podemos ligar a 13 com a 18… vamos colocar "because" então.

(123) S2: "Nayar believes in the winners because...." aí tem que colocar "they" pra não repetir de novo.

(124) S1: certo.

(125) S2: então, assim..... "Nayar believes in the winners because they will deliver the best results to customers."

(126) S1: tá bom. Agora vem….

B) Samples of Language-Related Episodes found in the transcribed data from Collaborative writing task 2 – Reformulation.

According to Swain and Lapkin (2002), reformulation stimulates noticing and metatalk, besides providing opportunities for collaborative dialogue. The following excerpts illustrate cases in which the students notice the forms and meanings they had identified as problematic in the first task, talk about them and decide to change (or not) their written production.

It needs to be pointed out that the reformulation technique used in this study is slightly different from the original version proposed by Levenston (1978) in which students' text is reformulated by a competent native speaker. In this study, an authentic English text related to students' area of specialization was used as the target language model instead. As EAP learners, their main goal is to read and fully understand authentic materials in English. Furthermore, although very relevant, writing is a skill which the students are not expected to improve during the course. Therefore, their written production was not considered in this study. The advantage of using an authentic text as a model, in my view, is that some students may feel embarrassed or even upset for having their production rewritten (and usually modified) by an outsider. Authentic texts provide learners with opportunities to deal with materials written for native speakers, and this may be highly motivating.

The effectiveness of reformulation, as a type of feedback to promote noticing seems to be largely dependent on learner variables, such as learner developmental readiness, proficiency level in the target language, learning experiences, knowledge of the first language, among others (Qi and Lapkin, 2001). The fact that the students were given the freedom to focus on different aspects of the target language as they pleased, i.e., their focus on form and lexis was spontaneous, it appeared that learners' noticing might have been influenced by their backgrounds, particularly their knowledge of the world, experiences as L2 learners and their native language. The examples that follow, then, provide excerpts from the collaborative dialogue that took place during the reading, noticing and rewriting stage.

<u>Form-based LREs:</u>

Episode 1: discourse

(001) S2: Bom, agora é hora de compararmos nosso texto com o original.

(002) S1: sim, vamos ver...

(003) S2: ok. Então... vamos começar vendo os parágrafos.

(004) S1: certo. "Vineet Nayar.... president..." certo.

(005) S2: olha, acertamos a ordem dos parágrafos!

(006) S1: legal... certinho mesmo! Agora vamos ver as frases...

(007) S2: tá. Nossa! Olha só! três frases juntas formando uma só!!!

(008) S1: nós colocamos "that" pra juntar.... e nem precisava....

(009) S2: isso... era só colocar entre vírgulas.... olha isso!!!!

This excerpt illustrates students' concern with coherence and cohesion. Expressions such as "olha!", "nossa!", "olha só!", "olha isso" demonstrate that the students noticed and discussed the differences between their written production and the original text.

Episode 2: –   verb form

(084) S1: agora juntou essa com essa aqui, oh, sem usar nada, só o verbo "dedicated"

(085) S2: é... ficou bom! Ih! Olha só! É "creating" mesmo. Não é possível que ia errar duas vezes!!!

(086) S1: acho que não! E aqui é o texto original! Cê lembra que a... a professora sempre diz que não tem pegadinha???? Então....

The above episode is related to episode 8 (page 55) in which the students question the use of the –*ing* form. They notice the correct verb form this time, but do not present any justification. The problem remains unsolved.

In the episodes 3, 4 and 5 below, the students notice and discuss the use of the relative pronouns "that", "which" and "who" – a doubt generated in the production stage (pages 53, 54) and finally correctly solved during the reformulation session.

Episode 3:

(046) S1: tá. Próximo parágrafo... certo... "You can't become a manager..." olha só! "that"… nós colocamos ponto em tudo.

(047) S2: podia ter colocado "that" mesmo. Viu? Tá falando de "courses" aqui é "that" – coisa.

(048) S1: certo. Então "that" é pra coisas mesmo. E aí tem um tracinho....

Episode 4:

(067) S2: olha agora! Descobri!!! É "who" ... "who" é que é pra pessoas.... "employees who are secure and happy"... "that" foi pra coisa....lá trás... vamos mudar aquela frase....

(068) S1: que ... a gente vai descobrindo as coisas e.... corrigindo o que escrevemos!!!! Muito legal isso!

Episode 5:

(074) S1: aí coloca "the winners" vírgula "Nayar believes" vírgula "will be those that" "that"? então "that" é que serve pra coisas e pra pessoas... é isso.

(075) S2: é... deve ser... não me lembro. Sei que tem um que serve pros dois.

(076) S1: é... mas se tá aqui... então é "that" mesmo.

A very interesting aspect to consider especially during the reformulation stage is that although they accept the authentic text as the correct English version, many times the students agree not to make changes in their production. In other words, the play out their agency, as demonstrated below:

- Form- and Lexis-based LREs:

Episode 1: Linkers and word meaning

(032) S1: olha agora! Nós juntamos as frases com "which" e é "to"...

(033) S2: "to" é "para", né?

(034) S1: sim... cada funcionário pode criar um ticket eletrônico para sinalizar..."

(035) S2: é... mas que irá sinalizar também tá certo..

(036) S1: é.. tem razão.

As the students compare their production to the original text, they notice a difference in the way the sentences are joined. However, by means of translation they realize that both forms are correct. They opt to keep their sentence, though.

This episode is also an example of a Lexis-based LRE. As it can be noted in turn 033, S2 is unsure about the meaning of the word "to" and, by means of a

confirmation request, she expresses this uncertainty. S1 immediately offers confirmation and translates the sentence into Portuguese (their native language)

Episode 2: Word choice: Linkers

(041) S2: (....) é… Aqui até que a nossa frase ficou bem melhor…. Nós usamos "entretanto", né? "however", e no texto tem "and".... "however" é mais chique!!!

In this example, S2 compares their production to the original text emphasizing that the linking word they had chosen ("however") seems to be more elaborate than the linker used in the original text, i.e. "and". Both students seem not to be aware of their error in the interpretation of discourse marker relationships and how these cohesive devices affect meaning. Whereas adversative markers such as "however" "introduce information that the writer sees as contrary to what is expected or hoped, or to what has been said (…), ["and," as an additive marker,] introduces further facts /ideas, seen by the writer as adding to or reinforcing those already dealt with" (Nuttal, 1996, p.96).

Conclusion - Findings related to research question 1.

The first research question of the current study sought to investigate if learners engaged in collaborative writing tasks in English would *language* about form and/or lexis. In order to answer this question, transcripts of students' collaborative dialogue were analyzed for Language Related Episodes (LREs) (Swain & Lapkin, 1995). The microgenetic analysis of the data revealed that students' collaborative work resulted in their consciously focusing on both form and lexis. Surprisingly, however, discussions about form were also raised during the production stage concerning verb tense/aspect, and verb form (as demonstrated in episode1 - page 50) and in episode 8 (page 55) as a language problem mistakenly identified by the students.

It was also evidenced that the participants demonstrated noticing gaps and holes in their interlanguage, focusing mainly on form during the reformulation stage. When comparing their written output to the original text, the students had rich insights into the process of language production. As Qi and Lapkin (2001, p.279) point out, "while noticing of input is exceedingly important, noticing as a result of producing the

target language (LT), as in the context of L2 composing, also has important roles to play in L2 development."

In summary, the findings demonstrated that the participants not only focused on form and lexis during the collaborative work, but also were able to provide reasons (unfortunately not always correct) for their choices. The data also found evidence of learning strategies used by the students as presented below:

(087) (...) sabe o que a gente podia fazer? Anotar então tudo que a gente tem dúvida e que não conseguiu descobrir... daí a gente pergunta depois pra Rosangela.
(088) S1: ou pra nossa professora. boa idéia. Senão a gente não vai aprender. Então, vamos anotar esse negócio do gerúndio aí.
(089) S2: tá. E aquela confusão de "who", "that", "which" também, né?
(090) S1: é. Tem mais alguma coisa?
(091) S2: acho que não.... só se for pronúncia...
(092) S1: é, pode ser....

The above excerpt poses the question of the role of the teacher as an important factor in language learning. The absence of the teacher (and of the researcher) in the current study, among other factors (providing support, encouragement, guidance, motivating learners, for example), contributed to students' inability to solve certain language problems identified during task performance. Fortunately, however, they developed a learning strategy, i.e. taking notes of their doubts concerning the target language form and lexis in order to elicit from the teacher later. This fact demonstrates not only students' motivation and interest in learning the target language, but especially their ability to deal with their own problems.

The next section explores the results of the data analysis that correspond to the second research question.

4.2.2. <u>Research Question 2:</u> If students *language* about form, how does it help them understand a written text in English?

As previously mentioned, in order to answer the second research question, transcripts of peer/peer collaborative dialogue (verbal protocols) were analyzed for evidence of reading strategies. Students' written feedback provided at the end of the

study and the results of their pre-test and compared to their answers to the reading comprehension exercise were also considered, as well as the type of assistance the students provided each other during collaborative work.

Although reading strategies are recognized in the literature as essential for proficient reading, the definition of the term and the categorizations of strategies vary among researchers. In this dissertation, "strategy" is used to refer to a conscious process used by readers to enhance reading comprehension and overcome comprehension problems. In the description given below of the reading strategies used by the participants of the present study, the reading strategies were categorized as bottom-up processing strategies (or text-driven strategies), top-down processing strategies (or reader-driven strategies), and interactive strategies, although reference will occasionally be made to the three categories proposed by O'Malley et al. (1985) consisting of metacognitive, cognitive and social/affective strategy types. It is important to mention that the distinction among these strategies is not always very clear. Furthermore, as Oxford (1990) points out, strategy use is highly task dependent.

Researchers on reading development have relied on verbal data to gain insights about the reading strategies used by skilled individual readers. Spontaneous verbalization through social interaction in classroom settings, however, has been more recently explored, and the role of speaking in the form of dialogue (collaborative dialogue) in assisting learners to improve reading abilities is now relatively well accepted. (Anderson & Roit, 1993; Pressley & Afflerbach, 1995; McCafferty,1994).One major advantage of verbal protocol analysis in reading research then, is that it provides descriptions of how L2 readers deal with the text, how they use strategies to compensate for comprehension gaps (Poulisse et al, 1986).

There follows examples of verbal protocols for evidence of reading strategies.

Episode 1:

(001) S1: Tá bom, então… vamos começar! Vamos fazer uma estratégia de leitura, de repente, já ta.... associando qual que ta ligada à primeira.
(002) S2: a primeira então é essa aqui, a 8, eu acho.... aqui explica quem é Vineet Nayar.

(003) S1: Certo. Eu acho que... depois tem que ser esta... Ela... ela diz que ele está criando uma empresa. O que você acha?

(004) S2: hum...hum. Fica... essa sexta pra.. tá ligada à primeira.

(034) S2: tá. Então agora fala da avaliação. Tá explicando o processo.

(035) S1: é, mas tem que ser no mesmo parágrafo. Acho que a gente podia começar com a frase mesmo.

(036) S2: hum hum

(046) S1: pronto, assim... assim a gente termina o primeiro parágrafo.

(047) S2: e agora? Qual será o segundo?

(048) S1: ah... temos que ler tudo e ver... depende do assunto.

(049) S2: é mesmo... tem que estar relacionado ao primeiro.

(050) S1: tipo assim... aqui tem "ticket". Aí, assim, eu acho.... esse "ticket" pode ser da avaliação...

(051) S2: será? Péra aí... O primeiro terminou falando da…. Da avaliação.

(052) S1: Certo... então… acho que agora vai falar sobre como funciona a… a avaliação. Então... vamos colocar essa aqui, oh... começa com a 28: "every employee.." Olha só.. aí aqui tem... tipo assim… "the electronic ticket will flag.." deve ser a continuação."

(053) S2: é... mas tem essa aqui... a 22. não seria melhor começar com ela? Parece que dá continuidade ao outro parágrafo. Isso!

(054) S1: é isso mesmo. Então a gente coloca ela e vamos juntar então essas duas e começar o segundo parágrafo.

(081) S2: acho que ficou bom. Agora o outro parágrafo só pode ser o A. só pode...

(082) S1: é... hum... e… e olha só… aqui, continua falando dos gerentes. Que bom! Acho que estamos indo bem.

This episode illustrates the three types of strategies used by the participants while producing their text. Turn 001, for example, demonstrates that before engaging in the task, S1 developed a plan of action. As O'Malley and Chamot (1990, p.47) contend, "planning is a key metacognitive strategy for second language acquisition, involved in directing the course of language reception and production".

Students' collaborative dialogue centers mainly around the association of ideas contained in the passage. As a cognitive strategy, this may be classified as a reader-driven or top-down processing strategy because it draws "on our intelligence and experience" (Nuttal, 1996, p.16).   By assuming that texts must be coherent, the students searched for cues or "signals" within the scrambled sentences provided. They decided on the strategy of associating ideas starting from the alternative they identified as containing the topic sentence. In order to make associations, the

students first analyzed the sentences, discussed, compared and contrasted ideas. This ability to connect information with another previously mentioned is an important component of the comprehension process. As McCarthy (2001, p.28) points out,

> the interpretation of relations between textual segments is a cognitive act on the part of the reader, who might be supposed to be asking questions of the text as it unfolds (…) In this sense, reading the text is like a dialogue with the author, and the processing of two segments could be seen as analogous to the creation of an exchange in spoken discourse.

Another strategy evidenced in the above excerpts is the social/affective. Both participants responded positively to the collaborative work. They exchanged ideas, questioned for clarification, and encouraged each other by making positive statements, as for example, in turn 082.

Episode 2:

(031) S1: bom, ele tá falando que o tal Nayar é presidente de uma empresa na Índia. Ele tá criando uma outra... outra??? empresa que é "outsourcing" porque valoriza mais os funcionários do que os clientes. Quer dizer, essa empresa deve ser ... então... "outsourcing" deve ser .... fora do comum, né? Só pode ser... valoriza mais os próprios funcionários!!!!!
(032) S2: é mesmo, só pode..... isso. E daí que isso é inédito. Tá.então ficou assim até agora: 8-10-9...

In this episode, the students make use of both bottom-up and top-down processing strategies. This is therefore called "interactive processing strategy". In their attempt to understand the sequence of events in the passage, the students make use of translation (a type of bottom-up processing strategy). As their problem concerning the meaning of the word "outsourcing" was not solved, as demonstrated in Episode 1 (page 49), they relied on text-driven strategies, more specifically by inferencing from context and using their knowledge of the world. However, they erroneously translate the word "outsourcing" as "fora do comum" ("out of sight"). As it can be noted from the above episode, although the students sometimes make the wrong translation, they do not fail to understand the central idea. Mental or explicit translation may indicate a "bad habit" or a strategy used by "weak readers". However, Kern (1994, p.451) points out that in this case, translation "reflects the reader's need

for precision in interpreting visual information, and may indicate a switch from automatic to controlled processing."

Episode 3:

(019) S2: é... agora.... de novo, as frases ficaram juntas. E nós fizemos duas separadas. Olha aqui: "at HCL an extraordinary process of upward evaluation was implemented last year" ponto.

(020) S1: xiii… olha só! Não era pra colocar no passado mesmo não! Olha aqui!

(021) S2: é... vamos ver... ficou mesmo no presente.

(022) S1: é que... eu acho... é isso mesmo... "In an extraordinary process of upward evaluation implemented last year, every employee rates"... quer dizer.... a... a avaliação foi implementada no ano passado, mas ela continua, por isso é que tá no presente.

(023) S2: hummm.... começa no passado e continua no presente? Então... então... tinha que estar no... no... como é mesmo?

(024) S1: "present perfect"? hum... agora você me confundiu!!! Péra aí.. vamos ler de novo. Tá. É, mas não é isso... Acho que... a avaliação é que foi implementada no ano passado. Acabou. Agora, o processo é que é no presente. Sempre se faz a mesma coisa. A partir da implementação, né?

(025) S2: hummm.. complicado isso.... péra aí. Deixa eu ver aqui..... acho que entendi. É... faz sentido.... Então é presente mesmo. Vamos mudar aqui.

(026) S1: tá. A gente colocou tudo no passado.

(027) S2: a gente muda agora, então.

In the above episode in which form is negotiated, the students notice the correct verb form in the original text and discuss a problem mistakenly identified during the production stage. In this process of knowledge building, meaning is constructed through collaborative dialogue. Consequently, students' *languaging* helped them better understand the passage. This is again another example of interactive processing strategy use.

Episode 4:

(063) S2: hum hum. ... vou escrever aqui. "That's not all" ponto. "Every em.... employ…" Como é que se lê isso?

(064) S1: "employee" /Iμ´πλOI/ acho que é assim.... empregado.

(065) S2: ok... "employee" (repeating the word with the incorrect pronunciation)

This excerpt illustrates a very interesting bottom-up reading strategy unconsciously used by S1 to help S2 minimize her uncertainty. Although S2's doubt

concerns pronunciation and not word meaning, S1 makes use of translation probably to avoid misunderstandings. It seems that S1 wants to certify that by identifying the meaning of the word, S2 is able pronounce it correctly. This view is supported by Smith (1973) who states that "before you can utter a sentence, you must know what it means (…). Sound, if it is produced at all, comes only after the comprehension of meaning in reading."

Episode 5: knowledge of the world (schemata) – a higher-level or top-down strategy:

 (025) S1: hum.. assim... essa de... de "evaluation process" não é essa não. Não é o primeiro não. Você lembra que depois, mais no final, tinha a de "evaluation process" e aí tem aquela parte da avaliação que eles fazem com o... próprio chefe.... o próprio chefe, o chefe do chefe, ele escolhe, eles...

(026) S2: é... essa parte fica perdida.... por causa do vocabulário.

(027) S1: como eu trabalho lá na Vale, eu sei que eles fazem avaliação de 180 graus e de...

(028) de 360 graus... hum...hum...

(029) S1: de 180 graus é do chefe com você. Aí depois, 360 graus é todo mundo avalia todo mundo. Aí eu acho que essa daqui, oh...

In this episode, the students make use of a top-down processing strategy as there is evidence of their background knowledge playing a role.

"Every act of comprehension involves one's knowledge of the world as well" (Anderson et al. in Carrell and Eisterhold 1977 p.369). In the process of reading, some disruption of comprehension can be attributed to the reader's lack of background knowledge or schemata. According to the schema theory, readers develop a coherent interpretation of a text through the interaction between their own background knowledge (which covers from everyday knowledge to very specialized knowledge, knowledge of language structures, and knowledge of texts and forms they take in terms of genre, and organization) and the information contained in the text. As Brown and Yule (1998, p.233) point out,

> the interpretation of discourse is based to a large extent on a simple principle of analogy with what we have experienced in the past. As adults, we are liable to possess quite substantial amounts of background experience and knowledge.

The excerpt above clearly demonstrates how socio-cultural background knowledge influences L2 reading comprehension. S2 is unable to understand the connection between the sentences, therefore, she cannot follow the writer's train of thought. In this case, she lacks the knowledge the writer expects her to have. On the contrary, S1's schemata associated with types of evaluation processes allow her to understand the ideas contained in the text. By activating her prior knowledge (her work experience), she provides the explanation thus helping S2 solve her comprehension problem.

Episode 6 : dictionary use

(018) S2: que que é essa frase 4? Não entendo nada!!!
(019) S1: nem eu!!! Agora temos mesmo que ver no dicionário!

(069) S2: "action in the company" – ponto. Agora vem "the ticket is routed to a manager for resolution. Entretanto, né? Como é "entretanto" em inglês?
(070) S1: vou ver aqui .....   [no dicionário]

In the following episode, the students use an interactive processing strategy. In turn (087), S2 signals her incomprehension of the expression "highly-skilled". By activating her prior linguistic knowledge to help her decode the unknown words and, with the assistance provided by S1, student 2 successfully solves her problem.

Episode 7:

(087) S2: ok. "Nayar aims to build an organization full of highly-skilled…" "highly skilled" ????
(088) S1: é.. "skill" é capacidade.
(089) S2: "high" é alto, né? "-ly" é "-mente". Então...
(090) S1: é, sim… altamente capacitado...

The excerpts illustrated in this episode indicate the ways in which the participants were able to reach a better understanding of an authentic English text through collaborative dialogue. The reading strategies used and evidence of better comprehension were also indicated in students' evaluation reports produced as a

post-reading activity. Some extracts of their final feedback are presented next compared to their own view of the comprehension process during the pre-test stage.

Student 1: (Pre-test stage)

A que você atribui o seu sucesso (ou fracasso) total/parcial ao tentar compreender o texto?

Compreendi o texto de um modo geral graças ao meu conhecimento do vocabulário e também porque alguns termos são utilizados onde eu trabalho.

Que estratégias você utilizou durante a leitura para facilitar a sua compreensão?

Ler o texto sem me preocupar em traduzir palavra por palavra, mas sim em entender o sentido da frase ou do parágrafo pelo contexto.

(Final evaluation report)

Quanto à primeira etapa achei tranqüila. É lógico que não entendi 100%, mas entendi o contexto – conhecia bastante o vocabulário. Quando encontrava alguma palavra que não sabia ou não me lembrava o significado, imediatamente procurava então relacioná-la ao contexto, ou, se não fosse importante, deixava pra lá.

In the extracts above, student 1 attributes her success in general reading comprehension to her familiarity with the vocabulary used in the texts. The strategy she used to deal with unknown words and expressions was mainly deducing the meaning from context. She expressed her concern with understanding the general idea of the text, considering it as a whole. The vocabulary which was unfamiliar but not relevant for the general comprehension of the text, was then ignored.

Student 2: (Pre-test stage)

A que você atribui o seu sucesso (ou fracasso) total/parcial ao tentar compreender o texto?

Pouco conhecimento do vocabulário.

Que estratégias você utilizou durante a leitura para facilitar a sua compreensão?

Li o texto, em sua maior parte, tentando traduzir mentalmente

(Final Evaluation Report):

O trabalho realizado em par certamente me proporcionou a oportunidade não apenas de desenvolver a habilidade de leitura em inglês, mas também de rever e aprender algumas regras básicas da língua. Tendo um maior conhecimento da língua inglesa, a colega me ajudou bastante, esclarecendo dúvidas, fornecendo significados de palavras desconhecidas, me levando a analisar as frases mais cuidadosamente. Todo esse processo foi bastante útil e importante para a minha compreensão do

texto apresentado. Percebi, através desse trabalho, que embora o conhecimento do vocabulário seja importante, isso apenas não é suficiente para uma compreensão detalhada de um texto em uma língua estrangeira. É preciso sim conhecer o funcionamento dessa língua, o seu sistema e sua estrutura básica. Da mesma forma, pude ver que nem sempre traduzir é um método adequado.

As less proficient L2 reader, student 2 first attributed her comprehension difficulties to her limited vocabulary. During the pre-test, she mentioned the necessity for a bottom-up processing, for example, using mental translation. However, after the collaborative work, she recognized that this strategy was not always very efficient. Likewise, although the knowledge of vocabulary is important for the comprehension of a text, this student could realize that it is not enough. Good reading comprehension is not achieved by just knowing the meaning of words. She concluded that a deeper knowledge of the language system is essential. The above extract also demonstrates S2's recognition of S1's assistance.

The following extracts refer to students' reporting on the strategies used during collaborative work. The use of bottom-up, top-down and interactive processing strategies to understand content was also evidenced in this stage. Student 1, for example, used a skimming strategy to find the general idea before relating previous information to new information:

A segunda etapa (de ordenar as frases) foi mais trabalhosa. Procurei ler as frases para ter uma idéia geral do assunto e depois então, conseguir relacioná-las.

She also mentioned that her comprehension was faciliated by the activation of her prior (world and linguistic) knowledge:

Também considero importante o meu conhecimento sobre o assunto e vocabulário. A minha experiência profissional ajudou bastante, assim como o conhecimento que já adquirimos sobre a língua inglesa.

The participants also seemed to rely on the organization of the sentences to understand or predict the flow of ideas:

Para organizar as frases, nós discutimos e buscamos ordená-las de uma maneira lógica. Primeiro agrupamos as frases afins, por exemplo, todas as frases que tinham a palavra "ticket" estariam no mesmo parágrafo, e assim por diante.

A very relevant comment was made by S2 in her final report. She expressed her opinion about the process of working collaboratively from production to

comprehension. She considered it a very interesting and useful way of improving reading comprehension abilities:

Quanto à tarefa, achei muito interessante o fato de começarmos escrevendo para só depois lermos o texto. Geralmente, nas aulas, o oposto acontece. Achei que através das discussões para organização das frases e dos parágrafos pude entender melhor os detalhes do texto, as formas como as idéias se organizam formando um todo.

Student 2 also highlighted the effectiveness of using the mother tongue for negotiating form and meaning through collaborative dialogue. In her view, using the target language during this process would lead the students to focus their attention on the oral production rather than on the reading process:

Também o fato de termos conversado em Português facilitou todo o processo. Acho que se tivéssemos que falar em inglês, tudo seria mais complicado, porque estaríamos mais preocupados com a produção oral e não com a leitura.

Finally, there is evidence that both students recognize the value of collaborative dialogue for the improvement of reading comprehension skills.

Student 1: *Com certeza, ajudou muito o fato dessa etapa ter sido feita em dupla (...) Se não fosse a troca de idéias com a colega, acredito que teria sido muito mais difícil. No final, percebi que ficou muito mais fácil compreender o texto original.*

Student 2: *Achei muito válida a atividade. Ao responder as perguntas de compreensão de texto no final, senti que já havia compreendido tudo.*

Evidence of improved comprehension from the reading comprehension exercises:

Compared to the pre-test results, the reading comprehension exercise reveals that there were improvements in students' L2 reading abilities, as it is demonstrated below. It must be emphasized, however, that the numbers presented in the following chart were used simply with the purpose of helping visualize the results obtained. There was no intention to analyze the data quantitatively.

Total number of comprehension questions: 12

Participants:	Pre-Test Results:		Post-reading comprehension exercises:	
	Right answers	Wrong answers	Right answers	Wrong answers
Student 1	06	06	12	0
Student 2	03	09	12	0

<u>Conclusion – Findings related to research question 2</u>

The second research question of the present study sought to find evidence that the participants improved comprehension ability in English as a result of their *languaging* about form and lexis. Analysis of the data indicated that the students made use of a variety of strategies to produce and reformulate their written text. In fact, they attempted to use both text-driven and reader-driven processing strategies, as well as a combination of strategies to facilitate comprehension. They used context clues, related previous information to proceeding information, decoded unknown words, activated their prior linguistic and world knowledge, used the dictionary, made inferences, for example. A careful analysis of the protocols revealed that, in most situations, the students were aware of what they thought and did to monitor their comprehension. In other words, the findings indicated that the participants had a considerable high level of metacognitive awareness. This may suggest that the students involved in the present research study may be considered, according to Anderson (1991), good L2 readers. Successful readers monitor their reading, "plan strategies, adjust effort appropriately, and evaluate the success of their ongoing efforts to understand" (Brown et al., 1986, p.49).

Translation was probably the strategy most used by the participants. According to Cook (1992, p.584), "the L1 is present in the L2 learners' minds, whether the teacher wants it to be there or not. The L2 knowledge that is being created in them is connected in all sorts of ways with their L1 knowledge." It is important to note, however, that the translation strategy used by the students was the "process-type translation", which, according to Kern (1994), is a mental operation used to help keep concentration and solve comprehension problems. This is certainly different from the traditional type of translation used in EFL classes whose main purpose is not to improved students' comprehension. Kern (op.cit) demonstrated, however, that the use of process-type translation decreased as proficiency in the target language increased.

Social/affective strategies were also evidenced in the protocols. The students assisted each other in completing the tasks and understanding detailed information. They asked questions and provided feedback, completed each other's thoughts, reached agreement, negotiated form and lexis, summarized ideas, and encouraged each other. There were clear indications that both students recognized the value of

collaborative discussions (in which form, lexis and strategies are negotiated) for the improvement of reading abilities. In sum, the findings suggested that collaborative dialogue helped the students emotionally and intellectually to participate in the tasks, generating an opportunity for enjoyable L2 reading experiences. This seems to demonstrate that collaborative dialogue with conscious and spontaneous focus on form through writing tasks performed in dyads or in small groups may help EFL learners to become better readers.

A general discussion of the results follows in the next section.

4.3 DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

The present research study investigated the collaborative dialogue performed by a small number of participants in a very specific context. Therefore, the results obtained should be treated as exploratory and suggestive. Certain important factors such as learner variables and text characteristics were beyond the scope of this study. In addition, there was no interest in generalizing the findings to other situations or to other people.

The microgenetic analysis of the data reported in this chapter provided evidence that while producing and reformulating a text in English, the students spontaneously engaged in collaborative dialogue which mediated their language learning. Through their output, they became aware of their linguistic difficulties and points of uncertainty, as predicted by the Output Hypothesis (Swain, 2000). By verbalizing their problems through social interaction, the participants had opportunities to reflect on, analyze and better understand them. It was evidenced that, unlike Williams' (1999) study, the students focused both on form and lexis. Although it was not the purpose of the current research to analyze the types of forms the students attended to, the findings demonstrated that on the basis of the LREs generated, verb tense and aspect, relative pronouns and discourse markers seemed to be the source of most concern for the students. Their attempts to consider meaning mainly arose when they were producing their text and found words which they did not understand. Given the nature of the task, this finding was perhaps not surprising. However, what the results also revealed was that the students managed to solve (either correctly or incorrectly) their language problems while working collaboratively. By resorting to their schemata, in most situations, they also justified

their decisions. Confirming the postulates of the Output Hypothesis (Swain, 1985, 1995, 2000), the students noticed gaps and holes in their interlanguage and formulated and tested hypothesis. In addition, they developed their own learning strategies in their attempt to solve linguistic problems as they worked collaboratively on tasks. These findings underlie the value of collaborative work and of the students taking control of their learning. As Williams and Burden (1997, p.101) point out, this "locus of control" is "one of the most significant factors in determining people's motivation to act in various ways and in retaining their interest and involvement". It also gives support to the sociocultural view that initially, regulation is social. It first arises on the social or interpsychological plane, and then on the intrapsychological or individual plane (Vygotsky, 1978). Self-regulation, i.e. the degree to which individuals are capable of controlling their own activity and the environment, is realized through dialogue (Werstch, 1979).

The collaborative work via metatalk (or collaborative dialogue) also provided opportunities for the students not only to consolidate their knowledge of the target language, but also to evaluate their own learning process and behavior as EFL students and readers. Another important factor to mention is that the learners in this study were found to have behaved as true participants, that is, as agents, actively engaged in shaping their own activity. Although the tasks were selected with the purpose of encouraging the students to focus spontaneously on form and lexis, the findings indicated that their behavior during task performance was not predictable. This is consistent with the postulates of the Activity theory (a component of Vygotsky's sociocultural theory) which state that "tasks do not result in homogeneous activity". As Roebuck (1998, p.23) explains, "the task represents what the researcher (or the instructor) would like the learner to do, and activity is what the learner actually does. That is, activity is how learners construct the task". According to Vygotskian thought, this fact happens because each individual brings to the task his/her own histories, experiences, goals and capacities. In other words, development is dialogic and situated activity (Werstch, 1985). Certain episodes demonstrated, for example, how the students played out their agency – they set their own goals, questioned the task, disagreed and made their own decisions. However, I strongly agree with Vidal (2003), Swain (1998) and Williams (1999) that results might have been affected by the nature of the tasks and by the characteristics of the learners involved. As Swain (1998,p.79) points out, "a task that elicits metatalk from one group of learners may

not do so from another group of learners. This may be due to the level of learners' proficiency, the age of the learners, and any of a host of other factors."

Although the purpose of this study was to investigate learner-generated attention to form through collaborative dialogue, the results suggested that, in students' view, the teacher's role in facilitating learning is an important factor. The absence of the researcher/teacher intervention might have contributed to the participants' inability to solve certain problems. Mitrano Neto (2007, p.153) contends that the teacher "is an element through which students' autonomy may be developed". However, the role of an "expert" was clearly evidenced through the protocols. Although working in a very friendly atmosphere, it was possible to observe that, in contrast with the pilot study results, in this investigation there was an expert/novice relationship. In the interaction between the participants, S1, who was more proficient in English, in certain occasions, played the role of the teacher, providing assistance, giving feedback and encouraging S2, thus helping her to create a new Zone of Proximal Development (Vygotsky, 1978), and possibly allowing for interlanguage development to occur. Although S2 may be considered "the novice", she participated actively in the tasks. What is important to mention, however, is that S1 also seemed to have profited from the experience of constructing and sharing knowledge through collaborative dialogue. In fact, I believe that the success of the interaction rested in part on the scaffolding that the students provided each other as well as on their motivation to work collaboratively on the tasks. Results also indicated that the use of the mother tongue helped the students to lower their affective filter (Krashen, 1982).They felt more confident and at ease to work. It seems likely that learners' native language successfully mediated their L2 learning. In fact, it offered a foundation from which the students engaged in learning, and consolidated their knowledge of English. This finding supports Vygotsky's (1978, 1986) hypothesis concerning the verbalization of an adult's inner speech when faced with difficulties during a task so as to gain control of the task performance and to direct problem-solving strategies (Vygosky, op.cit, McCafferty, 1994).

Time was also an important element. The findings of the current study support the notion that students must be allowed to move at their own pace. It was evidenced that the participants needed time to think, to analyze, to formulate and test their hypothesis, to consult the dictionary, to listen to each other, in short, to use language as a "thinking tool" (Swain, 2000).

Finally, the analysis of students' written reports provided evidence to suggest that the knowledge that they constructed together through dialogue became a tool for their improved reading comprehension. Their dialogue was more than two people talking. In fact, it was two people constructing knowledge together. These findings corroborate those of Swain and Lapkins' (in press, p.4) who concluded that "through talking [and] writing, we may reach a new or deeper understanding".

A final conclusion along with the pedagogical implications and limitations of the present study, follows in the next chapter.

5. CONCLUSION

The present study explored a setting in which EAP students spontaneously focused on form through collaborative dialogue in the attempt to understand an authentic text in English. Despite Alderson's (1984) arguments to the contrary, because they are adults, and usually good L1 readers, most EAP students in Brazil seem to have a language problem, rather than a reading problem. Thus, a question that often arises in EAP courses concerns how best to teach grammar in these environments. Informed by the sociocultural theory, and based on the works of Swain and her assistants (1985-2006), it seems likely that, although small in scale, this study provided a contribution to the field. All in all, I believe that the findings obtained can be classified as positive. As a case study, it contributes to a better understanding of the L2 reader and of the L2 reading comprehension process through collaborative discussions. It also confirms the postulates of Vygotsky's (1978) sociocultural theory about human cognitive development through social interaction, and corroborates Swain's (2000) Comprehensible Output Hypothesis. The results obtained provide evidence to suggest that, at least in certain teaching/learning environments, collaborative dialogue as implemented in this study may lead to language learning, and consequently, to improved reading comprehension.

Thus, based on the findings presented in this dissertation, certain pedagogical implications for L2 learning in both EAP and General English contexts must be addressed.

Firstly, if, as Swain and Lapkin (in press, p. 3) aver, "one entry into language learning is through language production", and if collaborative dialogue is knowledge-building dialogue with the self and/or with others (Swain, 2000), then FL learners should be encouraged to work collaboratively on writing tasks which provide opportunities for collaborative dialogue with the purpose of enhancing comprehension and learning. It is often assumed, however, that simply arranging students into groups will lead to successful collaboration. In most cases, students need training and support. Likewise, influenced by their previous learning experiences, most adult students resist verbalizing their thoughts during group work. Considering that group discussions are common practices in EAP courses, teachers should become aware that in certain situations, training sessions should also be provided.

Another implication is that it would be beneficial for teachers to help students view reading as process and as problem-solving activity. In addition, learners should be provided with opportunities to use appropriately the wide range of reading strategies available, as well as to discover new strategies which can be used to overcome the problems faced. This is particularly useful for EAP students who need to continue studying independently through the medium of English once they have completed the EAP courses that are part of their academic program requirements.

The present study indicated that students' native language can have an important scaffolding role in EAP reading classes. Adult students in monolingual EFL classes can therefore benefit from appropriate use of L1 in group discussions. What this finding implies for language teachers is that, although the use of the target language should, obviously, be strongly encouraged in monolingual L2 classes, collaborative dialogue in L1 should also be welcomed, especially among students of lower proficiency and in ESP contexts. An important point to be made, however, is that although verbalization by means of collaborative dialogue engaged learners actively with the tasks, thus enhancing their reading comprehension in English, it also slowed down the reading rate. Therefore, this procedure should be best applied when the purpose of reading is "reading to learn".

A very relevant finding, although not surprising due to learners' characteristics, was that the participants were able to focus spontaneously on form, to notice their language difficulties and to attempt to solve them by means of their own resources. Thus, this study also plays its part in highlighting the importance of learner autonomy as well as the role of the teacher as a mediator in language learning However, while providing students with opportunities to become more independent in how they think, act and learn, teachers should also be aware that there are possibly some students who need greater support as they move towards autonomy. Becoming an autonomous learner does not happen automatically. It's something that is achieved gradually with practice (Dickinson, 1987). Without suitable guidance, students will not become aware of the possibilities. Thus, the teacher's role in this process mainly should be to encourage the students, provide feedback, and remain silent. As Stevick (1980, p.197) points out, "learning is something that the learner does, and (…) he does it best when the teacher does not stand over him, breathe down his neck, jiggle his elbow and chatter into his ear."

Finally, with regard to the question of how collaborative dialogue with a conscious and spontaneous focus on form can help L2 learners improve their reading comprehension abilities, there seems to be no single answer. Certainly, it will always depend on the nature of the contexts in which students work, their individual characteristics, the types of tasks assigned, and the tools and materials available for them to use (Swain, 1998, Vidal, 2003, Williams, 1999; Swain & Lapkin, 2002).Nonetheless, it seems now possible to affirm that, unlike certain theorists and teachers still believe, grammar teaching (i.e. form-focused instruction) is relevant and necessary for L2 acquisition, and consequently, for reading comprehension improvement. However, there is certainly in the literature a recognized need for further studies on form-focused instruction. In addition, as Vidal (2003, p.126) notes, "studies which have directly used Swain's framework are scarce, particularly with older learners in different educational and cultural contexts". Therefore, it is hoped that, as a case study , this research could also contribute to a better understanding of the L2 focus on form phenomena in general, and particularly in the context of Brazilian EFL adult teaching/learning. However, three limitations of this study should be noted: First, the participants involved in this research may be termed "mature learners" (the term *mature* is used here in not only its biological, but also its cognitive sense, as "intellectually equipped"). Further research is needed to investigate conscious focus on form through collaborative dialogue involving younger L2 learners and less able readers. Second, the sample was limited to one specific academic environment. Studies involving ESP students from other types of institutions (private colleges, technical schools, language institutes, for example) with different cultural, social and educational background are also needed. Finally, another factor to be considered is that EAP intermediate-level English students were involved in this research. I believe it's also worth investigating the process of language learning through collaborative dialogue in general English contexts as well.

6. FINAL REMARKS

The benefits of verbal interaction during collaborative work as developed in the present study appear to extend far beyond learning a foreign language. By sharing ideas, doubts and experiences in the classroom and talking about them, students learn how to become real partners in the learning process, rather than competitors. Since most real-life problems are solved via collaboration, students who learn to work in groups and share their ideas are better prepared for professional life in the real world. They begin to develop a positive image of self and others, to see the importance of their involvement in language learning, to become more confident of themselves, and consequently more autonomous learners. As Donato (2000, p. 299-300) points out, "collaboration is a powerful concept that moves us beyond reductive input-output models of interaction and acknowledges the importance of goals, the mutuality of learning in activity, and collective human relationships".

Thus, I do hope that this study may open up new horizons to the investigation of the processes of language learning and reading comprehension as a collaborative activity in Brazil, and consequently to improving pedagogical practices. After all, as Vygotsky (1981, p. 161) contends, "it is through others that we develop into ourselves".

REFERENCES

ALDERSON, C. Reading: a reading problem or a language problem? In: ALDERSON, C., and URQUHART, A.H. *Reading in a foreign language.* London: Longman, 1984.

ALVARENGA, J.O., SÁ, P.A, E MOTTA, S.A. *Apostila Petrobrás – nível superior-Administrador Jr.* B.H. Didática dos Concursos, p.32, 2007.

ALLWRIGHT, D. The Importance of interaction in classroom language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, vol.5, n.2, p.156-171, 1984.

ANDERSON, N. J. Individual differences in strategy use in second language reading and testing. *Modern Language Journal,* v.75 p.,460-472, 1991.

ANDERSON, R.C., REYNOLDS, R.C., SHCALLERT, D.L. & GOETZ, T.E. Frameworks for Comprehending Discourse. *American Educational Research Journal*, vol.14, p.367-81, 1977.

ANDERSON, V.A. & ROIT, M. Planning and implementing collaborative strategy instruction for delayed readers in Grades 6-10.*The Elementary School Journal,* vol.94, n.2, p. 121-137, 1993.

ANDERSON, R.C. and PEARSON, P.D. A Schema-theoretic view of basic processes in reading comprehension. In: CARRELL, P.L., DEVINE, J. and ESKEY, D.E. (eds) *Interactive approaches to second language reading.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

ANDRADE, M.M. *Introdução à metodologia do trabalho científico.* SP: Atlas, 1997.

ATKINSON, D. The mother tongue in the classroom: A neglected resource*? ELT Journal,* vol.41, n.4, p: 241-247, 1987.

AUERBACH, E. Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom*. TESOL Quarterly,* vol.27, p.1, p. 9-32, 1993.

BELL, J. *Doing your research project.* Buckinham: Open University Press, 1999.

BREEN, M.P. and C.N.CANDLIN. The essentials of a communicative curriculum. *Applied Linguistics*, vol.1, n.2, p. 89-112, 1980.

BROWN, H.D. *Teaching by principles.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc, 1994.

BROWN, A.L. Metacognitive development and reading. In: Spiro, R.J., B. Bruce, B & W.F. Brewer, W.F. (eds), *Theoretical issues in reading comprehension.* Hillsdale, N.J: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1980

BROWN, A.L, ARMBUSTER, B., & BAKER, L. The role of metacognition in reading and studying. In: ORASANU, J. (ed.), *Reading comprehension.* Hillsdale, NJ:Lawrence Erlbaum, 1986.

BROWN, G. & YULE, G. *Discourse analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

CARRELL, P. L., DEVINE,J. AND ESKEY, D.E. (eds) *Interactive approaches to second language reading.* Cambridge: CUP, 1988.

CARREL, P.L. & EINSTERHOLD, J.C. Schema theory and ESL reading pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly,* v.17, p.553-573, 1983.

_____. Schema theory and ESL reading pedagogy. In: CARRELL, P.L., DEVINE, J. and ESKEY, D.E. (eds) *Interactive approaches to second language reading.* Cambridge: CUP, 1988.

CARROLL, S & SWAIN, M. Explicit and implicit negative feedback: an empirical study of the learning of linguistic generalizations. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition.* n.15, p. 357-386, 1993.

CLARKE, M. The short circuit hypothesis of ESL reading or When language competence interferes with reading performance, *Modern Language Journal,* v.64,p.203-209, 1984.

COOK, V. Using the first language in the classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review.* Vol. 57, n. 3 p. 402-23., 2001.

_____. Evidence for multicompetence. *Language Learning, 42*, 557-591, 1992.

_____. *Second language learning and language teaching.* London: Arnold, 1991.

COLE, M. & SCRIBNER, S. Introduction. In: L.S. Vygotsky. *Mind in Society.* Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1978.

CORDER, P. The significance of learners' errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, vol..* 5, p.161-9, 1967.

DICKINSON, L. *Self-instruction in language learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

DONATO, R. Aspects of collaboration in pedagogical discourse. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, vol.* 24, p. 284-302, 2004.

_____. Sociocultural contributions to understanding a foreign and second language classroom. In: .LANTOLF, J. (ed) *Sociocultural theory and second language learning.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

DONATO, R. Collective scaffolding in second language learning. In: LANTOLF, J.P. & APPEL, G. (eds) *Vygotskian approaches to second language research.* Connecticut: Ablex Publishing, 1994.

DOUGHTY, C. & WILLIAMS, J. (eds) *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1998.

ELIS, R. Introduction: investigating form-focused instruction. *Language Learning,* vol1, n.1, p. 1-46, 2001.

_____. Teaching and research: options in grammar teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 32 , n.1, p.39-59, 1998.

_____. Interpretation tasks for grammar teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, vol.* 29, p. 87-106, 1995a.

_____. *The study of second language acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995b.

FOTOS, S. & ELLIS, R. Communication about grammar: a task-based approach. *TESOL Quarterly,* vol.25, p. 605-628, 1991.

GAMBRELL, L.B. & ALMASI, J.F. Fostering comprehension through discussion. In: MORROW, L.M., SMITH, J.K. & WILKINSON, L.C. (eds) *Integrated language arts: controversy to consensus.* Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon, 1993.

GASS, S. *Input, interaction and the second language learner* .New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1997.

GEAR, J. & GEAR, R. *Cambridge Preparation for the TOEFL Test.* Cambridge: CUP, p.344-5, 1997

GIL, A.C. *Como elaborar projetos de pesquisa.* SP: Atlas, 1996.

GRABE, W. and STOLLER, F.L. *Teaching and researching reading.* Essex: Pearson Education, 2002.

GREENBAUM, S. & QUIRK, R. *A student's grammar of the English language.* Essex: Longman, 1990.

HOSELFELD, C. Case studies of ninth grade readers. In: ALDERSON, J.C. & URQUHART, A.H. (eds) *Reading in a foreign language.* London: Longman, 1984.

KERN, R.G. The role of mental translation in second language reading. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* vol.16, p.441-61, 1994.

KOWAL,M. & SWAIN, M. From semantic to syntactic processing: how can we promote metalinguistic awareness in the French immersion classroom? In: JOHNSON, R.K. & SWAIN, M. (eds) *Immersion education: international perspectives.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 284-309, 1997.

KOWAL, M. & SWAIN, M. Using collaborative language production tasks to promote students' language awareness. *Language Awareness,* vol.3 n.2, p.73-93, 1994.

KRASHEN, S. Seeking a role for grammar: a review of some recent studies. *Foreign Language Annals, vol.* 32, p. 245-257, 1999.

_____. *The input hypothesis: issues and implications.* London: Longman, 1985.

_____. P*rinciples and practice in second language acquisition.* Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1982.

LANTOLF, J.P. *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (ed). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

LANTOLF, J.P. & APPEL, G. (eds). *Vygotskian approaches to second language research.* Connecticut: Ablex Publishing, 1994.

LARSEN-FREEMAN, D. Grammar and its teaching: challenging the myths (1997) *ERIC Digest,* ED406829, 1997. Disponível em: http://www.ericdigests.org/1997-4/grammar.htm. Acesso em: 03/02/2007.

LEONTIEV, A.A. *Psychology and the language learning process.* Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1981.

LEVENSTON, E.A. Error analysis of free composition: the theory and the practice. *Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, vol. 4, n.1, p. 1-11, 1978.

LIGHTBOWN, P. & SPADA, N. *How languages are learned.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999

_____. Focus on form and corrective feedback in: communicative language teaching: effects on second language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition. vol.* 12, p.429-448, 1990.

LONG, M. The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In: RITCHIE, W.C. and BHATIA, T.K. (eds) *Handbook of second language acquisition.* San Diego: Academic Press, p. 413-68, 1996.

_____. Focus on form: a design feature in language teaching methodology. In: de BOT, K., GINSBERG, R. & . KRAMSCH, C. (eds). *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, p.39-52, 1991.

_____. Linguistic and conversational adjustments to non-native speakers. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, vol.*5, p.177-193, 1983.

_____. Input, interaction, and second language acquisition. In: H. WINITZ (ed) *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences Conference on Native and Foreign Language Acquisition.* New York: New York Academy of Sciences, p. 159-278, 1981.

LONG, M.H. & ROBINSON, P. Focus on form: theory, research and practice. In: DOUGHTY, C. & WILLIAMS, J. (eds) *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,1998.

LURIA, A.R. *Cognitive development: its cultural and social foundations.* Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1976.

LYNCH, T. *Communication in the language classroom.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

LYSTER, R. & RANTA, L. Corrective feedback and learner uptake: negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* vol.19, p. 37-66, 1997.

MARKEE, N. *Conversation analysis.* Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2000.

McCAFERTY, S.G. The use of private speech by adult ESL learners at different levels of proficiency. In: LANTOLF, J.P & APPEL, G. (eds).*Vygotskian approaches to second language research.* Connecticut: Ablex Publishing, 1994.

McCARTHY, M. *Discourse analysis for language teachers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

MERRIAN,S.B. *Qualitative research and case study applications in education.*San Francisco, CA:Jossey-Bass, 1998.

MITCHELL, R. & MYLLES, F. *Second language learning theories.* London: Arnold, 2002.

MITRANO NETO, N. Enfocando a forma via aprendizagem individualizada: um estudo preliminar. In: LIMA, M.S. GRAÇA, R.M.O. *Ensino e aprendizagem de língua estrangeira: relações de pesquisa Brasil / Canadá* Porto Alegre: Armazém Digital, 2007.

NEWMAN, F. A Therapeutic deconstruction of the illusion of self. In: HOLZMAN,L. (ed.), *Performing psychology..* New York: Routledge, 1999.

NEWMAN, F. & HOLZMAN, L. *Lev Vygotsky.* London: Routledge, 1993.

NUNAN, D. *Research methods in language learning.* Cambridge: CUP, 1992.

_____. *Language teaching methodology – a textbook for teachers.* London: Prentice Hall, 1991.

_____. *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

NUTTALL, C. *Teaching reading skills in a foreign language.* Oxford: Heinemann, 1996.

OHTA, A. S. *Second language acquisition processes in the classroom: Learning Japanese.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2001.

OHTA, A.S. Rethinking interaction in SLA: developmentally appropriate assistance in the zone of proximal development and the acquisition of L2 grammar. In: LANTOLF, J. (ed) *Sociocultural theory and second language learning.* Oxford: Oxford University Press,2000.

O'MALLEY, J.M. and CHAMOT, A.U. *Learning strategies in second language acquisition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

O'MALLEY, J.M., CHAMOT, A.U., STEWNER-MANZANARES,G., KÜPPER, L and RUSSO, R. Learning strategies used by beginning and intermediate ESL students. *Language Learning, vol.* 35, p.21-46, 1985.

OXFORD, R.L. *Language learning strategies – what every teacher should know.* Boston, Massachusetts: Heinle & Heinle, 1990.

PALINCSAR, A.S. & BROWN, A.L. Reciprocal teaching of comprehension-fostering and comprehension-monitoring activities. *Cognition and Instruction* .vol. 1, n.2, p.117-175, 1984.

PATTON, M.Q. *Qualitative research and evaluation methods.* London: Sage Publications, 3rd edition, 2002.

PICA, T. Second language learning through interaction: multiple perspectives. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, Vol.*12 n.1, University of Philadelphia, p.1-22, 1996.

_____. Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second-language learning conditions, process, and outcomes? *Language Learning, vol. 44, n.*3, p. 493-527, 1994.

PICA, T. and DOUGHTY, C. Input and interaction in the communicative language classroom: a comparison of teacher-fronted and group activities. apud ELLIS, R.. *The study of second language acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995

PORTER, P. How learners talk to each other: input and interaction in task-centered discussions (1986) apud ELLIS, R. *The study of second language acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

POULISSE, N., BONGAERTS, T**.,** & KELLERMAQ, E. The use of retrospective verbal reports in the analysis of compensatory strategies. In FAERCH, C &. KASPER, G (eds.), *Introspection in second language research* Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters, 1986.

PRAHBU, N,S. *Second Language Pedagogy.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.

PRESSLEY,M. What should comprehension instruction be the instruction of? In: KAMIL,M., MOSENTHAL, P. PEARSON,D. & BARR, R. (eds). *Handbook of reading research.* vol III, p.163-179, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2000.

PRESSLEY, M. & AFFLERBACH, P. *Verbal protocols in reading: the nature of constructively responsive reading.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1995.

Qi,D.S. & LAPKIN, S. Exploring the role of noticing in a three-stage second language writing task. *Journal of Second Language Writing.* Vol.10, p.277-303, 2001

ROEBUCK, R. R*eading and recall in L1 and L2- a sociocultural approach.* Stamford, Connecticut: Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1998.

SAVIGNON, S.J. *Communicative competence: theory and classroom practice.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley,1983.

SCARDAMALIA, S. I. & BEREITER, C**.** Child as co-investigator: Helping children gain insight into their own mental process. In: PARIS, S.G**,** OLSON, G & H. W. STEVENSON, H.W. (eds.), *Learning and motivation in the classroom.* Hillsdale, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 1983.

SCHACHTER J. Corrective feedback in historical perspective. *Second Language Research, vol. 7*, p. 89-102, 1991.

SELIGER, H.W. Does Practice Make Perfect? *Language Learning*, vol. 27, n. 2, p.263-275, 1977.

_____ Learner interaction in the classroom and its effects on language acquisition In: SELIGER, H.W. and LONG,M. (eds) *Classroom-Oriented Research in Second Language Acquisition*, Rowley, Mass: Newbury House,1983.

SMITH, F. *Psycholinguistics and reading.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc, 1973.

SPADA, N. Form-focused instruction and second language acquisition: a review of classroom and laboratory research. *Language Teaching,* vol.30, n.2, p.73-87, 1997.

SKEHAN, P. *A cognitive approach to language learning.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

STAKE, R. *The art of case study research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1995.

_____. Case study methods in educational research: seeking sweet water. In: JAEGER, R.M. (ed) *Complementary methods for research in education.* Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association, 1988.

STERN, H. *Issues and options in language teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

_____. Analysis and experience as variables in second language pedagogy. In: HARLEY, B. ALLEN, P., CUMMINGS, J. & SWAIN, M. (eds). *The development of second language proficiency.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

STEVICK, E.W. *Teaching languages – a way and ways.* Massachusetts: Newbury House, 1980.

STORCH, N. How collaborative is pair work? ESL tertiary students composing in pairs. *Language Teaching Research,* vol. 5, n. 1, p.29-53, 2001.

_____. A classroom-based study: insights from a collaborative text reconstruction task. *ELT Journal* vol. 52, n.4, Oxford University Press, p.291-299, 1998.

STREVENS, P. English as an international language. *English Teaching Forum*, vol.XXV, n.4, p.56-63, 1987.

SWAIN, M. Languaging, agency, and collaboration in advanced second language learning proficiency. In: BYRNES, H. (ed) *Advanced language learning. The contributions of Halliday and Vygotsky.* London: Continuum, no prelo..

_____. Verbal protocols: what does it mean for research to use speaking as a data collection tool. In: M. CHALOUB-DEVILLE, M. C. CHAPELLE, C. &. DUFF, P. (eds) *Inference and generalizability in applied linguistics: multiple research perspectives.* Amsterdam:John Benjamins, 2006.

_____. Integrating language and content teaching through collaborative tasks. *Canadian Modern Language Review.* Vol.58, n1, September, 2001.

_____. The output hypothesis and beyond: mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In: LANTOLF, J.P. (ed) *Sociocultural theory and second language learning.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

_____. Focus on form through conscious reflection. In: DOUGHTY, C. AND WILLIAMS, J. (eds) *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

_____. Integrating language and content in immersion classrooms: Research perspectives. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, vol. 52,* p.529-548, 1996.

_____. Three functions of output in second language learning. In: COOK, G. & SEIDHOFER, B. (eds).*Principle and practice in applied linguistics: studies in honour of H.G.Widdowson.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

_____. Communicative competence: some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In: GASS, S. & MADDEN, C. (eds) *Input in second language acquisition.* Rowley, Mass: Newbury House, p. 235-253, 1985.

SWAIN, M. & LAPKIN, S. Oh, I get it now! From production to comprehension in second language learning. In:. BRINTON, D.M. & KAGAN, O. (eds) *Heritage language acquisition: a new field emerging.* Mahawan. NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, no prelo..

SWAIN, M. & LAPKIN, S. Talking it through: two French immersion learner's response to reformulation. *International Journal of Education Research, vol.*37, p.285-304, 2002.

_____. Interaction and second language learning: two adolescent French immersion students working together. *The Modern Language Journal,* vol. 82, n. iii, p. 320-337, 1998.

_____. Problems in output and the cognitive processes they generate: a step towards second language learning. *Applied Linguistics,vol.* 16, p. 3, p.370-391, 1995.

Van LIER, L. From input to affordance: social-interactive learning from an ecological perspective. In: LANTOLF, J. (ed) *Sociocultural theory and second language learning.* Oxford: Oxford University Press,2000.

VIDAL, R.T. *Interlanguage stretching: the role of counsciousness-raising communicative tasks and metatalk.* 290f. vol.1. Tese (doutorado) Centro de Estudos Gerais, Instituto de Letras, Universidade Federal Fluminense, Niterói, RJ, 2003.

VYGOSTKY, L.S. *Thought and language.* Cambridge, Mass:MIT Press, 1986.

_____. The genesis of higher mental functions. In: WERTSCH, J. (ed) *The concept of activity in Soviet psychology.* New York: M.E. Sharpe Inc, 1981.

_____. *Mind in society: The development of higher mental processes.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978.

WAGNER, E. D. In support of a functional definition of interaction. *The American Journal of Distance Education, vol. 8, n.* 2, p..6-29, 1994.

WEISSBERG, R.*Connecting speaking and writing in second language writing instruction.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2006.

WERSTCH, J.V. *Vygotsky and the social formation of mind.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985.

_____ The regulation of human interaction and the given-new organization of private speech. In: ZIVEN, G. (ed)*The development of self-regulation through private speech.* New York: Wiley,1979.

WHITE, L. Adverb placement in second language acquisition: some effects on positive and negative evidence in the classroom. *Second Language Research,* vol.7, p.133-161, 1991.

WIDDOWSON, H.G. *Teaching language as communication.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

WIDDOWSON, H.G. *Aspects of language teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.

_____. *Explorations in applied linguistics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980.

WILLIAMS, M. & BURDEN, R. *Psychology for language teachers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

YIN, R. *Case study research: design and methods.* (3rd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2003.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A - PRE – TEST

PART I:

A)

      Experiments have shown that in selecting personnel for a job, interviewing is at best a hindrance, and may even cause harm. These studies have disclosed that the judgments of interviewers differ markedly and bear little or no relationship to the adequacy of job applicants. Of the many reasons why this should be the case, three in particular stand out. The first reason is related to an error of judgment known as the halo effect. If a person has one noticeable good trait, their other characteristics will be judged as better than they really are. Thus, an individual who dresses smartly and shows self-confidence is likely to be judged capable of doing a job well regardless of his or her real ability.

      Interviewers are also prejudiced by an effect called the primacy effect. This error occurs when interpretation of later information is distorted by earlier connected information. Hence, in an interview situation, the interviewer spends most of the interview trying to confirm the impression given by the candidate in the first few moments. Studies have repeatedly demonstrated that such an impression is unrelated to the aptitude of the applicant.

      The phenomenon known as the contrast effect also skews the judgment of interviewers. A suitable candidate may be underestimated because he or she contrasts with a previous one who appears exceptionally intelligent. Likewise, an average candidate who is preceded by one who gives a weak showing may be judged as more suitable than he or she really is.

      Since interviews as a form of personnel selection have been shown to be inadequate, other selection procedures have been devised which more accurately predict candidate suitability. Of the various tests devised, the predictor which appears to do this most successfully is cognitive ability as measured by a variety of verbal and spatial tests.

(GEAR, J. & GEAR, R. *Cambridge Preparation for the TOEFL Test.* Cambridge: CUP, p.344-5, 1997)

1. O assunto principal do texto é:

    a) a eficácia da entrevista como técnica para seleção de candidatos nas empresas
    b) tipos de entrevistas para contratação de funcionários
    c) os efeitos das entrevistas nos entrevistados
    d) as características de um bom entrevistador
    e) a ineficácia da entrevista como técnica para seleção de candidatos

2. De acordo com o texto, a primeira impressão:

    a) pode ser facilmente esquecida

    b) é a que permanece na mente do entrevistador
    c) não interfere no julgamento
    d) sempre demonstra a aptidão do candidato
    e) nunca deve ser considerada em uma entrevista

3. Segundo o texto, os efeitos "halo", "primacy" e "contrast" são:

    a) tipos de preconceitos contra os candidatos a empregos
    b) erros de julgamento de entrevistadores
    c) tipos de entrevistas
    d) técnicas empresariais para seleção de funcionários
    e) características comuns dos entrevistados

4. Para a solução do problema apresentado, o texto sugere:

    a) aplicação de questionários escritos antes das entrevistas
    b) entrevistas mais longas
    c) provas de conteúdo além das entrevistas
    d) candidatos bem vestidos e confiantes
    e) testes para medição da capacidade cognitiva do candidato

B)

        For years, companies have been using employee stock ownership plans (ESOPs) and various other ownership-sharing tools to attract, keep, and motivate talented people. But stock ownership alone won't make your employees *think and act* like businesspeople. As management guru Peter Block writes in his visionary book *Stewardship*, "At worst, employee stock ownership carries the illusion of partnership with no substance; at best, stock ownership underscores the organization's intent to treat employees as owners in a thousand other ways." ("Employee Ownership" – disponível em: http:// www.inc.com/)

 5. De acordo com o texto acima, ESOPs são:

    a) empresas de contratação de funcionários talentosos
    b) livros sobre gerenciamento
    c) armazéns para estocar ferramentas
    d) planos de aposentadoria para executivos
    e) planos de incentivo para funcionários ativos

6. A postura do autor em relação aos ESOPs é:

    a) favorável
    b) negativa
    c) neutra
    d) visionária
    e) confiante

C)

Our company has grown 50 percent, in just the past year. We are now up to 45 employees. Up until a few years ago when we consolidated everyone into our new offices, the company was split in half: two offices across the hall from each other. Mistakes? You bet. Neither side visited the other very often. New hires didn't know each other let alone longstanding employees. It was painful. Now, as we're about to grow large enough where we'll need to be on a few separate floors, we've learned enough to avoid making the same mistakes twice. (POPICK.J. "Relationships with your employees at each, and every levels" – disponível em:http:// www.inc.com/)

7. O texto acima aponta um erro cometido em uma empresa, mas que deverá ser corrigido. A que erro o texto se refere?

a) contratação de poucos funcionários por ano

b) crescimento muito rápido da empresa

c) falta de relacionamento interno entre os funcionários

d) empresa grande em prédio pequeno

e) divisão da empresa em muitos departamentos

D)

PARIS, France (CNN) -- Commuters in Paris have braved severe traffic jams as transport workers in the city continued a second day of strikes against planned pension reforms by President Nicolas Sarkozy.

A spokeswoman for the RATP, the company that runs Paris's transport network, told CNN that subway trains and bus services were running at two-thirds capacity, but the RER, the city's suburban rail service, had ground to a halt. This meant a second day of delays for beleaguered commuters, who were forced to use bikes, roller blades and scooters to get to work. Many Parisians chose to stay at home, but those who decided to drive in were caught up in severe go-slows with transport Web sites reporting more than 320 kilometers (200 miles) of traffic backed up across the capital during Friday rush hour. There were also fears for fans traveling to the final of the Rugby World Cup between England and South Africa this Saturday, with the RATP telling CNN it could not rule out the strikes continuing into the weekend. (disponível em: http://www.cnn.com/)

8. O assunto principal do texto é:

   a) turismo
   b) esporte
   c) política
   d) construção
   e) drogas

9. De acordo com o texto, muitos parisienses optaram por ficar em casa:

    a) por causa da copa do mundo de "rugby"
    b) para acessar a internet
    c) porque era final de semana
    d) porque havia greve dos motoristas do sistema de transporte de Paris e o trânsito estava caótico
    e) porque o Presidente Nicolas Sarkozy havia decretado feriado.

10. Na frase: "... but the RER, the city's suburban rail service, <u>had ground to a halt</u>", a expressão grifada significa:

    a) circulou normalmente
    b) foi parando lentamente
    c) aumentou a frota
    d) ofereceu transporte extra
    e) circulou com maior rapidez

E)

      Taxpayers who change jobs or are transferred to another job location during the year can deduct part of their moving expenses. These expenses include travel and the cost of moving household goods to their new home. The cost of meals while moving is no longer deductible.

      To qualify, the move must be a result of changing job locations or starting a new job and must meet distance and time tests. The new job must be at least 50 miles farther from the former home than was the old job. Employees also must work full time for at least 39 weeks during the first 12 months after they arrive in the general area of their new job.

      Taxpayers no longer have to itemize on Schedule A to deduct moving expenses. These expenses are now adjustment to income and should instead be reported on page 1, Form 1040. (ALVARENGA, J.O., SÁ, P.A, E MOTTA, S.A. *Apostila Petrobrás – nível superior- Administrador Jr.* B.H. Didática dos Concursos, p.32, 2007)

11. Qual das opções abaixo resume o conteúdo do texto?

    a) Imposto sobre viagens
    b) Contratação de novos funcionários
    c) viagem a negócios
    d) mudanças ilegais
    e) dedução de imposto por motivo de transferência

12. O texto não menciona:

    a) valor da taxa
    b) despesas com refeições
    c) tempo de serviço
    d) distância
    e) viagem e bens

STUDENTS' ANSWERS:

Questions:	Std. 1	Std. 2
1	e	b
2	b	e
3	b	b
4	e	e
5	e	a
6	a	a
7	c	b
8	b	b
9	a	a
10	a	e
11	a	a
12	a	a

PART II:

TEXT: (disponível em: http://www.inc.com/ Acesso em: 04/05/2007)

ORIENTAÇÕES:

1. Leia o texto apresentado com bastante atenção.
2. Responda as perguntas abaixo:

Knowledge Crisis Ahead?

Column by Allan Schweyer

As older workers retire, the first priority for your company shouldn't be to replace them. Rather, it should be to "download" their knowledge.

As of the first quarter of 2006, according to the US Bureau of Labor Statistics, unemployment for knowledge workers (defined as anyone with a bachelor's degree or higher) was hovering just above 2% and on the decline throughout the US. In addition, 76 million baby boomers will retire in the next five years. We are on the verge of a more acute and protracted "War for Talent" than we faced in the late 1990s. However, this time the talent war will be much more cross-cultural, multi-generational and global.

Recruitment and human resources leaders can no longer afford to be parochial in their outlook on talent. Ageism, non merit-based discrimination of any sort and myopic attitudes toward the sources of talent will spell disaster for organizations where those biases are allowed to prevail. The winners of the war on talent will welcome talent of all ages and varieties, and they will build their networks into the farthest reaches of the planet.

In a 2006 survey of vice presidents of human resources conducted by the Human Capital Institute and Ernst & Young, human resources leaders demonstrated a clear appreciation of the talent shortages likely to come as retirements increase. The report notes: "While more than half... agreed that the aging workforce is an issue that must be dealt with because it will lead to a workforce shortage, and almost two-thirds said that retirements in their organization will lead to a 'brain drain,' less than one-quarter of those surveyed said that the aging of their workforce is an issue that is strategically very important to

them." This is a strange paradox given the widespread shortages of talent that are already occurring across the country.

As for diversity, the US Census Bureau projects that the percentage of whites in the workforce will drop to just 62% by 2020 (from 82% in 1980) and that of minorities will rise to 37% (from 18% in 1980). These numbers will also be reflected among the consumer population making a diverse workforce an imperative for many organizations that need to reflect their customer base. Strategic human resources and recruiting executives must make their workplaces more attractive and friendly to diverse and older workers. And when this is done, they must recalibrate their branding initiatives in order to appeal to both groups.

The winners also will master the challenges of assembling and deploying a virtual global workforce. The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) projects that more than 98% of global workforce growth will occur outside of North America and Europe over the next three to five decades--and top talent, whether it be in India, China or Brazil, is far less inclined to emigrate for work than in the past.

But developing a global mindset is easier said than done. As the world shrinks with greater advancements in technology, it expands as new business locations and talent pools become viable. The global labor pool has virtually doubled in size in the last 15 years, and according to Harvard University's Richard Freeman, "... the entry of India, China and the former Soviet Bloc to the global capitalist economy is a turning point in economic history."

It is imperative that executives and senior managers, from small, mid-size and large firms, understand the implications of our aging and diversifying domestic talent pools as well as the dynamics of a global workforce that is expanding at lightning speed. For human resources leaders, knowledge of best practices in retaining older workers is key. For recruiters, knowledge of top sources for recruiting the diverse workforce and of the factors that appeal to diverse recruits is critical.

In the end, tapping into the global, remote workforce may prove the most challenging. Recruiting leaders should ask themselves who they know in talent "hot spots" around the world and how well they know those regions--their cultures and values--themselves. What partnerships have they made with global services firms who can provide on-demand skilled workers? Would they know where to start if they had to quickly build a team of software engineers, or accountants and actuaries, or build a call center for customer care and management? As the supply of skilled and semi-skilled workers dries up in the developed world, these connections and partnerships will be invaluable.

For more information on the HCI/Ernst & Young research or to learn about HCI's programs for building and managing the global workforce, please visit www.humancapitalinstitute.org or contact Allan Schweyer directly at aschweyer@humancapitalinstitute.org.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS:

Student 1:

1. Assinale a alternativa conforme a sua compreensão:

- O assunto do texto não ficou claro para mim (   )
- Só identifiquei o assunto geral (   )
- Compreendi algumas idéias principais de um modo geral (**X**   )
- Compreendi todo o texto detalhadamente. (   )

2. Responda:

- A que você atribui o seu sucesso (ou fracasso) total/parcial ao tentar compreender o texto?

Compreendi o texto de um modo geral graças ao meu conhecimento do vocabulário e também porque alguns termos são utilizados onde eu trabalho.

- Que estratégias você utilizou durante a leitura para facilitar a sua compreensão?

Ler o texto sem me preocupar em traduzir palavra por palavra, mas sim em entender o sentido da frase ou do parágrafo pelo contexto.

- O que poderia levá-lo (a) a melhor compreender o texto?

Caso houvesse um glossário (em inglês mesmo) junto ao texto.

- Você gostaria de obter mais informações sobre esse assunto?

Sim, certamente.

- Qual a relevância desse assunto para a sua área acadêmico/profissional?

Como trabalho em um ambiente organizacional, sempre me interesso pelas novas práticas mundiais.

Student 2:

1. Assinale a alternativa conforme a sua compreensão:

- O assunto do texto não ficou claro para mim (**X**)
- Só identifiquei o assunto geral (   )
- Compreendi algumas idéias principais de um modo geral (   )
- Compreendi todo o texto detalhadamente. (   )

2. Responda:

- A que você atribui o seu sucesso (ou fracasso) total/parcial ao tentar compreender o texto?

Pouco conhecimento do vocabulário.

- Que estratégias você utilizou durante a leitura para facilitar a sua compreensão?

Li o texto, em sua maior parte, tentando traduzir mentalmente

- O que poderia levá-lo (a) a melhor compreender o texto?

Maior conhecimento do vocabulário

- Você gostaria de obter mais informações sobre esse assunto?

Sim. Embora tenha tido dificuldades para compreender o texto, sei que o assunto está relacionado à minha área acadêmico/profissional e isso me interessa muito.

- Qual a relevância desse assunto para a sua área acadêmico/profissional?

Certamente, qualquer assunto relacionado á minha carreira contribuirá para um maior conhecimento da área e enriquecimento profissional.

APPENDIX B - COLLABORATIVE WRITING – Producing a text

(Based on Widdowson's (1980, p. 82-83 *Gradual Approximation* exercises – stage 1 – discourse composition)

Put the sentences in the following sets in the appropriate order and combine them where necessary to make a paragraph. Then arrange the four paragraphs in the most appropriate order to form a complete passage.

A.

   1. The group of courses include negotiation skills, presentation skills, account management, and what they call "expectation management".
   2. You can't become a manager at HCL until you've passed a group of courses.
   3. The "expectation management" deals with the expectations of both customers and employees.

B.

   4. That's un-heard-of!
   5. In the evaluation process, every employee rates their boss, their boss' boss, and any three other company managers they choose, on 18 questions using a 1-5 scale.
   6. At HCL all results are posted online for every employees to see.
   7. At HCL, an extraordinary process of upward evaluation was implemented last year.
   8. Vineet Nayar is the president of India's 30,000-employee HCL Technologies
   9. In the IT outsourcing firm, employees come first and costumers second.
   10. Vineet Nayar is creating an IT outsourcing firm.
   11. Such 360-degree evaluations are not uncommon.

C.

   12. HCL employs 20 percent of its workforce overseas
   13. Nayar believes in the winners.
   14. Nayar calls the model of Indian IT "effort-based"
   15. Employees are secure and happy.
   16. Nayar aims to build an organization full of highly-skilled employees
   17. Nayar has concluded that the "effort-based" model of Indian IT up to now will not win long term.
   18. The winners will deliver the best results to customers.
   19. Nayar thinks that employees can better focus on customer success.
   20. The highly-skilled employees will be dedicated to creating customer value.
   21. He wants to make HCL the place where people most want to work

D.

   22. That's not all.
   23. The more tickets the departments are creating, the better.

24. The electronic "ticket" will flag anything the employees think requires action in the company.
25. Amazingly, the electronic "tickets" can only be "closed" by the employees themselves.
26. Nayar is vigilant that managers not intimidate employees about creating or closing tickets.
27. The ticket is routed to a manager for resolution.
28. Every HCL employee can at any time create an electronic "ticket".
29. Managers are evaluated partly based on how many tickets their departments are creating.
30. The ticket is routed to a manager for resolution.

APPENDIX C - COLLABORATIVE WRITING - Reformulation

(Text used as a reformulated version for comparison)

THE WORLD'S MOST MODERN MANAGEMENT

HCL Technologies is empowering its employees and pointing the way to the future of business

By David Kirkpatrick, *Fortune* senior editor

NEW YORK (FORTUNE) - Vineet Nayar, president of India's 30,000-employee HCL Technologies, is creating an IT outsourcing firm, where, he says, employees come first and customers second. In an extraordinary process of upward evaluation implemented last year, every employee rates their boss, their boss' boss, and any three other company managers they choose, on 18 questions using a 1-5 scale. Such 360-degree evaluations are not uncommon, but at HCL all results are posted online for every employee to see. That's un-heard-of!

And that's not all. Every HCL employee can at any time create an electronic "ticket" to flag anything they think requires action in the company. Amazingly, such tickets can only be "closed" by the employees themselves. The ticket is routed to a manager for resolution, and Nayar is vigilant that managers not intimidate employees about creating or closing tickets. Managers are evaluated partly based on how many tickets their departments are creating – the more the better.

You can't become a manager at HCL until you've passed a group of courses that include negotiation skills, presentation skills, account management, and what they call "expectation management" – dealing with the expectations of both customers and employees.

Nayar has concluded that what he calls the "effort-based" model of Indian IT up to now will not win long term. The winners, Nayar believes, will be those that deliver the best results to customers. Employees who are secure and happy can better focus on customer success, he thinks. So he aims to build an organization full of highly-skilled employees dedicated to creating customer value. He wants to make HCL, which employs 20 percent of its workforce overseas, the place people most want to work.

APPENDIX D - READING COMPREHENSION - Individual work

The world's most modern management

HCL Technologies is empowering its employees and pointing the way to the future of business.

By David Kirkpatrick, Fortune senior editor
April 14, 2006: 12:41 PM EDT

NEW YORK (FORTUNE) - I have seen the future of management, and it is Indian. Vineet Nayar, president of India's 30,000-employee HCL Technologies, is creating an IT outsourcing firm where, he says, employees come first and customers second. (…)

Here are some things I can say about him with confidence: He is good at motivating employees, very committed to building a great team, but a little shaky on getting things done on time. These are not my observations. They are what his employees told him in an extraordinary process of upward evaluation he implemented last year at HCL.

Every employee rates their boss, their boss' boss, and any three other company managers they choose, on 18 questions using a 1-5 scale. Such 360-degree evaluations are not uncommon, but at HCL all results are posted online for every employee to see. That's un-heard-of!

And that's not all. Every HCL employee can at any time create an electronic "ticket" to flag anything they think requires action in the company. The ticket is routed to a manager for resolution. Amazingly, such tickets can only be "closed" by the employees themselves. And Nayar is vigilant that managers not intimidate employees about creating or closing tickets. Managers are evaluated partly based on how many tickets their departments are creating - the more the better (…)

In addition, every employee can post a question or comment on any subject in a public process called "U and I." About 400 come in each month, and questions and answers are all posted on the intranet. "The food served in Sector 24 is stale," read one recent comment. Vendors were replaced.

You can't become a manager at HCL until you've passed a group of courses that include negotiation skills, presentation skills, account management, and what they call "expectation management" - dealing with the expectations of both customers and employees.

There is a method to what some might consider madness. Nayar has concluded that what he calls the "effort-based" model of Indian IT up to now will not win long term. That's because IBM and other global IT companies now have their own local employees and can match many longtime Indian cost advantages. The winners, Nayar believes, will be those that deliver the best results to customers. Employees who are secure and happy can better focus on customer success, he thinks. So he aims to build an organization full of highly-skilled employees dedicated to creating

customer value. He wants to make HCL, which employs 20 percent of its workforce overseas, the place people most want to work (…)

(Disponível em: http://www.cnn.com/ Acesso em: 14/05/2007)

Responda (individualmente) as questões abaixo em Português, de acordo com o texto "The world´s most modern management".

1. Qual o tema central do texto?
2. Qual a posição do autor sobre o assunto apresentado?
3 .Por que a empresa de Vineet Nayar pode ser considerada "the future of management"?
4..Que tipo de avaliação ele criou na empresa?
5 .O que essa avaliação apresenta de diferente, uma vez que, segundo o texto, "tais avaliações de 360 graus não são incomuns"?
6. Como as mudanças são implementadas na empresa?
7. O que é "U and I" e como funciona?
8. O que é preciso para se tornar um gerente na HCL Technologies?
9. Como os gerentes são avaliados?
10. Por que Nayar decidiu criar as inovações em sua empresa?
11. Por que essas inovações funcionam bem?
12. Qual o objetivo maior de Nayar ao criar essas inovações em sua empresa?

ANSWERS:

(STUDENT 1):

1. *Administração de empresas, mais especificamente Recursos Humanos. O texto fala de uma inovação criada por um executivo na Índia em que seus funcionários são considerados mais importantes do que seus clientes.*
2. *O autor se posiciona favorável a essas inovações e até mesmo admirado.*
3. *A empresa de Vineet Nayar é inovadora. Ele acredita que funcionários felizes podem melhor contribuir para o sucesso de seus clientes.*
4. *Ele criou uma avaliação na qual os funcionários avaliam os gerentes e o próprio chefe.*
5. *Embora esse tipo de avaliação seja comum nas empresas, na firma de Vineet Nayar, os resultados são expostos online para que todos possam ver. Além disso, os funcionários podem também criar bilhetes eletrônicos com sugestões para melhorias na empresa*
6. *Os bilhetes com sugestões escritos pelos funcionários são então encaminhados para os gerentes para resolução*
7. *É um processo público na empresa no qual cada funcionário pode fazer uma pergunta ou comentário que são colocados na intranet.*
8. *É preciso fazer cursos específicos.*
9. *Os gerentes são avaliados de acordo com o número de bilhetes gerado – quanto maior, melhor.*
10. *Porque ele acredita que o modelo tecnológico chamado "effort-based" na Índia está ultrapassado.*
11. *Porque ele acredita que funcionários satisfeitos e altamente capacitados trarão maiores benefícios para a empresa.*

12. *Embora ele acredite que com tais inovações os funcionários serão mais felizes, por outro lado, obviamente, seu lucro também será maior*

(STUDENT 2)

1. *O texto fala de uma empresa na Índia na qual os funcionários são muito valorizados. O assunto é sobre Administração de Empresas. Na verdade, uma empresa bem administrada.*
2. *O autor do texto parece bastante positivo em relação ao assunto. Ele demonstra estar elogiando a empresa.*
3. *Essa empresa é inovadora e como tal, espera-se que ela seja um exemplo para o mundo.*
4. *Nayar criou uma avaliação específica para os funcionários.*
5. *Ela é diferente porque os funcionários podem reclamar, dar sugestões, criticar até mesmo seus chefes sem serem punidos por isso. E tudo é feito de uma maneira pública, ou seja, para que todos possam ver.*
6. *As críticas, sugestões, comentários, são encaminhados para os gerentes a fim de que medidas sejam tomadas.*
7. *É um sistema de diálogo na empresa. Perguntas e respostas são registradas na intranet*
8. *Para ser um gerente na empresa de Nayar, é preciso fazer um conjunto de cursos*
9. *Os gerentes são avaliados pelos funcionários.*
10. *Para competir com o mercado.*
11. *Por que funcionários mais satisfeitos atraem um maior número de clientes para a empresa.*
12. *Atrair mais clientes.*

APPENDIX E - STUDENTS' EVALUATION REPORTS

STUDENT 1 :

Primeiramente, gostaria de agradecer a oportunidade de participar do seu trabalho. Achei muito válido e uma experiência única para mim. Além do mais, serviu para praticar o meu inglês. Como já havia comentado com você, me formei há mais de seis anos e de lá pra cá, a minha prática tem sido ouvir música, assistir a seriados, jornais e uma vez ou outra, ler textos em inglês no meu trabalho.

Quanto primeira etapa achei tranqüila. É lógico que não entendi 100%, mas entendi o contexto – conhecia bastante o vocabulário. Quando encontrava alguma palavra que não sabia ou não me lembrava o significado, imediatamente procurava então relacioná-la ao contexto, ou se não fosse importante, deixava pra lá. A segunda etapa (de ordenar as frases) foi mais trabalhosa. Procurei ler as frases para ter uma idéia geral do assunto e depois então, conseguir relacioná-las. Com certeza, ajudou muito o fato dessa etapa ter sido feita em dupla. Também considero importante o meu conhecimento sobre o assunto e vocabulário. A minha experiência profissional ajudou bastante, assim como o conhecimento que já adquirimos sobre a língua inglesa. Para organizar as frases, nós discutimos e buscamos ordená-las de uma maneira lógica. Primeiro agrupamos as frases afins, por exemplo, todas as frases que tinham a palavra "ticket" estariam no mesmo parágrafo, e assim por diante. Depois, procuramos usar conectivos para não ficar tão repetitivo. Na última etapa, a de comparar o nosso texto com o original, percebemos que não tínhamos feito tudo 100% correto, algumas frases estavam diferentes, mas decidimos deixar muita coisa do nosso modo mesmo. Outras, tivemos que modificar. Se não fosse a troca de idéias com a colega, acredito que teria sido muito mais difícil. No final, percebi que ficou muito mais fácil compreender o texto original. Também pude ver o quanto fomos capazes de fazer sozinhas – isto me deu mais confiança e vontade até de continuar lendo esses tipos de textos em inglês. No início, por não serem didáticos, esses textos assustam um pouco – a gente pensa que nunca vai conseguir compreender tudo. Mas, através dessa atividade, acho que venci esse medo inicial. O trabalho em equipe é realmente muito valioso, mas o auxílio do professor ainda é bastante necessário para a aprendizagem. Bom, acho que é isso. Valeu a pena!!!!

STUDENT 2:

O trabalho realizado em par certamente me proporcionou a oportunidade não apenas de desenvolver a habilidade de leitura em inglês, mas também de rever e aprender algumas regras básicas da língua. Tendo um maior conhecimento da língua inglesa, a colega me ajudou bastante, esclarecendo dúvidas, fornecendo significados de palavras desconhecidas, me levando a analisar as frases mais cuidadosamente. Todo esse processo foi bastante útil e importante para a minha compreensão do texto apresentado. Percebi, através desse trabalho, que embora o conhecimento do vocabulário seja importante, isso apenas não é suficiente para uma compreensão detalhada de um texto em uma língua estrangeira. É preciso sim conhecer o funcionamento dessa língua, o seu sistema e sua estrutura básica. Da mesma forma, pude ver que nem sempre traduzir é um método adequado. Quanto à tarefa, achei muito interessante o fato de começarmos escrevendo para só depois lermos o texto. Geralmente, nas aulas, o oposto acontece. Achei que através das discussões para organização das frases e dos parágrafos pude entender melhor os detalhes do texto, as formas como as idéias se organizam formando um todo. Embora eu esteja acostumada a estudar sozinha, senti falta do apoio da professora. O uso do dicionário, entretanto, ajudou bastante. Também o fato de termos conversado em Português facilitou todo o processo. Acho que se tivéssemos que falar em inglês, tudo seria mais complicado, porque estaríamos mais preocupados com a produção oral e não com a leitura. O trabalho colaborativo me fez sentir mais confiante. Pude perceber, entretanto, que devo continuar estudando, ou pelo menos lendo mais textos em inglês. Achei muito válida a atividade. Ao responder as perguntas de compreensão de texto no final, senti que já havia compreendido tudo. Foi ótimo! Obrigada pela oportunidade de poder praticar um pouco mais o inglês. Um grande abraço.

APPENDIX F -TRANSCRIPTS

Collaborative writing task 1 – producing a text

(001) S1: Tá bom, então. Vamos começar! Vamos fazer uma estratégia de leitura, e...de repente, vê qual que tá ligado à primeira.
(002) S2: a primeira então é essa aqui, a 8, eu acho. Aqui explica quem é Vineet Nayar.
(003) S1: Certo. Eu acho que... depois tem que ser esta. Ela... ela diz que ele está criando uma empresa. O que você acha?
(004) S2: hum‑hum. Fica... essa pra... tá... eu acho... tá ligada à sétima.
(005) S1: Acho que é isso mesmo.
(006) S2: O que é "outsourcing"?
(007) S1: Não sei não... mas é um adjetivo – olha só : "outsourcing firm". Na verdade, é...
(008) S2: e deve ser positivo, é claro! Mas... procuro agora no dicionário, ou deixa pra lá?
(009) S1: na verdade, não interfere em nada; a gente pode ver depois.
(010) S2: é melhor mesmo, porque... aqui.. nesse dicionário aqui, nem tem!
(011) S1: ok, então vamos juntar as frases. Acho que podemos juntar a 8 com a 10 e usar.... "that" porque tá falando de Nayar.
(012) S2: hum-hum. Então vai ficar assim: "Vineet Nayar is the president of India's 30,000 employee HCL technololgies that is creating an IT outsourcing firm". Acho que ficou bom.
(013) S1: Também gostei. Qual é a próxima, então?
(014) S2: deve ser a 9! Continua falando da "IT outsourcing firm"! que que é IT, você sabe?
(015) S1: é alguma coisa de.... de "technology", eu acho, mas não me lembro o que é o "I".
(016) S2: tá bom. Deixa pra lá! Péra aí... já vi isso.... é... é... agora que você falou em "technology", lembrei. É.... "information", isso mesmo. "Information Techonology".
(017) S1: isso mesmo!!! é, mas se vamos juntar a 9, a gente não vai repetir esse negócio de novo: "outsourcing firm". Podemos escrever: "in this firm", employees come first and customers second. Isso.
(018) S2: que que é essa frase 4? Não entendo nada!!!!
(019) S1: nem eu!!! Agora temos mesmo que ver no dicionário! Se é que tem essa palavra! Vamos procurar "un-heard". Vê aí.
(020) S2: tá aqui. É... "unheard... unheard of" – inédito.
(021) S1: ótimo.
(022) S2: então, vamos colocar aqui agora. Acho que essa... hum... deve ser a próxima frase. Que acha?
(023) S1: tá bom aí. depois vem… agora vem tudo de "evaluation" – a 5,6, 7 e 11.
(024) S2: é... eu acho que essa....
(025) S1: hum... assim..... essa de.... de "evaluation process" não é essa não. Não é o primeiro não. Você lembra que depois, mais no final, tinha a de "evaluation process" e aí tem aquela parte da avaliação que eles fazem com o.... próprio chefe... o próprio chefe, o chefe do chefe, ele escolhe... eles....
(026) S2: é.... essa parte..... fica perdida aí..... por causa do vocabulário.

(027) S1: como eu trabalho lá na Vale, eu sei que eles fazem avaliação de 180 graus e de...

(028) S2: de 360 graus.... hum-hum...

(029) S1: de 180 graus é do chefe com você. Aí, depois, 360 graus é todo mundo avalia todo mundo. Aí eu acho que essa daqui, oh....

(030) S2: e tá falando de "last year", então tem que ser no passado. Mas, como vamos juntar então? O que que a gente vai usar?

(031) S1: bom, ele tá falando que o tal Nayar é presidente de uma empresa na Índia. Ele tá criando uma outra... outra??? empresa que é "outsourcing" porque valoriza mais os funcionários do que os clientes. Quer dizer, essa empresa deve ser ... então... "outsourcing" deve ser .... fora do comum, né? Só pode ser... valoriza mais os próprios funcionários!!!!!

(032) S2: é mesmo, só pode..... isso. E daí que isso é inédito. Tá.então ficou assim até agora: 8-10-9...

(033) S1: 9...4...

(034) S2: tá. Então agora fala da avaliação. Tá explicando o processo.

(035) S1: é, mas tem que ser no mesmo parágrafo. Acho que a gente podia começar com a frase mesmo.

(036) S2: hum-hum.

(037) S2: tá, mas olha só! Tá falando do passado, e os verbos estão no presente. Será que foi de propósito? Vamos mudar.

(038) S1: então tá. : então.... o passado de "rate" é…. É regular, não?

(039) S2: acho que é regular. Então é "rated" . "rate" é classificar? Avaliar?

(040) S1 : hum... não sei não, mas pelo contexto, acho que é. Vou ver aqui. É isso mesmo.

(041) S2 : então... se a gente vai colocar no passado, temos que mudar "choose" também. Será que é regular? Não me lembro... "choose"....

(042) S1: sabe que não me lembro também ? "choose….acho que é "choosed", não sei, mas tá estranho.... hum.... "choose... choose.... é... "choose, chose, chosen", isso! Isso mesmo! Então é "chose"! põe aí.

(043) S2: ok. Então ficou.... hum… " at HCL, an extraordinary process of upward evaluation was implemented last year". Ponto. "Every employee rated their boss, their boss's boss, and three other company members they cho…." Como é que se escreve mesmo? Com um "o" só?

(044) S1: é. Agora eu acho que vem a 11 que é a avaliação de 360 graus.

(045) S2: hum hum. E aí só fica faltando a 6.

(046) S1:   Podemos juntar com "but".Pronto, assim ... assim a gente termina o primeiro parágrafo.

(047) S2: e agora? Qual será o segundo?

(048) S1: ah... temos que ler tudo de novo e ver... depende do assunto.

(049) S2: é mesmo.... tem que estar relacionado ao primeiro.

(050) S1: tipo assim... aqui tem "ticket". Aí, assim, eu acho... esse "ticket" pode ser da avaliação...

(051) S2: será? Péra aí…O primeiro terminou falando da .... da avaliação.

(052) S1:   Certo. Então... acho que agora vai falar sobre como funciona a... a avaliação. então... vamos colocar essa aqui, oh... começa com a 28 : "every employee...." Olha só... aí aqui tem…. Tipo assim... "the electronic ticket will flag..." deve ser então a continuação.

(053) S2: é… mas tem essa aqui… a 22. não seria melhor começar com ela? Parece que dá continuidade ao outro parágrafo. Isso!

(054) S1: é isso mesmo. Então a gente coloca ela e vamos juntar então essas duas e começar o segundo parágrafo.

(055) S2: tá, mas não vamos repetir a palavra "ticket", né?

(056) S1: não... a gente pode colocar um conectivo.

(057) S2: sim, então coloca "which"

(058) S1: tá bom. "that's not all. Every HCL employee can at any time create an electronic ticket which will flag anything the employees think requires action in the company."

(059) S2: agora…. Agora pode vir a 26.

(060) S1: hummm... não.... olha aqui.... acho que… que a 25, eu acho, vem antes. Esse "closed"... "closing tickets" está relacionado....

(061) S2: hum hum...

(062) S1: ah, mas aqui diz que o "ticket" é enviado para um gerente para resolução. Aí, a gente pode acrescentar que entretanto, só os funcionários podem fechar os "tickets". Fica bom assim.

(063): S2: hum hum... vou escrever aqui. "That's not all" – ponto. "Every em"… employ…. Como é que se lê isso?

(064) S1: "employee" acho que é assim. .... empregado...

(065) S2: ok. "employee". "Every employee can at any time create an electronic ticket which will flag… "flag" não é bandeira?

(066) S1: flag é bandeira….. mas, will flag… aqui…. Aqui é verbo!

(067) S2: então deve ser sinalizar.

(068) S1: que vai sinalizar tudo que os funcionários acham que precisa de ação da companhia. Tá certo.

(069) S2: "action in the company" – ponto. Agora vem "the ticket is routed to a manager for resolution. Entretanto, né? Como é entretanto em ingles?

(070) S1: vou ver aqui…

(071) S2: é.... mas, tipo assim... e esse "amazingly" ? como é que fica? Entretanto, amazingly? Será que fica bom?

(072) S1: acho que não tem nada a ver... pode ser sim. Hum... Entre... entretanto... achei aqui. É "however". "However" não é porém? É… entretanto, porém… tá certo. Dá no mesmo.

(073) S2: Ok. Então… "however, amazingly"… vírgula, "the electronic tickets can only be closed by the employees themselves." Tá bom.

(074) S1: é…. Mas acho que agora é que a gente podia colocar "however". Fica melhor, eu... eu acho.

(075) S2: é.... então vamos tirar daqui… e aí... e aí.. a gente começa essa outra frase então.

(076) S1: vamos ver... "Amazingly, the electronic tickets can only be closed...." hum…. "however, Nayar is vigilant…" é, acho que agora tá bom. O que você acha? Ficou melhor assim?

(077) S2: hum… também gostei mais. Vamos deixar assim então.

(078) S1: tá bom. Hum.... olha só essa aqui agora…. Os gerentes são avaliados em parte baseado na quantidade de tickets que seus departamentos tão criando.... onde vamos colocar essa?

(079) S2: a gente pode.... assim…. A gente coloca essa, depois da 24. não vejo nada de mais... é a continuação! Então..... "Amazingly, the electronic tickets can only be closed by the employees themselves" ponto. Aí começa: "Managers are evaluated…."

(080) S1: é… pode ser… então fica bom assim e termina com a essa agora. pronto. Mais um.

(081) S2: acho que ficou bom. Agora... agora, o outro parágrafo tem que ser o A. só pode...

(082) S1: é... hum.... e…. e olha só… aqui, continua falando dos gerentes…. Que bom! Acho que estamos indo bem….

(083) S2: então… começa com a 2, é claro! "You can't become a manager at HCL until.........courses..." aí continua com a 1 "the group of courses…. Expectation management"

(084) S1: management (correcting S2's pronunciation). E agora é mole! Só falta a 3. jóia!

(085) S2: esse parágrafo agora é maior....

(086) S1: então.... a gente começa então com essa frase mesmo, tira a outra.

(087) S2: ok. "Nayar aims to build an organization full of highly-skilled..." "highly skilled"???

(088) S1: é…. "skill" é capacidade.

(089) S2: "high" é alto, né? "-ly" é –mente. Então....

(090) S1: é, sim.... altamente capacitado. Então vamos lá. 16. "Nayar aims to build an organization full of highly-skilled employees" ponto.

(091) S2: ponto, não. A gente junta com a 20 e põe "which". Esse é o conectivo pra pessoas, né? Tira Nayar ....

(092) S1: tá... "and which".... "which" não é pra coisas? "and that..." não, "that" é que e pra coisas, não?

(093) S2: acho que é.... deixa eu ver... agora não tô lembrando não. Deixa "which" mesmo.

(094) S1: a gente usou "which" aqui pra "tickets". Hum hum.... "tickets" é coisa. "...full of highly-skilled employees which will be dedicated...." acho que seria "whose"

(095) S2: não…. "whose" é de quem. "who" é quem.

(096) S1: tá… então vamos deixar "which" mesmo. Acho que serve pros dois.

(097) S2: "Nayar aims to build an organization full of highly-skilled employees which can better focus on customer success." Tá bom.Vamos em frente.

(098) S1: hum…. Sei não…. Olha essa aqui…. A 16. tá falando direto dos "highly skilled employees".. essa então que podia vir junto da 20.

(099) S2: Já colocamos essa 16 no início.

(100) S1: é... hum…. Assim… eu acho… é melhor então juntar a 16 à 20... oh... "Nayar aims to build an organization full of highly-skilled employees which will be dedicated to creating customer value". Ficou melhor. Que acha?

(101) S2: hum... "Nayar aims to build an organization full of highly-skilled employees which will be dedicated to creating customer value." "creating"? "-ing" não é gerúndio? Estranho!!!! Serão dedicados a criando????

(102) S1: é.... tinha que ser "create". Acho que tá errado aqui. Vamos deixar "create".

(103) S2: mas será que tem erro assim nas frases? É pra gente consertar? Ela não falou nada!!!!

(104) S1: vai ver foi de propósito. É só pra ver se a gente nota....

(105) S2: tá, então vamos corrigir. Então... ficou assim... primeiro a 16, depois a 20 então. agora vem....

(106) S1: deixa eu ver... "Nayar believes..." não... essa não.

(107) S2: olha essa aqui. Acho que tem que ser a 18. começa a frase do jeito que tá aqui mesmo. "Nayar thinks that...." e aí vai embora.

(108) S1: depois da 19?

(109) S2: é.... assim.... "which will be dedicated to create customer value" ponto. Agora vem "Nayar thinks that employees can better focus on customer success." Tá bom?

(110) S1: é… acho…. Pode ser. E depois?

(111) S2: vamos ver aqui… parece que tá tudo sem pé nem cabeça! Esquisito! Não liga!!!!

(112) S1: vamos dar um jeito. Tem que ligar....

(113) S2: então.... já sei... pode ser a 14 e depois a 17 .... olha só.. tá falando de "effort-based" – as duas.

(114) S1: é... vamos ver.... "Nayar aims to build an organization full of highly-skilled employees which will be dedicated to create customer value" ponto. "Nayar thinks that employees can better focus on customer success" ponto de novo. Agora vem 14, né?

(115) S2: é, quer dizer, eu acho, né?

(116) S1: tá. 14. "Nayar calls the model of Indian IT 'effort-based'" e aí você diz que vem a 17, né?

(117) S2: é… olha só…. "effort-based" de novo!

(118) S1: tá. Então. Mas agora a gente tira Nayar pra não repetir. Coloca "he". Fica assim: "he has concluded that the effort-based model of Indian IT...."

(119) S2: sim…. Ficou bom. Agora acho que…. Hum.... acho que... podia vir a ....

(120) S1: a 13, não é?

(121) S2: sim... fica bom. "Nayar believes in the winners"

(122) S1: já sei. Podemos ligar a 13 com a 18… vamos colocar "because" então.

(123) S2: "Nayar believes in the winners because...." aí tem que colocar "they" pra não repetir de novo.

(124) S1: certo.

(125) S2: então, assim..... "Nayar believes in the winners because they will deliver the best results to customers."

(126) S1: tá bom. Agora vem….

(127) S2: só pode ser a 15.... "employees are secure and happy"

(128) S1: vamos colocar como?

(129) S2: acho melhor colocar primeiro a 12 e depois a 15 e terminar com a 21.

(130) S1: tá, então.... "HCL employs 20 percent of its workforce overseas"

(131) S2: "overseas" ? ….

(132) S1: "overseas" é "fora", no exterior.

(133) S2: você sabe tudo, hein???

(134) S1: é porque eu trabalho com isso. Tenho que ler muita coisa em inglês.

(135) S2: não me lembro mais de muita coisa que aprendi. Tenho que ler mais... essas aulas aqui são boas. A gente usa mesmo os textos da nossa área. Acho isso legal.

(136) S1: então. "HCL employs 20 percent of its workforce overseas." "but his employees are secure and happy" que acha?

(137) S2: ficou bom. E aí, termina com a 21. "He wants to make HCL...."

(138) S!: péra aí….. agora não pode começar com "he" - acho que tem que colocar o nome dele.

(139) S2: é, senão não fica claro. "ele", quem???Vamos escrever "Nayar" no lugar de "he". Pronto. Acabamos então.

(140) S1: acho que agora temos que ler tudo pra ver como ficou.

(141) S2: é. Tá certo. Vamos ler então.

(142) S1: agora acho que cada um pode ler sozinho. É só pra conferir.

(143) S2: tá bom.

The students read their text individually.

(144) S2: acho que ficou bom. O que você achou? tem que mudar alguma coisa?
(145) S1: gostei. Vamos deixar assim então. Depois a gente vai comparar com o texto original, e vê como tem que ser....
(146) S2: terminamos então essa parte.
(147) S1: sim, acabamos. Vamos falar com ela.

Collaborative writing task 2 – Reformulation

(001) S2: Bom, agora é hora de compararmos nosso texto com o original.
(002) S1: sim, vamos ver...
(003) S2: ok. Então... vamos começar vendo os parágrafos.
(004) S1: certo. "Vineet Nayar.... president..." certo.
(005) S2: olha, acertamos a ordem dos parágrafos!
(006) S1: legal... certinho mesmo! Agora vamos ver as frases...
(007) S2: tá. Nossa! Olha só! três frases juntas formando uma só!!!
(008) S1: nós colocamos "that" pra juntar.... e nem precisava....
(009) S2: isso... era só colocar entre vírgulas.... olha isso!!!!
(010) S1: é... um aposto. Igual a português! Nem pensamos nisso!!! Fica bem melhor!
(011) S2: sim... e olha depois... "where".... na empresa....
(012) S1: nós colocamos ponto. E, pra não repetir... "in this firm".
(013) S2: é... mas.... mas a nossa não ficou ruim!!!
(014) S1: não... também não achei ruim... só que a outra é mais elaborada.
(015) S2: vamos deixar assim?
(016) S1: acho que sim!
(017) S2: tá. Aí nós colocamos a : "That's un-heard of"!
(018) S1: é... mas eu acho que não faz diferença. Ela pode ficar aí mesmo.
(019) S2: é... agora.... de novo, as frases ficaram juntas. E nós fizemos duas separadas. Olha aqui: "at HCL an extraordinary process of upward evaluation was implemented last year" ponto.
(020) S1: xiii… olha só! Não era pra colocar no passado mesmo não! Olha aqui!
(021) S2: é... vamos ver... ficou mesmo no presente.
(022) S1: é que... eu acho... é isso mesmo... "In an extraordinary process of upward evaluation implemented last year, every employee rates"... quer dizer.... a... a avaliação foi implementada no ano passado, mas ela continua, por isso é que tá no presente.
(023) S2: hummm.... começa no passado e continua no presente? Então... então... tinha que estar no... no... como é mesmo?
(024) S1: "present perfect"? hum... agora você me confundiu!!! Péra aí.. vamos ler de novo. Tá. É, mas não é isso... Acho que... a avaliação é que foi implementada no ano passado. Acabou. Agora, o processo é que é no presente. Sempre se faz a mesma coisa. A partir da implementação, né?
(025) S2: hummm.. complicado isso.... péra aí. Deixa eu ver aqui..... acho que entendi. É... faz sentido.... Então é presente mesmo. Vamos mudar aqui.

(026) S1: tá. A gente colocou tudo no passado.

(027) S2: a gente muda agora, então.

(028) S1: aqui tá certo. Começa outra frase. "Such 360 degree..." ok, certo.

(029) S2: haha.... aqui nós acertamos!!! Colocamos "but"... ficou jóia!!!

(030) S1: isso... legal... segundo parágrafo.

(031) S2: começamos bem!!! Certo.

(032) S1: olha agora! Nós juntamos as frases com "which" e é "to"...

(033) S2: "to" é "para", né?

(034) S1: sim... cada funcionário pode criar um ticket eletrônico para sinalizar..."

(035) S2: é... mas que irá sinalizar também tá certo...

(036) S1: é... tem razão.

(037) S2: agora nossa ordem tá... tá diferente.

(038) S1: é... aqui é primeiro a 25. mas isso não faz mal. Rosangela disse que não era pra gente se preocupar com o texto original. É só pra comparar o inglês.

(039) S2: é... o modo como nós escrevemos as frases, não a ordem.

(040) S1: é... só.. assim... só se fizer muita diferença.

(041) S2: se tiver muita bobagem. Hahaha.... é. Aqui até que nossa frase ficou bem melhor.... nós usamos "entretanto", né? "however", e no texto tem "and".... "however" é mais chique!!!!

(042) S1: hahaha.... é... agora, agora olha só essa... não precisava ter repetido tudo...

(043) S2: onde?

(044) S1: aqui na... na última frase. Olha só como tá aqui no texto.

(045) S2: é mesmo. Assim ficou bem melhor. Vamos mudar o nosso então.

(046) S1: tá. Próximo parágrafo... certo... "You can't become a manager..." olha só! "that"… nós colocamos ponto em tudo.

(047) S2: podia ter colocado "that" mesmo. Viu? Tá falando de "courses" aqui é "that" – coisa.

(048) S1: certo. Então "that" é pra coisas mesmo. E aí tem um tracinho....

(049) S2: hum.... e gerúndio... aqui, acho, aqui tá certo – "lidando". A gente podia ter feito assim!

(050) S1: é, mas agora a gente já sabe. Fica igual a português.

(051) S2: que coisa, né? A gente nem pensa nas outras possibilidades.... a pró...

(052) S1: a próxima agora... hum... totalmente diferente.

(053) S2: é porque não é a nossa língua! Ok. não tem problema. O sentido é que importa, né?

(054) S1: mas ... será que... será que o sentido tá certo?

(055) S2: temos que analisar....

(056) S1: vamos ler novamente a frase do original e vê se a gente entende.

(057) S2: tá. Hummmm. Mas aqui tá escrito "what he calls the effort-based" não tinha isso no nosso!

(058) S1: hummmm... "HCL employs... Nayar believes... Nayar calls…" aqui! Olha aqui!! Tá aqui! Isso! Nem percebemos! Olha ela aqui!!!

(059) S2: como assim? O quê?

(060) S1: aqui, oh... "Nayar calls the model effort based" então… "Nayar has concluded that the effort-based…" tava tudo aqui… a gente não viu!!! Agora olha o original!

(061) S2: hummmmm.... pôxa!!! É mesmo.

(062) S1: agora olha só... quer dizer... ele acha que o modelo das empresas na Índia não vai muito longe... daí ele acredita nos vencedores... quer dizer.... naqueles que darão maior resultado para os clientes.

(063) S2: hummm... por isso ele está criando um novo modelo de empresa!!! Entendi!

(064) S1: isso mesmo. Bem, continuando.... olha aqui de novo....

(065) S2: nossa! Esse parágrafo tá fogo!

(066) S1: de novo... juntou as duas.... "Nayar believes..." quer dizer... "The winners" vírgula "Nayar believes" vírgula – ficou muito bom assim….

(067) S2: olha agora! Descobri!!! É "who" ... "who" é que é pra pessoas.... "employees who are secure and happy"... "that" foi pra coisa....lá trás... vamos mudar aquela frase....

(068) S1: que ... a gente vai descobrindo as coisas e.... corrigindo o que escrevemos!!!! Muito legal isso!

(069) S2: olha... "he thinks" no final da frase.. é, mas a gente tem que prestar atenção!

(070) S1: tanta coisa que a gente nem imaginou!!!! Ficou bem melhor assim mesmo! Vamos corrigir tudo.

(071) S2: tá. Então ficou... "Nayar has concluded that" aí encaixa "what he calls effort-based..."

(072) S1: é… "effort-based model of Indian IT up to now" e deixa o resto.

(073) S2: tá. "long term" ponto. Aí coloca …

(074) S1: aí coloca "the winners" vírgula "Nayar believes" vírgula "will be those that" "that"? então "that" é que serve pra coisas e pra pessoas… é isso.

(075) S2: é... deve ser... não me lembro. Sei que tem um que serve pros dois.

(076) S1: é... mas se tá aqui... então é "that" mesmo.

(077) S2: humhum. Tá. "to customers" ponto. "employees who are ..."

(078) S1: "secure and happy" e aí continua, põe vírgula e termina com "he thinks".

(079) S2: agora tem "so" ...

(080) S1: então.

(081) S2: então, o quê?

(082) S1: "so" é então.

(083) S2: ah, tá!

(084) S1: agora juntou essa com essa aqui, oh, sem usar nada, só o verbo "dedicated"

(085) S2: é... ficou bom! Ih! Olha só! É "creating" mesmo. Não é possível que ia errar duas vezes!!!

(086) S1: acho que não! E aqui é o texto original! Cê lembra que a... a professora sempre diz que não tem pegadinha???? Então....

(087) S2: é.... a gente... a gente devia saber.... fomos mudar, né? sabe o que a gente podia fazer? Anotar então tudo que a gente tem dúvida e que não conseguiu descobrir... daí a gente pergunta depois pra Rosangela.

(088) S1: ou pra nossa professora. boa idéia. Senão a gente não vai aprender. Então, vamos anotar esse negócio do gerúndio aí.

(089) S2: tá. E aquela confusão de "who", "that", "which" também, né?

(090) S1: é. Tem mais alguma coisa?

(091) S2: acho que não.... só se for pronúncia...

(092) S1: é, pode ser....

(093) S2: a última frase tem "which" para a empresa. Então é pra coisa.

(094) S1: tá, mas vamos perguntar assim mesmo, eu acho.

(095) S2: também acho melhor. Ficou boa esta frase, né?
(096) S1: a última? Sim... agora a gente já sabe que pode usar as vírgulas também.
(097) S2: é... quando vai explicar alguma coisa... como em português.
(098) S1: acho que acabamos.
(099) S2: hum hum.... conferimos tudo. Ficou bom.
(100) S1: gostei. Muito interessante isso.
(101) S2: é.... e a gente aprende sem sentir...
(102) S1: então.... então vamos.... vamos chamar Rosangela, ok?
(103) S2: humhum acabamos. Amanhã ela falou que... que tem a outra parte, né?
(104) S1: parece que é. Então pronto. "finished".