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# ABSTRACT <br> THE ORALNNRITTEN CONTRAST IN EFL LEARNERS' NARRATIVES 

## STELLA MARIA MIRANDA VIEIRA

## UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE SANTA CATARINA 1995

Supervising Professor: Dr. Carmen Rosa Caldas-Coulthard

This study examines the oral and written versions of personal stories produced in English by two groups of non-native speakers at two different levels of proficiency in the light of previous investigations of the oral/literate contrast in native-language data. The main object of the analysis are the dimensions integration $X$ fragmentation and involvement X detachment proposed by Chafe as distinctive of speech and writing. I do not lose sight, however, of the $L_{2}$ research and theory context taking into account the interplay of automaticity and control in second language use. What emerges from the findings is a tentative profile of the pre-intermediate Brazilian EFL learner in terms of the oral/written distinction.

## RESUMO

O presente estudo examina as versões orais e escritas de narrativas pessoais produzidas em inglés por dois grupos de falantes não-nativos em dois níveis diferentes de proficiếncia, à luz de investigaçס̄es anteriores do contraste oral/escrito em língua nativa. O objeto principal da análise são as dimensठ̋es 'integração x fragmentação' e 'envolvimento $x$ distanciamento' propostas por Chafe (1982) como diferenciadoras da fala e da escrita. O atual contexto de teorias e pesquisas do uso da segunda língua é tambem levado em conta no que diz respeito à interação 'automatismo -- controle'. O que resulta das conclusões da análise é uma caracterização da interlíngua do aprendiz pré-intermediário de inglés como língua estrangeira em termos da distinção oral/escrito.

## CONVENTIONS

1 - Transcription of the Oral Data

```
falling tone
rising or falling-rising tone
? rising tone in yes/no questions: falling tone in wh- questions
```

1? high rise
:: lengthening of preceding vowel or diphthong
pause
short pause
(...) omission of a portion of text (in the examples)
() enclose audience interference
(----) incomprehensible sequence by the teller
[---] incomprehensible sequence by the audience
(laugh) by the audience
[laugh] by the teller
\{\} enclose non-verbal features (except laughing)used by the teller

Obs.: a) Occurrences of level tone as well as incomplete tone units are not punctuated.
b) A paralinguistic feature like 'laughing' in square brackets after an underlined sequence means that the whole sequence is marked by that feature.
c) Emphatic pitch is shown by capitalizing the stressed syllable.

2 - Identification of the Examples
(O) oral story
(W) written story

T target subject
$R$ reference subject
e.g. (O)T4-1-(2) means oral story, target subject 4, centre of interest 1, composition unit 2;
$(W) R 2$-4) means written story, reference subject 2 , sentence 4.
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## CHAPTER ONE

## INTRODUCTION

As an EFL teacher in Brazil, I have frequently observed a mismatch between the learner's speaking and writing abilities in the target language. There are the ones (and they seem to be the majority) who are capable of producing acceptable pieces of writing but behave very awkwardly in a speech situation and others who, despite their reasonable oral fluency, feel completely lost when they need to write something in the $\mathrm{L}_{2}$. On the receptive side, the situation is similar -- I have come across many learners who complain that, although satisfied with their reading skills, their listening comprehension is quite poor. It was this pedagogic concern that triggered my interest in the differences between spoken and written discourse.

The aim of this research is, then, to contribute to a better understanding of the differences between the speech and writing of foreign learners of English as a necessary first step in trying to help them to overcome their difficulties.

When I surveyed the literature on differences between spoken and written discourse, I discovered that almost all the existing research deals with native language data. The present investigation, therefore, undertakes the task of finding out whether and to what extent the results of first language research in this field are applicable to non-native speaker's discourse. I also take into account the special
nature of non-native language production by examining the data against the background of current research and theories of second language use.

## 1.1-The Data

The data for this study consist of the oral and written versions of forty-one personal stories (eighty-one texts in all) produced in English by two groups of Brazilians at two different levels of proficiency.

I chose to work with personal narratives because (a) they are relatively easy to elicit, even from non-proficient speakers; (b) their highly predictable structure lends itself perfectly to comparative analysis and (c) they are delivered in the form of extended turns, which makes fluencyfnon-fluency features more apparent.

The first group of subjects are twenty-six learners of English at preintermediate level. Some of them study English at the Britanic English Centre (a private English school in Recife), and the others are undergraduates at the Federal University of Pernambuco (UFPE). Their age range is from fourteen to twenty-five. They will be referred to as the 'target group'.

The fifteen subjects who comprise the second group are totally fluent in English. Some of them teach English at the Britanic English Centre, some are undergraduates at UFPE and the others are postgraduates at the Federal University of Santa Catarina (UFSC). Their ages vary from twenty-five to forty-two. This group will be referred to as the 'reference group'.

Halliday (1989) mentions two differences between speaking and writing in the $L_{1}$ which are not present in the $L_{2}$ data of this study. The first is that speech is acquired naturally while writing is usually taught; the second is that the acquisition of the former always precedes the learning of the latter. In the case of the subjects of this analysis, both speech and writing are learned in a classroom setting and the two modes are tackled in a rather simultaneous fashion.

On account of those differences, although the starting point for this study are the $L_{1}$ research findings in the field of orality $X$ literacy, the focal comparison (cf. research question $\mathbf{2}$ in the following section) leaves out the native speaker. I believe that speakers like the ones in the reference group constitute a more realistic standard against which to compare the group I am mainly concerned with, namely, the target group. The non-proficient subjects in this study will never become native speakers but they can certainly aim at achieving the level of proficiency of the subjects in the reference group.

## 1.2-Research Questions

The questions which guide this investigation can be formulated as follows:
1- Are the differences between speech and writing in the $L 2$ similar to the ones detected in the $L_{1}$ by previous research?

2- How do the two groups of subjects compare to each other in terms of the differences mentioned in question 1 ?

3- How do non-fluent learners differ from the fluent ones in their choice of strategies?

Besides the questions above, there is the hypothesis, based on the observation of my own students' behaviour, that learners may have problems in dealing at the same time with the interaction of the speech situation and the production of acceptable language. Ochs (1979) refers to this as the difficulty in attending to situational and conceptual demands at the same time:

When an adult is thinking through a difficult idea, he may tune out the behaviours of others present. Often, for example, the speaker will avoid eye contact. Here the speaker appears unwilling to establish intersubjectivity and register additional social demands. (Ochs 1979:76)

The global goal of this research is, then, to arrive at a profile of the interlanguage competence of pre-intermediate Brazilian EFL learners which contemplates the differences between speech and writing. Although one cannot expect that every learner will behave in conformity with a established profile, it may provide teachers with some guidance on predicting some of the difficulties learners are likely to face in second language use.

## 1.3 - The Development of the Thesis

This thesis starts with a survey of first language studies of orality versus literacy in Chapter Two which is followed by an overview of current $L_{2}$ research and theories (Chapter Three), highlighting the two executive control processes of planning and
monitoring and reporting some of the controversy as to the interface of automaticity and control in second language production.

Chapter Four provides a characterization of the narrative genre reviewing some of the most relevant literature on the subject.

Chapter Five discusses data collection and analytical procedures defining the units used for segmentation of the stories.

The dimension integration versus fragmentation as it appears in the oral and written stories which make up the present data is the subject of Chapters Six and Seven. Chapter Six reports the analysis of the disturbances of the speech flow called by Chafe 'perturbations of the expression of centres of interest', and also tackles other hesitational phenomena due to the on-line nature of speech production such as pauses and fillers. Chapter Seven deals with the use of independent clauses, coordination versus subordination, and the relative length of noun phrases.

The analysis of the dimension involvement versus detachment is reported in Chapter Eight. The features analysed are: a) reference to first and second person, b) reference to the speaker's mental processes, c) monitoring the communication channel, d) fuzziness, e) proximal deixis and f) evaluation of reportability. I also propose here mean length of text as a feature of both integration $X$ fragmentation and of involvement X detachment.

Directly related to the matter of automaticity versus control mentioned in Chapter Three, Chapter Nine focuses on the use of communication strategies by the subjects.

The Conclusion includes, besides the interpretation of the results, a few pedagogical implications and suggestions for further research.

## CHAPTER TWO

## DIFFERENCES BETWEEN SPOKEN AND WRITTEN DISCOURSE

This chapter consists of a survey of orality/literacy studies carried out in the last twenty years. It starts with a diachronic perspective of how thought processes have been affected by the advent of literacy and then by print, computer and video technologies.

After this brief account of the development of human consciousness as a product of the new media, a number of studies are examined which deal with the differences between oral and written language in literate societies. A consensus seems to be emerging that oral and literate strategies are not the exclusive property of spoken and written language respectively. The recent tendency is, then, to admit that the two kinds of strategies can occur in both modes of expression.

## 2.1-The Orality/Literacy Shift

Ong (1982) approaches the contrast between orality and literacy from a diachronic perspective. Drawing on previous studies, he focuses on the different ways in which oral and literate cultures express their thoughts and how thought processes themselves are influenced by the medium of expression.

The study of Homeric poetry, which kept scholars busy for two millenia, highlighted the formulaic character of oral art forms.

In an oral culture, knowledge, once acquired, had to be constantly repeated or it would be lost; fixed formulaic thought patterns were essential for wisdom and effective administration. (Ong 1982:24)

Story-telling was crucial in oral tradition, which depended for the acquisition of knowledge on the sense of identification of the listener with the speaker or the characters in the discourse. But when writing was interiorized, centuries after the development of the Greek alphabet around 700-720 BC, the mind became capable of more original and more abstract thought as a consequence of not having to depend on mnemonic formulas to store knowledge.

In ancient cultures, orally orientated, communication was characterized by immediacy and spontaneity, whereas the literate world has been dominated by written communication which has imposed its rules even on oral discourse. Communication has, then, in general terms, become less spontaneous and more organized. (Lakoff 1982)

Oral communication brings people together; writing and reading are isolating activities. The reader is not present when the writer is writing and the writer is normally absent when the reader is reading; otherwise there would be no need for writing. Written discourse, then, cannot be directly questioned by the audience as speech can.

Writing is a technology like print and the computer, and, as Ong says, 'the most drastic of the three'. It started what print and the computer continued to do --
imprisoning the evanescence of sound in the concreteness of space. (Ong 1982:82)

In manuscript cultures, reading tended to be a social activity; texts used to be read aloud due to the lack of reproduction facilities and also to the inability of many to read. Print has fostered greater individualism. The printed text is also more definitive than the manuscript which can still be altered by erasures, insertions and marginal comments.

Electronic media have both deepened the spatialization of language and started a new era of secondary orality. Secondary orality is different from primary orality in that it is deeply rooted in writing and print. The group sense is a common feature of both kinds of orality, but in secondary orality it is addressed to much larger groups (McLuhan's global village). Moreover, oral cultures were groupminded because they had no other alternative; in secondary orality the concern for the group is an intentional attitude.

Unlike members of a primary oral culture, who are turned outward because they have had little occasion to turn inward, we are turned outward because we have turned inward. (Ong 1982:136)

Ong (ibid:137) gives a good example of the differences between the two kinds of orality: although radio and television have enabled politicians to address immeasurably larger audiences, these audiences are invisible and inaudible. In the old oral world there used to be intense interplay between orator and audience and this constant feedback inhibited any sense of closure.

One of the results of this new shift towards orality is the tendency to apply oral strategies to written texts. Lakoff (1982) illustrates this tendency with a few facts she has observed. She shows, for example, that devices which were strongly criticized
in comic books are now being used by serious writers of fiction and non-fiction. She also shows that even the oral media have changed to accommodate this new concern for spontaneity and involvement: the old polished style once fashionable among politicians is being gradually replaced by a more conversational style.

The concurrent findings of orality/literacy studies are that oral tradition is characterized by formulaic language and reliance on the context while in literate tradition language is analytic, linear and less dependent on context. Ong exemplifies this by opposing the formulary nature of the Homeric poems to the literate ideal of original expression:
[..]] the Homeric poems valued and somehow made capital of what later readers had been trained in principle to disvalue, namely, the set phrase, the formula, the expected qualifier -- to put it more bluntly, the cliche. (Ong 1982:23)

## 2.2-Chafe's Integration and Involvement

Chafe (1982) relates certain differences in the processes of speaking and writing to specific differences in the corresponding products. He focuses on two differences in the speaking and writing processes:
a) speaking is faster than writing;
b) speakers interact directly with their audiences while writers do not.

The data analyzed by Chafe consist of language samples of two maximally differentiated styles: informal spoken language (dinner-table conversations) and formal written language (academic papers).

Chafe says that writing is much slower than speech and it is not the mechanics of writing that demands all this extra time but the effort to integrate a series of ideas into a single linguistic unit. This gives written language its 'integrated' quality in opposition to the 'fragmented' quality of speech.

Written discourse is syntactically more complex than speech in that it presents a greater amount of subordination; spoken texts, due to a greater reliance on coordination, are syntactically simpler.

In spoken language, idea units -- stretches of language which correspond to distinct focuses of consciousness (cf. 4.3.1.1) -- are shorter and more independent of each other than in written language. They appear in sequence, without connectives or linked by coordinating conjunctions, of which the most common is 'and'. An idea unit in spoken language normally consists of a single clause and may sometimes consist of just a noun phrase or prepositional phrase.

Integration is 'the packing of more information into an idea unit than the rapid pace of spoken language would normally allow' (Chafe ibid:39). Integration is achieved by means of several devices such as nominalization (verbs changed into nouns), participles (verb forms used as adjectives), attributive adjectives (e.g. 'the old house' for 'the house was old'), constituents conjoined in series, sequences of prepositional phrases, complement clauses (e.g. 'it is notable that....'), defining relative clauses and indirect quotations.

The other dimension of divergence between spoken and written language proposed by Chafe is the one of involvement versus detachment. The detached quality of the written language is due to the peculiar kind of relation that exists
between the writer and his/her audience. Very often the writer does not even know who his/her audience will be; in these cases the writer is concerned with producing a text which will be adequate to a variety of readers. Even when known to the writer, the reader is always displaced in time and space. The contrary occurs in typical spoken language: participants in spoken interaction share considerable knowledge about the environment and there is constant and mutual feedback between them. The speaker is usually more concerned with providing experiential details than a logically coherent skeleton.

Schegloff (1982) argues that even lectures, sermons or stories told in elicitation interviews should not be treated 'as the product of a single speaker and a single mind'. Even when only one person does all the talking, 'speech-exchange systems are involved'. As he says

Anyone who has lectured to a class knows that the (often silent) reactions of the audience -- the wrinkling of brows at some point in its course, a few smiles or chuckles or nods, or their absence -- can have marked consequences for the talk which follows: whether, for example, the just preceding point is reviewed, elaborated, put more simply, etc., or whether the talk moves quicly onto the next point, and perhaps to a more subtle point than was previously planned. (ibid:72)

The main device used in written language for the sake of detachment is the passive voice, which avoids the involvement of an agent in an action. Nominalization, besides contributing to integration, also suppresses involvement in action.

The involvement that a speaker has with his or her audience is manifested in language via references to the speaker, references to the speaker's mental processes, devices for monitoring listener's comprehension (Well..., I mean..., You
know...), the use of emphatic particles, fuzziness (sort of, something like, a milimeter or two) and direct speech.

In a later article Chafe (1985) refines his conception of the differences between written and oral language to which he adds the dimension of evidentiality which refers to the speaker's or writer's attitude toward the information they communicate. Evidentiality has to do with the reliability of the knowledge, the reasoning which gave origin to it or the data on which it is based.

Differences in the expression of evidentiality between written and spoken language are attributable to both the temporal and the interactive aspects which distinguish speaking from writing.

The greater time available to writers mean that they can deliberate longer regarding the status of their knowledge, and in fact writers show a concern for certain kinds of reliability and certain kinds of reasoning that speakers are not so much concerned with. (Chafe ibid:118)

Because of the interactive nature of speech, speakers tend to pay more attention to the ways in which language reflects their direct experience. Writers' evaluation of the reliability of their subject matter is more detached.

The speaker or writer's assessment of the reliability of the knowledge communicated is not usually signalled linguistically in English. When it is, adverbs like 'maybe', 'probably', and 'certainly' and modals like 'may' and 'might' are used.

A second type of evidentiality marks the kind of reasoning which led to the knowledge being transmitted. Spoken language shows a preference for inductive reasoning signaled mainly by the modal 'must' and expressions like 'seem to', 'evidently' and 'be obvious'. Written language marks deductive reasoning more than inductive reasoning through the use of expressions like 'should' and 'presumably'.

A third type of evidentiality has to do with the kind of evidence on which
knowledge is based. Sensory evidence (hear, see, feel) and hearsay (it seems, it's supposed to) markers are found in Chafe's spoken data but never appear in the written.

The fourth type, hedges, concerns the inadequacy of an expression to convey a certain kind of meaning. 'Sort of' and 'kind of are often used for this purpose in spoken language. Writers do not need to use hedges since they normally have enough time to search for the right word.

The view of spoken language as more involved and more interactive than written language, as in Chafe, has been challenged by a number of studies (Tannen 1982b, Rubin 1980, Besnier 1988). Besnier, for example, has questioned whether findings about English and other western languages can be generalized to nonwestern languages. With this question in mind he carried out a large-scale study of oral and written texts produced by speakers of Nukulaelae Tuvaluan, a Polynesian language spoken by a restrictedly literate community in the Central Pacific. The results show that the differences between Nukulaelae registers are not related to whether the text is spoken or written but to the communicative norms of each register. This confirms Besnier's assumption that 'since there may be important differences from one speech community to another in the functions of oral and literate communication, there may also be significant cross-linguistic differences in the form of language produced in the spoken and written modes' (Besnier 1988:708).

Chafe himself recognizes that the generalizations he makes 'apply best to the extremes of spoken and written language' that he has investigated and suggests that they should be verified in more formal styles of speech and more casual styles of writing (Chafe 1982:122).

## 2.3- Rubin's Taxonomy

Rubin (1980) finds it misleading to compare the broad classes written language and oral language since the differences within these classes can be greater than the differences between them. She proposes a taxonomy in which the oral/written distinction is just one of the several dimensions of language experience.

The article focuses on the differences between children's oral language experience (conversation) and the experience of reading a story. The reason for using 'reading a story' as the goal language experience is that stories are the text type to which children learning to read are first and most frequently exposed.

The differences between language experiences can be medium-related and message-related. Medium is considered here in experiential terms, not just as the vehicle of a message. What is contrasted is not, for example, a conversation and a play but the situation of being in a conversation and watching a play. Mediumrelated dimensions are modality, interaction, involvement, spatial commonality, temporal commonality, concreteness of referents, and separability of characters.

Modality is the written/oral distinction. Oral language experiences are characterized by the presence of prosodic features which enhance comprehension of the message. Written communication, in its turn, has the privilege of permanence which permits the reader to go back and fonward in the text.

The dimension of interaction is a question of whether the reader-listener is able to interact with the writer-speaker. In interactive language experiences such as conversations, because of the constant feedback between participants, hypotheses are verified more quickly than in non-interactive experiences (e.g. reading a story). In conversation there is an active attempt to understand in order to respond
apropriately, and each participant constantly adjusts the message to the other participant's needs and expectations.

In reading a story, the lack of extra-linguistic clues delays hypothesis verification. Since there is no immediate need for response, the reader is allowed to postpone understanding of the message. Adjustment of the message is not possible in reading, due to the permanent character of the printed text.

The involvement dimension is expressed by the question 'Is the message directed to the reader-listener?' Involvement implies that the speaker-writer knows who the reader-listener is. it is usually indicated by the use of second-person pronouns.

Spatial commonality is the sharing of a spatial context by participants. It means that the participants can see each other and use the same spatial deictics. Face-to-face interactions and telephone conversations, for example, diverge in relation to this dimension.

Temporal commonality is the sharing of a temporal context which permits participants to use the same temporal deictics.

Concreteness of referents is the dimension which distinguishes, for example, reading a story with pictures from the experience of reading a story without pictures. In the former, objects and events referred to are visually present which is not the case in the latter.

Language experiences can also be contrasted as to separability of characters. The question here is whether or not the distinction between statements and points of view is clearly indicated. In face-to-face conversation each point of view is physically anchored; this is not true of printed stories, which demand an inferential effort from the reader.

The category message, called by Rubin the "meat" of communication, comprises three aspects: topic, structure and function. Although treated separately for analytical purposes, medium and message-related dimensions are not independent from each other. In many cases the choice of medium determines some aspects of the message, and certain media are more appropriate for particular types of message.

Structure is present at different levels of the message. At word level it is a question of vocabulary: words can be more or less abstract and more or less familiar. At sentence level there are syntactic differences among language experiences. Incomplete sentences (e.g. answers to questions) are a frequent feature of interactive communication; perfect tenses ('had been left') are usually replaced by simple tenses ('was left') in conversation. At discourse level there are differences between, for example, the structure of a conversation and that of a story.

The topic aspect distinguishes conversation from written stories in that children usually talk about objects, people and situations which are relevant to their own lives. Participants usually share a background of experiences and knowledge. Children's stories usually deal with a child or animal in an unfamiliar situation.

The function of children's conversation is also different from that of stories. Children learn to speak in order to get their needs filled. At the very beginning the function of speech is just to get parental attention; at a subsequent stage it serves the purpose of getting things done. Among older children the functions of conversation are: to persuade, to get information, to express emotion, to acquire something or just to maintain contact. The functions of printed stories are, for example, to describe, to entertain, to excite or to evoke. In the early stages of teaching reading all these functions can be reduced to the one of introducing certain words or letter-sound correspondences.

The view proposed by Rubin is, then, that 'each language experience involves its own set of cognitive skills, each of which is shared with many other language experiences'. (Rubin ibid:426)

## 2.4- Halliday's View of the Oral/Written Contrast

The first distinction between the spoken and written modes mentioned by Halliday (1989) is that the former is acquired naturally and the latter is usually taught. Speech comes first both in the life of individuals and in the history of societies. In literate societies writing assumes prestigious functions associated with government, religion and trade. Because of this association with authority and power, most literate people tend to give priority to the written language. It is often heard, for instance, that the sounds of a language do not conform to the writing system, when it would be more accurate, says Halliday (1989:xv), to say that the written forms do not conform to the sound system.

The most apparent difference between the two modes of expression is the lack of a counterpart in writing of the prosodic and paralinguistic features (rhythm, intonation, degree of loudness) which abound in speech. These features are tied to the particular moment and context of speaking while writing is not anchored to the here-and-now.

He (ibid:32) recommends, however, that spoken and written language should not be regarded as forming a simple dichotomy. There are different types of writing and different types of speech, many of which show features characteristic of the other medium. There is also the fact that different people write differently on different
occasions. Another point Halliday raises here is that meanings which are expressed by prosodic features in a particular language can be conveyed in another by devices which can be written down (e.g. particles). Punctuation is a device used in the written language to convey part of the meaning expressed by prosodic features.

In some languages, the degree of difference between spoken and written language is higher than in others. For example, we can expect a language with a phonological script to have less divergence between spoken and written discourse than language with a charactery. But there is one principle, Halliday reminds us, 'which ensures that spoken and written language will never be totally alike --. the principle of functional variation or register.' (ibid:44)

A register, in Halliday's terms, is 'a variety of language corresponding to a variety of situation.' (Halliday \& Hasan 1989: 38). He interprets the notion of context of situation by means of a conceptual framework of three components -- the 'field', the 'tenor' and the 'mode' of discourse.

The field refers to the experiential meaning of the text (what is going on at the time the text is being produced). The tenor refers to its interpersonal aspects and the mode refers to the role played by the text in the situation (spoken or written, dialogue or monologue, spontaneous or planned, formal or informal) (ibid:29)

Halliday (1989) also discusses the different kinds of complexity of written and spoken language. Written language displays a larger number of lexical items per clause than spoken language. Thus we can say that written language is dense while spoken language is sparse. Differently from Chafe, Halliday views spoken language as grammatically intricate (it has more clauses) while written language is simple.

Beaman's analysis of coordination and subordination in narrative discourse (1984) supports Halliday's hypothesis of the greater complexity of spoken language.

It also suggests that the discrepancy among previous studies in this respect arises from a confusion between spoken/written distinction and differences in formality and register. Another point raised by Beaman is that many of the 'ands' found in speech, rather than coordinating clauses, play the role of fillers.

Halliday (1989:100) comments on the tradition of regarding spoken language as formless and featureless. He argues that the formlessness of speech is a result of the transcription. If a written text were reproduced with all the planning processes, it would also appear formless. Spoken language does not look good in writing in the same way that most written language does not sound good in speech.

Both spoken and written language have to be thought of in terms of three interrelated aspects: function, medium and form. Each medium has certain properties of organization and is appropriate to certain functions. Speech can be produced very quickly, make rapid adjustments in the light of the changing context and express nuances of interpersonal meaning.

Halliday (ibid:80) compares pairs of wordings which are paraphrases of each other, one typical of writing and the other typical of speech, and finds that written language represents phenomena as processes. It is as if each mode projected its own nature on to reality. A written text is an object and represents reality as objects; an oral text is an action and represents reality as actions. This explains the predominance of nouns in the written mode and the larger number of verbs in the spoken mode.

The distinction between spoken text (process) and written text (product) is being blurred by modern technology. The use of tape-recorders has enabled us to listen to chunks of speech over and over again, and in this way it becomes another kind of product. On the other hand, reading from a computer screen, with only a few
lines visible at a time, has turned the written text into a process.
There are also differences between what tends to be written about and what tends to be spoken about. But these are changing, too, under the influence of technology.

## 2.5- Tannen's Oral/Literate Continuum

Tannen's (1982a:3) main contribution to the orality/literacy studies is her proposal for an alternative view of the oral/literate contrast in terms of a continuum which has at one end focus on interpersonal involvement and at the other end focus on message content.

According to this view, both the spoken and written modes of expression make use of strategies which have been traditionally associated with the other mode. A lecture, for example, is expressed orally but has a content focus, which inclines it towards the literate end of the continuum. Personal letters, on the other hand, use the written modality but are placed near the oral end of the continuum.

In her introduction to the collection of articles on orality/literacy she edited, Tannen (1982a) reports on a series of cross-cultural studies in which she applies the theory of the continuum. In one of these she analyses narratives produced by Greek and American women about a short film (6 minutes) with sound but no dialogue. Tannen observed that the Greek subjects seemed to be concerned with telling a good story, structured around a theme, leaving out unnecessary details and
providing an evaluation of the character's behaviour. Americans, on the other hand, behaved as if they were performing a memory task and tried to reproduce every detail with little concern for a thematic structure. In applying their critical faculties, the Americans looked at the technical quality of the film whereas the Greeks analysed its human message. Tannen's interpretation of these results is that the cultural differences here consist in 'the focus or signalling load being placed on different aspects of the interaction -- on the one hand, message content, and on the other, interpersonal involvement' (Tannen 1982:5).

An earlier study (Tannen \& Oztek 1977) examines formulaic language. The idea of the continuum is also enlightening here. The negative attitude of Americans towards formulaicness is compared to the one of Greek and Turkish speakers who seem to value it very much. The continuum has at one end rigid situational formulas and at the other end a totally new thought expressed in a totally original way. Along the continuum, there is a whole range of relative fixedness and relative novelty. Individuals differ as to the frequency of their use of fixed expressions, and cultures differ as to the value they place on relative fixedness/relative novelty of expression. The difference of attitude towards formulaicness/novelty depends on the way wisdom is viewed. When wisdom is seen as knowledge transmitted through generations, formulaicness is valued. Novelty of expression is valued when wisdom is seen as new information.

In another cross-cultural study involving Greeks and Americans, Tannen (1976) investigates interpretation of indirectness in a sample conversation. The

Greeks showed their tendency to relate language to their own experience while Americans were more apt to look at the dialogue objectively.

In her study of conversational styles in a group of Americans of different ethnic and geographic backgrounds, Tannen (1984) found that the New Yorkers of Jewish background shared a style characterized by placing the signalling load on interpersonal involvement. Non-New Yorkers, on the other hand, placed the signalling load on message content.

In the study above Tannen examines the stories told by the participants in a Thanksgiving dinner conversation. Her main observation concerns the way participants communicate what the point of the story is. She draws on Labov's notion of 'evaluation' -- the means used by the speaker to show his/her attitude toward the story (cf. chapter 4). Tannen sees internal evaluation as a result of a greater load on interpersonal involvement which creates the sense of identification with the teller and or characters.

What became evident from the analysis of the stories told over dinner was the preference of New Yorkers of Jewish background for internal evaluation while the Non-New Yorkers not only did not use internal evaluation, but even felt annoyed by some features of the internal evaluation (e.g. dramatization) provided by the speakers of the other group. On the whole, New Yorkers' strategies are 'more inherently oral' while the Los Angeles natives use strategies 'more influenced by literacy'.

An important contribution of the study just mentioned is the conclusion that higher literacy does not imply preference for literate strategies since the subjects
were all highly literate. Most examples of speakers who use oral strategies in studies mentioned by Tannen have been American blacks, and there has even been a tendency to associate this oral characteristic to black children's difficulties in performing literate tasks. Labov's suggestion that middle-class American white speakers tend to use external evaluation does not hold here.

In another study, Tannen (1982b) compares two narratives, one written and one spoken, by the same person about the same events, and concludes that creative writing has to make use of features associated with orality in order to raise in the reader the sense of identification with the writer or the characters. In other words, both involvement and integration, which Chafe proposed as characteristic of spoken and written language respectively, are likely to be present in literary language.

In a similar vein, Green (1982) and Polanyi (1982) show that features such as inversions (Green), complexity of point of view and multiplicity of meaning, which used to be considered as characteristic of literary language, are also found in everyday conversation and story-telling.

## 2.6- Biber's Multidimensional Analysis of Language Variation

Biber analyses spoken and written texts along six dimensions (continuums) of linguistic variation. The basic assumption of his approach is that 'strong cooccurrence of patterns of linguistic features mark underlying functional dimensions'
(Biber 1988:13). Via frequency counts of particular linguistic features, he finds the patterns of co-occurrence which can be interpreted in functional terms. It is the patterns of co-occurrence that constitute the dimensions of variation proposed by Biber, namely, (1) involved versus informational production, (2) narrative versus non-narrative concerns, (3) explicit versus situation-dependent reference, (4) overt expression of persuasion, (5) abstract versus non-abstract information and (6) online informational elaboration.

Although Biber's study is first intended as an analysis of the contrast between speech and writing, it evolves into a description of the relations among a variety of genres for each mode. He questions the existence of an absolute linguistic difference between the two modes since neither of the dimensions he analyses makes an absolute distinction between all written and spoken genres. He admits, however, that there seem to be some differences in the potential form of speech and writing, due to the different cognitive constraints on speakers and writers. (p.160)

Like Tannen, he uses the terms 'oral' and 'literate' discourse not as synonyms for 'spoken' and 'written' but to refer to language produced in situations typical for speaking and writing respectively. He considers face-to-face conversation and academic expository prose (the genres analysed by Chafe 1980) as the stereotypes for the oral and literate genres.

Biber calls dimensions 1,3 and 5 the oral/literate dimensions since they are pertinent in distinguishing speech and writing although even along them there is considerable overlap. He raises the point that even the notions 'oral' and 'literate'
are multidimensional constructs since there is no single dimension of "orality" versus "literacy" (Biber 1988:162).

With respect to the three dimensions, Biber finds that there is a difference in the range of forms used in speech and writing, with the most informational and formal written genres using a greater frequency of literate features, than any of the spoken genres' (ibid:163).

The different social norms for speech and writing might be, in part, responsible for this difference,
but it seems to be related primarily to the processing constraints -- to the fact that even the most carefully planned and informational spoken genres are produced and comprehended in real-time, setting a cognitive ceiling for the syntactic and lexical complexity typically found in these genres'. (ibid:163)

## 2.7-Summary of the Chapter

From what has been seen in this survey, the relationship between discourse mode and the oral/literate continuum is rather complex. Strategies of interpersonal involvement are used both in spoken and written registers according to the norms of the speech community. The detachment of academic writing cannot be found in creative writing which shows a high degree of interpersonal involvement. Oral presentation in public settings both in oral and literate cultures have much of the integration and detachment characteristic of formal writing.

The advancements of technology, as pointed out by Ong (1982) and Halliday (1989), have modified most of the traditional assumptions about the characteristics of spoken and written language. Listening to a tape from a friend, for example, is as
interactive as reading a letter from him/her. It seems that in the modern world, there are only two intrinsic differences between spoken and written language: (1) the presence of prosodic features in the former versus their absence in the latter and (2) the fragmented nature of speech, which is a consequence of the speed of production, opposed to the integration of writing. These are sufficient, however, to make speech and writing recognizable as such, regardless of the form the text is presented. If we hear a written text read aloud, we still recognize it as written language. In the same way, spoken language in transcript is still spoken language.

Although the special features of each variety clearly derive in the first place from the medium and the function it serves, once it has evolved the variety becomes independent of the medium and can be transposed into the other form. We can all learn to talk written language and even (though this is harder) to compose conversation (Halliday 1989:97).

I find this last quotation very relevant to second language pedagogy since it describes a possibility which is highly undesirable, that is, the overplanning of speech which can make it sound like written language. The following chapter will deal with planning and monitoring as crucial aspects of second language production.

## CHAPTER THREE

## THE $L_{2}$ RESEARCH AND THEORY CONTEXT

As this is an analysis of non-native-speaker discourse, it does not suffice here to examine the data in the light of existing research in the $L_{1}$. Therefore I shall also consider them against the background of current research and theories of second language use. This chapter reviews briefly what has been done in this field recently.

The second language production model underlying most contemporary SL investigation is basically the same as the one commonly accepted for the $L_{i}$. It comprises two executive control processes:
a) manipulation of the language items while the utterance is being formulated in the speaker's mind (planning);
b) manipulation of the language items during the process of articulation (monitoring). (Crookes 1991:115)

Planning is the stage which intermediates the speaker's intention to communicate and its phonological realization. The nature of this mediation, however, as suggested by Crookes, has been the object of some controversy. According to early views based on pausal data, after the expression of a conceptual unit in speech, the system would pause so as to formulate another conceptual unit. More recent tendencies find that it is not necessary to have a complete representation of an utterance before speech begins; the detailed formulation of an
utterance would, then, occur more or less simultaneously with its phonation. (Crookes 1991:115)

I myself prefer to consider planning as a more general phenomenon subsuming (a) the kind of planning which is previous to the actual utterance and (b) monitoring, which is concurrent with the expression of the message. When I mention, then, greater or lesser plannedness, monitoring is also included.

Monitoring is seen by Levelt (1983), quoted by Crookes (1991), as a component of the speech process responsible for the 'detection of speech errors, syntactic flaws, etc., but also [for] standards of rate, loudness, and other prosodic aspects of speech'. (Levelt 1983:50)

Morrison and Low (1983), quoted by Crookes (1991:120), argue that the monitoring of one's own speech can be pre-articulatory, resulting in hesitation phenomena, and post-articulatory with editing results such as corrections and false starts.

There has been recently a proliferation of terms which restricted the meaning of 'monitoring' to the function of 'observing utterance planning', while the 'vetoing of material prepared for speech' and the 'replacing of vetoed items by more appropriate material' were labeled 'filtering' and 'editing' respectively. In the present study, however, the term 'monitoring' will also include the functions referred above as 'filtering' and 'editing'.

## 3.1 - Automaticity versus Control

Current psycholinguistic studies of second language production seem to be revolving around the axis of automatic versus controlled processing. The cognitivist reaction against the excessive mechanicism of the behaviourist view of language acquisition had led to a complete denial of the role of auto- maticity which is gradually being replaced by an understanding of language use as the result of an interplay between rule-governed and automatic behaviour.

For Bialystock (1990:117) 'language proficiency is not a unitary phenomenon but rather emerges from the mastery of two underlying processing components' which she labels 'analysis of linguistic knowledge' and 'control of linguistic knowledge'. These components are interdependent in that neither works without the other.

Analysis of linguistic knowledge is the structuring of mental representations of meaning into 'explicit representations of structures organized at the level of symbols (forms)'.(ibid:118) Control of processing is the ability to direct attention to the relevant pieces of information and 'to integrate those forms in real time'. (ibid:125). Different uses of language require attention to different types of information and the task becomes more difficult when there is competing information that should be ignored. Conversation, reading, language tests impose different demands on the speaker's control of processing.

Although Bialystock (ibid:119) claims not to make a distinction between 'procedural' and 'declarative knowledge', her definitions of 'implicit' and 'explicit
knowledge' seem to correspond to what Paradis (forthcoming), for example, calls 'procedural competence' and 'declarative knowledge'. For him, the former is 'acquired incidentally, stored implicitly, used automatically, highly inflexible and opaque to introspection' whereas the latter is 'acquired consciously, stored explicitly, flexible and its content can be recalled to conscious awareness and verbalized'(p.1-2). Paradis also argues, and this has important implications for the SLA research field, that metalinguistic knowledge (declarative) cannot be automatized so as to become implicitly available.

Not only are implicit and explicit knowledge of language subserved by different cerebral systems, but they have different contents, and hence one cannot become the other, or be 'converted' to the other, or be 'transferred' to the other. (ibid. p.10)

Fluency in speech production is labeled by Schmidt (1992:358) as 'an automatic procedural skill'. He prefers to 'identify fluency with skill rather than knowledge' in order to emphasize 'the performance aspect of doing something in real time rather than the knowledge of how something is to be done'(ibid:359). He suggests that the development of skilled behaviour in general involves 'a shift with practice from controlled to automatic processing' (ibid:360). In the case of EFL learners, then, it could be said that in developing their interlanguage, they proceed along a continuum, departing from the controlled end towards the automatic one.

Executive control processes, namely planning and monitoring; are, however, always present in second language production as cognitive psychology has recognized to be the case in any complex skill.

The more complex unfamiliar behaviour is, the more important monitoring is for it to be carried out successfully, and the more likely that
some form of planning will be needed in the initial phases or occasions of use. (Crookes:119)

Unlike Schmidt, Bialystok (1990:125) proposes a shift from automaticity towards control, for the explanation of the fluency phenomenon:

Since control processing is constrained by real time, effective control processes confer the impression of fluency or automaticity upon performance... fluency is considered to be an emergent property of high levels of control. Skilled selective attention, that is, creates a performance that appears automatic and effortless.

She fails, however, to explain how selective attention produces the impression of automaticity.

Levelt's position (1989:20-22) reported by Schmidt (1992:367) seems to me more plausible (more in accordance with our intuitions of psychological reality). He argues that, as an intentional activity, speaking is under executive control but, for a fluent result, this control is allocated mainly to the conceptual level, while the low level components (selection of grammar, lexical retrieval, articulatory plans) must be largely automatic. In fact, what seems to happen as we convey an oral message in our native language is that the 'low level components', in Levelt's terms, are largely taken for granted. It is presumable, then, that in second language production the more capable the speaker becomes of focusing on the message while handling the formal aspects subconsciously, the more fluent he/she will sound.

The Kassel research group (Dechert, Möhle \& Raupach, 1984; Raupach 1983), although considering the second language production system as basically the same as that of the L1, recognize the existence of quantitative and qualitative differences. Second language competence is reduced and different since it consists of $L_{1}, I L$ and $L_{2}$ rules.

The macro structure of second language production is also basically the same as in the $L_{1}$, but, due to the limitations of the SL learner's production system,
planning and monitoring assume a much more important role. As Crookes puts it so well,
the production of second language speech may be difficult, unfamiliar, accessible to consciousness rather than automatic, and involving risk (at least to 'face'), so planning and monitoring may be more extensively utilized to cope with the greater demands and lesser resources of the $L_{2}$ learner. (Crookes 1991:116)

The difference between monitoring in the $L_{1}$ and in the $L_{2}$, in the standard view of current psycholinguistic theory, however, is a matter of degree, not of quality.

For the purposes of the present study, it does not seem necessary to go into the controversial points of psycholinguistic research (e.g. whether to attribute the development of fluency to the practising of specific instances or to the speeding up of the application of rules). It seems more appropriate here to stick to the consensual observations listed by Schmidt (1992:376) and summarized below:

1) Speaking is a complex task that requires processing at many different levels more or less simultaneously. Thus to the non-fluent learner speech is an effortful activity demanding a lot of planning and monitoring.
2) Most theorists recognize automatic processing as the basis for fluency. However, it is not the whole task that should be considered automatic or nonautomatic. There are components of L2 production that may become automatic (e.g. phonological processing) while others remain controlled (e.g. conceptual processing).
3) $L_{2}$ fluency develops gradually along the controlled/ automatic continuum.

The recognition of the automatic basis of fluency and its gradual development with the consequently greater need for executive control in the interlanguage of $L_{2}$ learners has a great bearance on the comparison between written and oral language. As the by-products of the lack of automaticity (excessive planning and
monitoring) are not visible in the written product, it is predictable that the differences between the spoken and written $L_{2}$ would be bigger than those between spoken and written $L_{i}$. One could also hypothesize that it should be easier for a non-native speaker at an advanced level of proficiency to achieve a near-native effect in writing than in speech.

Fluent writing is not detectable from the written product. The amount of planning effort exerted in the writing process is a covert aspect of the discourse. In unplanned speech, however, the degree of fluency is crucial since its lack cannot be disguised in the product. Most of the oral process, in fact, is shown in the product. The separability of process and product permits writing to rely on declarative knowledge while fluent speech depends on the automaticity of procedural knowledge.

## 3.2 - The Written Language

On the side of writing, which even in the $L_{2}$ context has been traditionally associated with school settings and prescriptiveness, researchers have concentrated on pedagogical matters.

Raimes (1991) provides a history of the teaching of writing to non-native adults in which she shows the different focuses of different periods.

From 1966 to the early 70s, the focus was on form, and grammatical accuracy was the ideal pursued. The research effort of that period was devoted mainly to the comparison of textual features across languages.

By 1976, a strong reaction against the excessive concern with form tried to highlight the role of the writer. Researchers became interested in what writers do as
they write. The process approach was characterized by the recognition of the learner as a 'creator of text' who could only benefit from the granting of more freedom in selecting topics and generating ideas, time and assistance for drafts and revision, and adequate feedback.

From 1986 on, research and teaching of the written language have contemplated both content and the reader. The main result of the focus on content has been the tying of language courses to specific contents (e.g. language for business, language for lawyers.) Focus on the reader has raised awareness of the interactive possibilities of the written language.

Despite the reactions mentioned above, the traditional focus on form is still very much present in the average classroom. As Zamel (1987:708) observes, students have been accustomed to view writing 'as a response to tests and homework assignments' to be evaluated by the teacher. Form has, then, precedence over meaning and awareness of the audience is reduced. This description seems applicable to the kind of writing that is done in most Brazilian EFL classrooms. The students I have sampled for this study will not be an exception.

## 3.3 - The Oral/Written Contrast and Second Language Pedagogy

The last few decades have been marked by a surge of scholarly interest in the differences between spoken and written language. Nearly all of the research effort in this field, however, has dealt with first language data. In fact, in this survey, I have
only found one study (Hansen-Strain 1989) relating the orality/literacy distinction to second language pedagogy.

Hansen-Strain analyses task variability in the interlanguage performance of ESL learners from different first language backgrounds and finds that the pattern of that variability may be influenced by the functions of written and spoken modes in the learner's $L_{1}$. Tasks requiring the production of discourse focused on content caused more difficulty to learners from traditionally oral societies than to learners from more literate traditions. When formal styles of English are elicited, the Polynesian students (oral tradition), for example, show a high level of interpersonal involvement both in speech and writing. They also perform better on relative clauses when tested in the oral mode.

Hansen-Strain (1989) proposes a model of discourse variability which combines the planned versus unplanned continuum with the interpersonal involvement versus message-content continuum. This model can be used to represent discourse types of a specific community -- either the first or target language -- and interlanguage stages of individuals or groups. She classifies some discourse types of English in this way and the result is the following:
a) Essays are at the positive extreme of the planning axis and the content end of the focus axis;
b) Lectures are almost as planned as essays but are a little less focused on content;
c) Research Reports, when written, are less planned than both lectures and essays and nearer the content end of the focus continuum than lectures. The oral
ones are even less planned than the former; as to the content $X$ involvement focus they have the same positon as lectures.
d) Informal letters are quite near the involvement end of the focus continuum and are largely unplanned.

The unmarked discourse type in this model is spoken, unplanned and focused on interpersonal involvement.

The two types of tasks which constitute the data for the present study, namely oral and written personal narratives, would certainly be seen by Hansen-Strain as relatively unplanned and near the involved end of the content $X$ involvement axis. The written stories, however, would be considered a little less involved and more planned than the oral ones.

## CHAPTER FOUR

## A BRIEF REVIEW OF NARRATIVE STUDIES

Although this is not a typical study of narrative, some of the concepts and terminology of narrative studies will be needed in the course of the analysis. The present chapter will, then, be devoted to a characterization of that genre.

Longacre (1983) classifies the discourse genres into the following types:
a) Narrative: reporting of events with the aim of entertaining or informing;
b) Procedural: instructions to help develop a certain procedure;
c) Expository: transmission of knowledge about a subject;
d) Hortatory (behavioural): tries to persuade the addressee to adopt a certain behaviour.

Narrative also distinguishes itself from the other genres in that it necessarily involves chronology, which is also important to procedural discourse but not to the others.

Labov's view of narrative, based on his analysis of stories told in New-York Black English (Labov 1972), is very restrictive and, unlike most recent work on narrative, does not admit a mismatch between the order in which the events are recounted and their chronological order of occurrence. It has been largely criticized on the grounds that little is left of a story if we strip it of all the elements that Labov wouldn't consider narrative.

Toolan (1988:181) contradicts the most delimiting aspect of Labov's description -- the requirement that only independent clauses can carry the story line. He argues that subordinate clauses often carry crucial events and that temporal ones, in particular, can either precede or follow their main clause.

Despite the criticisms of some of the basic assumptions of the Labovian model, the six-part structure that he proposes for narrative has not been refuted yet and is very likely to become a classic not to be ignored by any further study of narrative. For Labov, a fully-formed oral narrative consists of the following:

1- Abstract: What is the story about?
2-Orientation: Who, when, where, what?
3-Complicating Action: Then what happened?
4- Evaluation: So what? What's the point of the story?
5- Result or Resolution: What finally happened?
6-Coda: That's it. The story is finished and we're back to the present situation.

While abstracts and codas are entirely optional, complicating actions constitute the obligatory nucleus of a story.

A typical abstract gives an outline of the story to be told and can also function as a request for the extended turn at talk needed for a story. In the data for the present study, the extended turn is guaranteed by the specificity of the research situation in which the story is told in the interest of one of the listeners (the researcher). In this case, then, rather than bids for the floor, they appear as
statements of agreement to do the task required and often include evaluative elements as in the examples which follow:

Ex.1: (O)T4-1(1) I have a funny.. (2) funny.. (3) thing to told to tell.
Ex.2: (W)R2-1) I had a pretty serious accident back in 1985.
Codas, in their turn, signal the end of the story. In my data, they are usually evaluative and, in many instances, mere repetitions of the abstract.

Ex.3: (O)R12-32-(178) So it was one of the (179) [...] (180) It was not a very frightening experience. (181) It was the worst.. (182) experience I had (183) I had in my life.

Orientation, as summarized above, introduces the participants and specifies the circumstances of the story. The unmarked place for orientation is between the abstract and the complicating action, but parts of it can be delayed in order to create special effects. This happens particularly when the teller, as a participant in the events, only learned about a certain aspect of the situation late in the sequence of occurrence and wants to put the audience in a similar position.

Ex.4: (0)T26-2-(3) I wa::s (4) in the bus (5) and[i] (6) the bus was very crowded.

Ex.5: (W)R2-2) I was in my house at the neighborhood of Estreito here in Fpolis with my cousin Marcos.

Complicating action, the essence of narrative, brings in the element which disrupts the equilibrium which will be finally restored by resolution.

Ex.6: (W)R12-5) Everything was fine until I saw someone passing and stopping behind the entrance door of our apartment. 6) I waited for some noise, the bell or something but nothing happened.

The example which follows is the resolution for the complicating action in example 6.

Ex.7: (N)R12 - 13) Then when we were almost fainting the person revealled his name. 14) It was my stupid stepfather playing a silly trick at us.

A necessary ingredient of stories is what Labov calls reportability. The audience expects a story to be interesting, to have a 'point', a reason to be told, that is to be reportable (tellable). For Caldas-Coulthard (1988) it is reportability which distinguishes a narrative from a mere recounting which she defines as 'any set of propositions encoded with a sequence of dynamic verbs that are temporally and causally related' (ibid:12). All narratives are recountings but not all recountings are narratives.

According to Toolan (1988:169) evaluation undertakes the task of articulating the point of a story and persuading the audience of its tellability'.

Evaluation can appear at any point in a story but it is most frequently found around the climax of the action. It is through evaluation that the teller reveals his or her degree of involvement in the story and shows his/her recognition of the audience's expectation for tellability.

Labov's work on evaluation stems from the assumption that the core of a story is the sequence of actions performed by the participants whereas what they say plays the role of evaluating those actions. Toolan (1988:157) raises the point that
the sharp division between what people do and what they say in Labov's work may have been caused by the kind of data he studied, i.e. 'danger-of-death' stories. Sayings and doings can relate differently in other types of story; certain sayings can be taken as actions with a definite place in the narrative line. If we keep this restriction in mind, Labov's categories are perfectly applicable to other types of narrative data.

Evaluation, for Labov, can be either 'external' or 'internal' to the narrative clause.

External evaluation is divided into three sub-types:
1- Totally external - The teller interrupts the flow of the story and addresses the audience directly to express his/her impression of the events being told. It is often the case that the narrator stops the telling at a crucial point (e.g. before resolution) and expresses evaluation in a separate sentence.

2- Embedded evaluation - Sometimes the narrator quotes him/herself as a participant at the time of the events or an evaluative comment from another participant.

3- Evaluative action - The narrator sometimes achieves an evaluative effect by reporting 'actions that reveal the tension of the actors'. (Labov 1972:366)

Internal evaluation is classified by Labov into four sub-types:
1 - Intensifiers - These include (a) the use of gestures often accompanied by a deictic, (b) imitation of sounds, (c) expressive phonology (e.g. the lengthening of vowels), (d) quantifiers (e.g. all, very, many) and (e) repetition.

2- Comparators - These contribute to evaluation by comparing actions done to the ones not done. The most common type of comparator is negation. They also include futures, modals, questions, imperatives, comparatives and superlatives.

3- Correlatives - These conjoin events in a single independent clause as in progressives, appended participles (e.g. be +V -ing), double appositives (e.g. a knife, a long one, a dagger), double attributives (e.g. a big, burly-looking, dark type of girl). (Examples from Toolan 1988)

3- Explicatives - The events in a narrative are sometimes explained via subordinate clauses which are appended to the main narrative clause or to an evaluative clause. They are introduced by conjunctions such as 'while', 'although', 'since' and 'because'.

Wolfson (1982), working on a corpus of stories larger than Labov's and told in a variety of contexts, found that several tellers tend to act out their stories, conveying a more vivid account of their experiences. She detected in those tellers the following performance features:

1- Direct speech
2- Asides
3- Repetition
4- Expressive sounds
5-Sound effects
6- Motions and gestures
7- Conversational historic present (CHP)

Features $3,4,5$, and 6 had already been treated by Labov under the label 'intensifiers'; 'asides' correspond to 'wholly external evaluation'. Wolfson's main contribution to the field is the category CHP which unarguably makes a recounting more vivid.

In this study, I adopt the general categories 'external evaluation' and 'internal evaluation' but under internal | consider only 'intensifiers' from Labov's model. 'Comparators', 'correlatives' and 'explicatives' are left out of this analysis because, in my opinion, they are not intrinsically evaluative; they can contribute to evaluation sometimes but it is perfectly possible for them to introduce a narrative portion in a neutral manner.

Ex.8: (O)R1-2-(26) [...] (30) the sidewalk was full of water (31) and I (32) I didn't want (33) to pass near a man (34) that was sitting (35) in the shadow, (36) so I preferred to go (37) through the water, [...]

Ex.9: (0)T15-4-(35) [...] (36) I don't know if you saw the problem.. (37) from the GDN.. (38) company.

In the two examples above the negatives ('I didn't want' and 'I don't know') do not really provide evaluation. In example 8 it is part of the sequence of events which led to her falling into the water. In example 9 the subject is just trying to check if the audience have some previous knowledge of the topic of her story.

Ex.10: (O)R12-2-(6) [..] (9) and I wa::s (10) in the:: (11) in the sittingroom in the living-room watching television.

3- (12) It was about eleven o'clock at night.

The progressive form of the verb watch in the example above is not evaluative at all. It is merely part of the orientation of the story.

I also consider 'attitudinal disjuncts' and 'quoted speech' as devices for internal evaluation. Instances of quoted speech which are comments on the point of the story will be regarded as external evaluation.

## CHAPTER FIVE

## DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

## 5.1-Collecting Procedures

As I wanted the subjects to behave as naturally as possible, I tried to create a relaxed atmosphere for the collection of data. They were all recorded in their peergroups, and a small cassete-recorder was passed around so that they did not have to leave their seats as they volunteered to speak. The students were recorded in their classroom during a lesson period and the teachers had a meeting specially set for the purpose of data collection. In neither case did they know the kind of task they were going to perform. They told their stories to their colleagues, their teacher and or the researcher.

To prevent attributing to the difference in mode (speech $X$ writing) differences which may be caused by other aspects of the communication event, I decided to elicit pairs of texts which are similar in all possible respects other than mode. I tried as much as possible to avoid message-related differences (see 3.3). Topic was held constant by asking the subjects to report the same experience in both modes. Structural differences at discourse level were also avoided by using the same genre (narrative) in both modes. Function is also the same across modes since, presumably, oral and written stories both have the aim of catching the addressee's
interest. In the specific case of my data there was the additional purpose of accomplishing a task -- telling an interesting, embarrassing or dangerous experience. Bearing in mind Halliday's categories of field, tenor and mode (Halliday \& Hasan 1989), the data here can be said to differ only in mode which is the object of the present analysis.

With both types of subjects, I first asked them to recount a personal experience of their choice -- any experience that they found worth telling. In order not to allow excessive planning in the written task, only after everybody had finished telling their stories, did I ask them to give a written account of the same experiences they had reported orally. So, as they told the stories orally, they did not know they would be asked to write them. With the same intention of reducing the amount of planning I also recommended that they should not be too concerned with lexicogrammatical accuracy and tidiness.

The two sets of data were transcribed as accurately as possible. In the transcripts of the written stories line indentation, spelling mistakes, abbreviations and symbols have all been preserved. In the oral stories I took into account pauses, pitch changes, lengthening of phonemes, false starts and fillers. Phonetic symbols are only used when found indispensable. Intonation is indicated by means of punctuation marks. The conventions for the transcription of the oral data are presented before the introduction.

## 5.2 - Method of Analysis

The oral stories were divided into what Chafe (1980) calls 'centres of interest' -intermediate units between the idea unit and the whole story (cf. 5.2.1.1). The written stories were divided into sentences, which are assumed to be the written expression of centres of interest.

In the oral stories the centres of interest were segmented into 'composition units' -- stretches of speech between two pauses. Composition units, first detected in a pilot study with Japanese subjects in England (Vieira 1992), can be tone units (Brazil 1985) or incomplete tone units which are sometimes reduced to mere fillers. For the analysis of the written accounts, the centres of interest (sentences) were broken into clauses. For the sake of simplicity and also because it was not found necessary, clauses are not numbered in the transcripts of the written stories.

After the transcription and segmentation, the stories were examined in terms of the dimensions 'integration versus fragmentation' and 'detachment versus involvement' proposed by Chafe (1982), and in terms of the use of communication strategies. Whenever possible, the search for features related to those dimensions was carried out with the help of the concordance computer program Microconcord (Scott and Johns). This program enables the user to count the occurrences of a given word or phrase in a text and identify the contexts in which it appears.

### 5.2.1 - Integration versus Fragmentation

As was mentioned in chapter 2 ( $L_{1}$ studies), Chafe (1982) has found that, due to the difference in speed of delivery, writing tends to be integrated while speech tends to be fragmented. He says that integration is achieved through the use of devices such as nominalization, participles, attributive adjectives, constituents conjoined in series, series of prepositional phrases, complement clauses, defining relative clauses and indirect quotations.

Except for the last three devices, which are subordinate clauses, Chafe does not associate the use of subordination versus coordination in general to the integrated or fragmented quality of language. What he sees as a consequence of the choice between coordination and subordination is the greater or lesser complexity of the discourse. He says, then, that writing is more complex than speech because it normally contains more subordination.

As I find complexity an extremely vague concept, I will not discuss it here. Alternatively, I will consider the types of clause relations as features of either integration or fragmentation. Nominalizations, participles and attributive adjectives are indirectly accounted for in this study by the analysis of the relative length of noun phrases. As a matter of fact, types of clause relations and noun-phrase length (cf. chapter 7) are the only aspects of the dimension integration $X$ fragmentation to be examined across speech and writing in the present study since perturbations of the expression of the centres of interest, which will be treated in chapter 6, can only be encountered in spoken discourse.

The feature 'evidentiality', which has also been found by Chafe to differ between modes, is not considered here since it does not seem to be of much relevance to narrative data. Only the type concerning inadequacy of expression (hedges) deserves attention and that is subsumed under 'internal evaluation'.

### 5.2.1.1 - Idea Units and Centres of Interest

As Chafe's theory is the main basis for this study and since my units for segmentation of data are adapted from his, a brief discussion of his terminology is required here.

Chafe (1980:11) regards thinking as having three components that he calls 'information', 'consciousness' and the 'self'. Information is the large body of knowledge, from several sources, which is available to the individual at any time but of which only a small portion can be activated (i.e. brought into focus) on a given occasion. The self is the component which controls the activation of the information by the consciousness mechanisms.

The spurt-like nature of speech, according to Chafe (ibid:13), is due to the limited amount of information that the human mind can handle at any one time. The processing of information is, then, carried out through successful focuses of consciousness. The linguistic expression of these focuses has been called by Chafe 'idea unit', a term which had already been used by Kroll (1977:89-91).

Chafe says that the idea unit in his work is similar to Crystal's tone unit' (1975:15-22), Halliday's 'information unit' (1967) and Grimes's (1975) 'information block':

A centre of interest (c.i.) -- term taken by Chafe from Buswell (1935: chap.2) -- is an intermediate cognitive unit between a single focus of consciousness and the whole memory of an experience. In the quotation that follows, Chafe expresses his views on the nature of what he calls a centre of interest:

It may well be that the amount of information which will serve the organism best is often of an amount that overflows the very limited capacity of one focus. In such a case, it is necessary to allow several focuses to scan such information, in order that all of it can be comprehended and acted on. (Chafe 1980:26)

The linguistic expression of a centre of interest is characterized by both syntactic and intonational sentence closure. The latter, for Chafe, equals a falling tone. A centre of interest is usually related to a coherent mental image or to a series of events leading to a goal.

The following sequence,from the pear film narratives, is an example of a typical centre of interest divided into idea units:

Ex.1: (a)..So he takes the whole basket,
(b)..and puts it near his bike,
(c)..lifts up the bike,
(d)..puts the basket on..the front part of
his bicycle,
(e).[.5] and rides off. (Chafe 1980:13)

The delimitation of centres of interest is somewhat problematic even among native speakers as has been detected by Chafe. He has found examples of stories which only present a sentence closure at the very end. His interpretation of this phenomenon in his data is that it is due to a particular way of approaching the task -- the only unit the subject seems to be concerned with is the whole episode he or she was asked to report and sees no reason to stop before the job is complete.

He has also found cases of intonational closures after a single idea unit, but these are relatively rare among adult speakers except in the case of pre-telling and post-telling sequences.

Syntactic closure and intonational closure do not always co-occur. In Chafe's data there are several cases of discrepancy between syntactic and intonational criteria for sentencehood. Sometimes a syntactic sentence is complete but the speaker, instead of marking its end with a falling tone, uses a fall-rise as a clear indication that the scanning of that centre of interest is still in progress.

### 5.2.1.2 - The Composition Unit

The applicability of Chafe's analytical tools to non-native-speaker discourse was tested in a pilot study carried out with a group of Japanese learners in the University of Birmingham (Vieira 1992). I found that there would not be any special difficulty in using the notion of 'centre of interest' with that kind of data since the problems of delimitation were similar to those encountered by Chafe in his native-speaker data. It was, then, possible to apply Chafe's criteria for the identification of centres of interest -- syntactic and intonational closure combined with semantic unity -- both in the pilot and in the present study. As I tried to segment the transcripts of the oral stories, however, I came to realize that the idea unit, as conceived by Chafe, is of a different nature from the kind of unit that emerges from the analysis of EFL learners' oral narratives. In non-native-speaker oral discourse each 'spurt' of language does not correspond to an idea unit but to a unit imposed by the effort of encoding a message in the foreign language. I have labeled this unit, at Dave Willis' suggestion (personal communication), a 'composition unit' (c.u.).

In Chafe's native-speaker data an idea unit expresses a focus of consciousness or, as Halliday puts it, a 'block of informatlon' (Halliday \& Hasan 1989:22). In the case of the non-native speakers in both the pilot study referred to above and the present one, however, 'there seems to be a mismatch between the cognitive focus and its verbal expression which comes out in smaller doses' (Vieira 1992:8). I daresay that the marked way in which foreign language learners express themselves orally is due to the need to divide their attention between the actual mental image of the experience to be reported and its verbalization in the target language. A focus of consciousness, then, would be split, in non-native speech, into composition units, which, differently from idea units, do not always correspond to tone units; they can sometimes consist of incomplete tone units, i.e. interrupted before the tonic segment is completed as mentioned by Hewings (1990).

For the reasons just stated, I adopt in this study, as I did in the pilot, the term 'composition unit' for the basic unit of segmentation of the data. The boundaries between composition units, are marked either by a pause or the completion of an intonation contour. The following is an example of a centre of interest segmented into composition units. It is the fourth centre of interest in subject T6's story and it contains seven composition units (37-43).

Ex.1: (0)T6 - 4- (37) So.. (38) I.. (39) asked to.. (40) enter, (41) I sat down, (42) and I started to talk.. (43) with my friend.

## CHAPTER SIX

## FEATURES OF FRAGMENTATION RESTRICTED TO SPEECH

## 6.1 - Perturbations of the Expression of Centres of Interest

In the pear film narratives, Chafe detected the following types of perturbation in the process of expressing centres of interest:
(a) Abandonment of a plan for the expression of a centre of interest
(b) Postponement of the expression of a centre of interest
(c) Pursuit of a side interest, with subsequent return to the main track
(d) Insertion of a centre of interest on a different level of interest
(e) Supplementation of a centre of interest after preliminary closure has been reached. (Chafe 1980:33)

In the analysis of perturbations of the expression of centres of interest in the stories produced by the EFL learners in this study, categories (c) and (d) were reduced to one which I call 'insertion of a side interest' regardless of its being a centre of interest on its own or a simple composition unit.

Ex.1: (O)R10-13-(52) And she said (53)'Oh it's so BEAUtiful under water!

14a- (54) I thought (55) I was in the
15- (56) How do you say "infinito"? (T.: Infinity) (57) Yes.
14b-(58) She said (58) 'I thought (59) I was in the (60) infinitive'.
Ex.2: (O)T12 - 4a- (30) So a.. (31) a man.. (32) a boy. (33) Maybe.. (34) eighteen years old..

5- (35) And this history happened.. (36) erm.. (37) about six or seven years ago.

4b- (38) And this this boy.. (39) eh.. (40) begin to:... (41) talk with me.
Chafe would probably have classified example 1 as type ' $c$ ' (pursuit of a side interest) and example 2 as type ' $d$ ' but I see them as basically the same kind of phenomenon.

### 6.1.1 - Abandonment

Abandonments are often referred to as 'false starts'. The speaker begins to express a centre of interest in a certain way, then changes her/his mind and chooses a different way of expression. The following examples have been produced by the target group.

Ex.1: (0)T13-14b-(78) He was hunting, (79) and er.. (80) he had er:: (81) a gun with.. (82) There is er.. (83) a special gun for.. (84) for birds. (85) There are a lot of spheres. (86) Spheres of metal inside the cart er.. (87) It's hard to say.

The subject above was going to start describing his father's gun in a certain way (80) but abandons it for a more analytic description (82-86) which, in its turn, is abandoned without any further attempt, due to a difficulty which he verbalizes in composition unit 87.

Ex.2: (O)T1-2a-(32) [...] (42) he asked me.. [...] 2b- (49) [...] (54) to call.. (55) in this hotel, (56) er.. (57) there was a a Miss.. (58) Gonzalez (59) who was.. (60) her friend.

Ex.3: (0)T4-18- (127) He.. (128) You remember? (129) In the "bolsa"..
(130) was open (131) and every paper "voou". [...]

In examples 2 and 3 , the last part of the abandoned utterance becomes the beginning of the new utterance as if the subject had forgotten his/her original intention. In example 2, 'a Miss Gonzalez' (c.u. 57-58) is part of both the abandoned and the new utterance; in example 3, 'the "bolsa"', which would belong to an adverbial in the first intended utterance, becomes the subject of the new sequence.

Ex.4: (0)T6-3- (18) [...] (32) The shoes are on... (33) He took off the shoes, (34) and... (35) I could see only the socks. (36) Over the chair.
The subject above first tries to describe the teacher's being barefoot by saying where the shoes were, then abandons this syntactic arrangement for the expression of the act of taking them off.

Ex.5: (0)T8-4-(27) [...] (34) He was... (35) I don't know where.. (36) he was.

The abandonment above is motivated by a content correction.
Ex.6: (0)R1-3-(44) [...] (49) I'm hard to falling.. (50) to falling and..
4-(51) OK.
The subject in the last example not only abandons a way of expression but gives up whatever she was going to express and signals the end of the telling with the ' OK ' which constitutes the coda.

Abandonments have been found in the reference group at the same rate as in the target group. Both groups produced 0.1 abandonment for each c.i.; in other words, there is one abandonment in every 10 c.i. The examples which follow were taken from the reference group data.

Ex.7: (0)R2-12-(46) And in.. (47) in a space I would say er.. (48) not one kilometer.. (49) everything happened, (50) (----) from my house up to::

13- (51) I don't know if everybody knows Estreito, (52) more or less here
(53) no? (54) no? (55)OK. (56) Only you. (57)Yes. (58) Yeah.

14- (59) And in the meantime (60) you know? (61) It was.. (62) we left..
(63) our house around.. (64) eleven. (65) I think everything might happen..
(66) eleven-five something. (67) In five minutes. (68) Everything happened.

What started as a postponement of centre of interest 12 turned out to be an abandonment due to the impossibility of giving spatial orientation since most of the audience did not know the place where the acccident had happened. The subject, then, managed to convey the idea of how early in the ride the accident happened, via temporal orientation.

Ex.8: (0)R2-18-(93) [...] (101) although he was wearing a helmet (102) but the helmet (103) I don't know what might have happened. [...]

The narrator seems to forget his subordinating intention as he started c.u. 101, tries a coordination with 'but', only to give it up for an independent clause in the next composition unit.

Ex.9: (0)R3-2-(13) and er (14) and then we were at a.. (15) we were going slowly, (16) but er.. (17) we didn't observe that there wa::s (18) a truck coming.

The subject abandons the spatial orientation started in c.u. 14 for a reference to the speed of their ride (c.u. 15).

Ex.10: (0)R6 - 1a- (1) Well I I can.. (2) It's not really (3) something that (4) I can remember.

The abandonment above is motivated by the narrator's impulse to stress the fact that, although she had participated in the events she is about to tell, her story is in fact a retelling.

Ex.11: (0)R6 - 8- (36) [..] (40) there was a problem and the ship
couldn't.. (41) er my father was so anxious to see us (42) that he:: (43) he took a boat (44) to meet us.

Due to what seems to be a problem of lexical retrieval, the teller leaves the sentence in c.u. 40 unfinished and starts anew describing her father's initiative in meeting his family on the ship.

Ex.12: (O)R11-15-(55) And I (56) it was almost (57) It had been almost one hour (58) I was walking, (59) trying to find out the (60) the bus. [...] Here we have two successive abandonments. First the subject abandons ' 1 ' for 'it', then she changes her mind as to the verb tense.

Ex.13: (0)R12-30-(166) [..] (168) And I (169) when I heard (170) I was (171) It was also one of the (172) the worst (173) things l.. (174) It was my stepfather, (175) playing a trick at us.[laughing]

After three false starts, the subject finally clarifies the situation.
Ex.14: (0)R14-3-(7) [...] (11) | think she could only.. (12) I don't remember.

In example 14 Subject R14 starts what would be an account of her daughter's arithmetic abilities at the time of the story events, only to find out that she is unable to do it.

### 6.1.2 - Postponement

Postponement is a temporary abandonment. The speaker interrupts what she/he had begun to say, verbalizes something else, then returns to the original track. Of all types of perturbation this was the least common among the non-native speakers in the present study. There were only two occurrences in the target group ( $0.007 \mathrm{p} / \mathrm{c} . \mathrm{i}$.) and three in the reference group ( $0.01 \mathrm{p} / \mathrm{c} . \mathrm{i}$.). Such infrequent occurrence in both groups suggests that this kind of perturbation is more likely to be found among native speakers for it denotes a level of self-confidence which permits the speaker to start an utterance without any previous planning at all.

Ex.1: (O)T1-2a- (32) But the funny is.. (33) because I | was... (34) | | | | could.. (35) I could have.. (36) talk [---] (37) But the funny was the day, (38) that a Mexican, [...]

After a short incomprehensible sequence (32-35), he resumes what he had started in c.u. 31.

Ex.2: (O)T8-3-(8) And me and my friend, (9) At the beach, (10) there was a man, (11) that.. (12) he had a.. (13) cre creation. (14) of chickens. [...]

4- (27) So me and my friends, (28) [laugh] decided to.. (29) pick up stones, [laugh] (31) and throw in the chickens. [laugh]

Ex.3: (O)R3-4-(22) [..] (26) we were we were (27) it was a surprise, (28) and we were scared for a moment, [...]

One cannot be sure here if the expression has been postponed or abandoned (if what she intended in c.u. 26 were 'we were surprised').

Ex.4: (O)R14-7-(27) So she went (28) She got a little piece of paper, (29) she went to the phone, (30) and started dialing.

What happens in example 4 is a rearrangement of the order of reporting the events so that they match their chronological sequence.

Ex.5: (O)R5-16-(94) [...] (97) and I didn't know what.. (98) He was my only hope. (99) I didn't know what am I going to do now.

### 6.1.3 - Insertion of a Side Interest

Sometimes the normal development of a centre of interest is interrupted by the pursuit of a side interest whose expression can vary from a single c.u. to a whole c.i.. Most of the examples of insertion detected in the data are pieces of 'orientation' in Labov's terms. There is reference to time (example 3), place (example 4), weather (example 7) and character (example 9).

In the present study, two types of insertion have been detected: a) the ones focused on content and b) the ones focused on form (metalinguistic). On the whole, insertions of side interests are slightly more frequent in the reference group (0.07 $\mathrm{p} / \mathrm{c} . \mathrm{i}$.$) than in the target group ( 0.05 \mathrm{p} / \mathrm{c} . \mathrm{i}$. ). It is worth noting, however, that whereas the two types of insertion are evenly distributed in the target-group data (50\% of each), in the reference-group data the metalinguistic type represents only $15 \%$ of the total occurrence of insertions. This can be seen as a consequence of the target group's lack of confidence in their linguistic knowledge -- their constant awareness
of the formal aspects of their production leads them to keep checking the acceptability of what they are saying.

Ex.1: (0)T1-2a-[...] (42) he asked me.. (43) about.. (44) about talk to a..
(45) er.. (46) a phone girl.

3- (47) Do you know? (48) Phone girl.
2b- (49) To.:.. (50) to call.. (51) a hotel, [...]
The narrator steps out of the story world into the world of interaction to make sure that he is using an acceptable term.

Ex.2: (0)T4 - 6- (33) [...] (37) me and Cláudia, (38) er.. (39) say say [----]
(40) 'Into my life'. (41) "Juntas". (42) Together. (43) You know?

7- (44) And you know er.. (45)"verde e vermelho"? (46) Green and red?
(47) That every time, (48) that you speak together, (49) the same, (50) you you touch in red, (51)No. (52) In green and red. (53) And [----l (54) to give "sorte". [laugh] (Luck.)

The whole c.i. (7) is a parenthetical explanation of a popular game among teenagers in Brazil. The subject left the story world for the world of interaction not due to a lexical difficulty but in order to bridge a predicted experiential gap between herself and her audience.

Ex.3: (0)T12-4a- (30) So a.. (31) a man.. (32) a boy. (33) Maybe.. (34) eighteen years old..

5- (35) And this story happened.. (36) erm.. (37)about six or seven years ago.

4b- (38) And this this boy.. (39) eh.. (40) begin to:... (41) talk with me.
C.i. 5 interrupts the flow of c.i. 4 providing a bit of orientation which is important in the development of the story.

Ex.4: (O)T13-8a- (35) Oh my God! (36) It was terrible because.. [...] (39) and I was ALmost going to Pitimbu.

9-(40) Pitimbu is the beach that l.. (41) took my vacation.
8b- (42) And[i].. (43) it was terrible. [...]
C.i. 9 is a parenthetical explanation that the subject thought to be necessary before he proceeded with his evaluation of what it had been like to have an accident in the beginning of his holidays.

Ex.5: (O)T25-1a- (1) [...] (7) | used to go to.. (8) my.. (9) grandmother.. (10) house, (11) and stay stay there.. (12) er..

2- (13) How can I say (14) "o dia todo"? [...] (R.: All day.)
1b- (15) All day.
Ex.6) (0)T25 -6a- (59) [...] (62) Please grandmother. (63) Let me..
7- (64) How can I say (65) "enterrá-lo"? [...]
6b- (66) 'Let me bury it.' [laugh]
In the last two examples, the subject interrupts the flow of speech in order to ask for help on a lexical problem.

Ex.7: (0)R5-14a-(71) [...] (81) I have to hurry (82) because I have to be home (83) at four o'clock before the sun sets.

15- (84) And it was December (85) and the sun sets (86) very early (87) during the winter.

14b- (88) And he said that he had to be very early at home (89) because eh (90) in his religion [...]
C.i. 15 is a bit of orientation inserted here to emphasize how little time the man had to spare.

Ex.8: (O)R8-1-(1) I'm going to tell you (2) about an embarrassing.. (3) situation.

2- (4) Let's see if I can.. (5) remember.
3-(6) I.(7) was coming back (8) from the beach,[...]
Between the pre-telling sequence and the story itself, the subject inserts a filler in the form of a mention of her process of recall (c.i. 2).

Ex.9: (O)R12-7a- (33) [...] (40) and I told my mother (41) 'There is someone.'

8-(42) I was fifteen years old.
7b- (43) And I told her (44) 'There is someone behind the door'.
The subject's young age when he took part in the event being told adds up to the dramaticity of the episode. As a teller he seems to have suddenly noticed that that bit of orientation was missing and decides not to postpone it any more.

The subject interrupts the introduction of a character, to warn one of her colleagues in the audience, that the story is not new to her. After a brief exchange, she goes back to where she was and proceeds with the telling.

Ex.11: (O)R14-11a- (37) 'Mom! I can't call..' \{crying voice\}
12-(38) What's the name. (39) Débora I think.
11b- (40) 'I can't call Debora. (41) I can't call Debora'. \{crying voice\}

The quotation is interrupted by a thought-aloud process of recall and then resumed in its entirety, including paralinguistic features.

Ex.12: (O)R15 - 7a- (36) So I took the the the next (P.: What was people's reaction?)

8- (37) I don't know. (38) I didn't pay attention to anybody. (39) I just started laughing at me. (40) Right?

7b- (41) A::nd (42) and I took the other bus, (43) the next bus, (44) right?
Ex.13: (O)R6-1a- (1) Well I I can.. (2) It's not really (3) something that
(4) I can remember.. (R.: Your name?)

2- (5) OK. (6) L. (7) I was.. (8) I was born in Portugal.
1b- (9) And then er (10) this is a story (11) l've been told many times (12) and then (13) it's something that I think (14) it's really.. (15) for me it is funny. The two examples above $(12,13)$ are different cases of insertion. In example 12 the subject is taken out from a c.i. by a peer's question but, as soon as he answers it, he returns to the original path. In example 13 the insertion of c.i. 2 was triggered by my interruption asking her name. The subject had started explaining that her story is a retelling when she had to stop to tell me her name to which she added another bit of personal information -- her place of birth. Then she continued what she was saying about her story.

### 6.1.4-Supplementation

Supplementation, by far the most frequent of the perturbations of centres of interest both in the target and in the reference group, occurs when, after indicating with sentence-final intonation the achievement of the expression of a c.i., the speaker rescans the same c.i. for additional pieces of information. The result of this addition of supplementary information, after a preliminary closure has been reached, is called by Chafe 'the extended sentence'.

In the present data, the supplementary bits vary from a single constituent (e.g. c.u. 31 and 36 - ex. 1) to a whole sequence of clauses. Clauses or sequences of clauses are usually introduced by 'and' (e.g. c.u. 23 in example 3).

Ex.1: (O)T6-3-(18) And I. (19) entered the in the.. (20) in the class, (21) the door was open, (22) there was a man.. (23) er.. (24) sitting.. (25) reading a.. (26) a.. newspaper. (27) With er.. (28) with her feet er.. (29) over another.. (30) another chair. (31) With no shoes. (32) The shoes are on... (33) He took off the shoes, (34) and... (35) I could see only the socks. (36) Over the chair.

In the above example, the subject gives a sentence-final intonation to c.u. 26 which makes one think that the c.i. has finished. Then he opts for a more detailed description of the man reading the newspaper, which he achieves via a sequence of supplementations.

Examples 2 and 3 below sound as if the subjects were expressing the bits of memory as they were retrieved with no planning at all. Intonational closure comes
with each single bit. in example 3 , the last supplementation (c.u. 28, 29) is a repetition of the clause which introduces the c.i. (c.u. 12, 13, 14). The subsequent examples are self-explanatory since they behave very similarly to one another.

Ex.2: (0)T10-6-(34) She said (35) that she would call me after. (36) And she called me.. (37) on the night's Friday. (38) Eh.. (39) October ninth. (40) And she.. (41) and I confirmed.

Ex.3: (O)T12-3- (12) And.. (13) I was looking.. (14) all all fishes. (15) Beautiful fishes. (16) And.. (17) there.. (18) there was a.. (19) eh:: a.. (20) beautiful fish. (21) Only one. (22) Very beautiful. (23) A::nd.. (24) that is.. (25) eh (26) very expensive. (27) This fish. (28) And I was.. (29) only looking.

Ex.4: (0)T13-2- (6) Er.. (7) one of them.. (8) I was.. (9) I was er.. (10) in a on the street. (11) It's a bike. (12) And it was raining a lot.

Ex.5: (O)T14-8-(33) After I discovered, (34) I started to laugh. (35) A lot. (36) I was alone in the seat. (37) I started to laugh.

Ex.6: (O)T19-3- (17) And the.. (18) I.. (19) was very surPRISed. (20) With the (21) their methods, (22) right? (23) About the good news. (24) Eh.. (25) where eh.. they spoke about er (27) the Lord God (28) when.. (29) gave er (30) his son Jesus Christ (31) to save o our sins.

Ex.7: (0)T20-1- (1) One night (2) eh (3) my mother and I (4) were watching television. (5) A::nd (6) it was a (7) horror movie. (8) With ghosts.. (9) I don't know.

Ex.8: (O)R2-16-(72) And I was I was I was not wearing any protection. (73) Any helmet. (74) Because I was the passenger. (75) So didn't have any. (76) And he had his own.

Ex.9: (0)R4 - 4- (42) And I said (43) 'Oh I have to pee! (44) And she wouldn't get out of that shirt, (45) and we were together (46) you know. (47) And I pee::ed my pants.

Ex.10: (O)R5 - 4- (14) A::nd (15) so l:: had some papers, (16) (----) my passport, (17) all the documents, (18) but I was very scared (19) because I didn't know (20) what would happen (21) when I got there. (22) At the immigration. (23) Because I I wouldn't be able to communicate (24) with the people there (25) because I couldn't speak any English.

Ex.11: (O)R5-28- (158) Afterwards I laughed. (159) A lot. (160) About it.
Ex.12: (O)R6 - 3- (16) Er my father my father came er (17) before us.(18) Before my mother and my sister and I.

Ex.13: (O)R10-1- (1) We had a competition. (2) In my school. (3) Between classes. (4) And er (5) we were going to swim.

Ex.14: (0)R11-15-(55) [...] (57) It had been almost one hour (58) I was walking, (59) trying to find out the (60) the bus. (61) (--- laugh) (62) the twenty-two. (laugh) (63) Going up and down, (64) up and down. (65) And I couldn't find it.

Ex.15: (O)R11-20-(83) But there was a foreigner. (84) I think he was from.. (85) fro::m from Mexico. (86) I don't know.


#### Abstract

Ex.16: (O)R12 - 4- (13) A::nd (14) | heard a noise. (15) Someone knocking at the door.


### 6.1.5 - Relative Occurrence of the Perturbations

Although perturbations of the expression of centres of interest undoubtedly contribute to the fragmented nature of the spoken language, their frequency of occurrence does not seem to be related to the degree of linguistic proficiency. The comparison between the two sets of oral data has shown that the four types of perturbations studied here occur at an almost identical frequency rate across the target and the reference groups. Supplementation, which stands out as the most frequent in both groups, is a little more frequent in the reference group ( 0.5 p/c.i.) than in the target group ( 0.4 p/c.i.). Postponement is very rare in both groups but occurs more frequently in the reference group -- 0.01 p/c.i. against 0.007 of the target group. Insertions are also more common in the reference group -- 0.07 p/c.i. against 0.05 in the target group. (Fig.1)

What mainly distinguishes the performance of the target group from that of the reference group in terms of perturbations is the preferred type of insertion. Half of the insertions of the target group are focused on form while in the reference group only 15\% of the insertions belong to this type. (Fig.2)

Figure 1
Perturbations of the centres of interest


Figure 2
Insertion: Content Focus X Form Focus

$\square$ Content Focus $\triangle ग$ Form Focus

## 6.2 - Filled and Unfilled Pauses

The greater or lesser frequency of pauses, either filled or unfilled, causes speech to be more or less fragmented. In this study, I have counted the occurrences of 'er', 'erm' and 'eh' in the oral stories of both groups, looking for a relation between frequency of fillers and oral proficiency. Silent pauses have been counted indirectly via the counting of composition units. As unfilled pauses always occur at the boundaries between composition units, more of the former means more of the latter.
'Er', 'erm' and 'eh' appear everywhere in the oral stories of both groups avoiding silence and allowing the speaker more time for planning either in terms of (a) global organization and recall or (b) specific lexical and grammatical choices. The first case is typically represented by those fillers which occur in the beginning of a c.i., sometimes preceded by a connective (and, so, but), as in the examples below.

Ex.1: (O)T25-1a- (1) Er.. (2) I remember once.. [...]
Ex.2: (0)R6 - 4-(19) And er:: (20) it happened that[..]
In the second case, the filler appears in the middle of a clause, sometimes within a constituent, as in the examples which follow.

Ex.3: (O)R5 - 23- (134) [...] (137) I had a letter from the British eh:: (138) consulate in Rio, [...]

Ex.4) (O)R8-7-(58) [...] (67) and he asked me (68) to give him er.. (69) a bracelet (70) that I $\mathrm{h}(71)$ I had.

Ex.5) (O)T25-4-(34) [...] (37) I put the chick between er:: (38) wall (39) and er.. (40) something as er (41) a tank? (42) OK?

In examples 3, 4 and 5 above the speakers gain time for a lexical retrieval. The items which are causing trouble are 'consulate', 'bracelet', and in the case of the target subject, the words 'wall' and 'tank'. The subject is still not sure if the word 'tank' is the adequate choice and she marks her uncertainty by a pitch rise.

The first point which stands out from the inventory of filled pauses is that in the target group (Fig.3a), 'eh', a phonological transfer from Brazilian Portuguese, is more frequent (53\%) than 'er' and 'erm', the normal English fillers, which constitute 93\% of the fillers produced by the reference group (Fig.3b). On the whole, the target group uses more fillers than the reference group. The mean occurrence of fillers per clause is 0.22 in the target group and 0.15 in the reference group (Fig.4).

Unfilled pauses are also more frequent in the target group as can be seen from the average number of composition units per clause (Fig.5) -- 2.5 in the target group and 1.6 in the reference group.

Syllable lengthening, which is commonly used by native speakers as a strategy for holding the floor while planning the next bit of utterance, is also present in the oral stories of both groups. They usually occur on monosyllabic function words -mainly 'and' -- and what distinguishes the performance of target and reference subjects in this respect is that the latter linger on the existing vowel (examples 6,7, 8,9) while some of the former not only stretch that vowel but also add another, which can also be lengthened, after the final consonant, creating an extra syllable (examples 10, 11, 12).

## Figure 3b: Eh/er(m) Reference Group



## Figure 3a: $\mathrm{Eh} / \mathrm{er}(\mathrm{m})$


Figure 4: Fillers (Target $X$ Reference)


Ex.6: (O)R3-2-(6) [...] (17) we didn't observe that there wa::s (18) a a truck coming.

3- (19) A::nd we thought our.. (20) we had the way, (21) but we didn't.
Ex.7: (O)R5-1- (1) [...] (3) And I::'m.. (4) the experience I'm going to tell i::s (5) when I went to England [...]

Ex.8: (0)R6 - 14- (76) And (77) so the the thing wa::s (78) er embarrassing.

Ex. 9: (O)R12-27-(121) A::nd er [...] (127) because if they listen (128) they listen to us (129) calling the police, (130) they're not going to:: (131) they're goin'away.

Ex.10: (0)T16-6-(28) And the man looked to him (29) and[i] said (30) 'what are happening?' (31) And[i].. (32) he didn't answer. (33) A::nd[i].. (34) my fiance \{gesture\} (T.: Fainted?) (35) Fainted.

Ex. 11: (0)T23-2a-(11) [..] (15) and[i] (16) I was.. (17) in front of my.. (18) my friends. (---) (19) And I (20) I'm[i]

3-(21) how can I say (22) "enrolada"?
Ex.12: (0)T2-9-(---) (56) Yes. (57) And[i].. (58) I leave.. (59) I left the laboratory crying a lot.

## 6.3-Conclusion of this Chapter

In this chapter I first analysed the occurrence of perturbations of the expression of centres of interest in order to see whether and how it is affected by the difference in degree of proficiency in the foreign language. The findings are that the two groups behave very similarly with the exception of insertions, which in most cases of the reference group are focused on content while in the target group form focus is as frequent as content focus.

As for fillers (er, erm, eh) the groups have similar results except for the tendency of the target subject to use a phonological transfer from their native language. Another device for filling pauses which also results from the application of L1 phonological rules in the stories of the target group is the adding of an extra syllable to words which end in a consonant (and[i], I'm[i]).

## CHAPTER SEVEN

# FEATURES OF INTEGRATION X FRAGMENTATION WHICH AFFECT BOTH ORAL AND WRITTEN DISCOURSE 

The ways in which clauses interrelate in the text and noun-phrase length can be responsible for the more or less integrated quality of both speech and writing. This chapter reports the analysis of the data in terms of the occurrence of independent clauses, coordination and subordination and also compares the length of nounphrases across groups and across the spoken and written stories.

## 7.1 - Independent Clauses

Independent clauses, which do not enter into any explicit relation with other clauses, were counted separately and their frequency was considered as a ratio of the total number of clauses. They are rather infrequent as can be seen in Table 1 below. They are slightly more common in the written than in the oral versions of the target group whereas the reference group group show a reverse tendency. The difference, though, does not seem significant.

Table 1: Independent Clauses
Target Group Reference Group

|  | Oral | Written | Oral | Written |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Clauses | 720 | 544 | 821 | 485 |
| Indep. | $41(5.6 \%)$ | $36(6.6 \%)$ | $44(5.3 \%)$ | $21(4.3 \%)$ |

I think that the greater or lesser occurrence of independent clauses in the present data is a matter of individual style rather than a result of the difference in mode.

Most independent clauses detected are either evaluative comments, abstracts, codas or bits of orientation.

In T1's written story, the independent clauses which are twice as frequent as in his oral version seem to have the function of marking stages in the telling.

The first one introduces the main orientation of the story as can be seen in the example:

Ex.1: $(\mathbf{W}) \mathbf{T} 1-1)$ This year I went to United States as a tourist.
The second one introduces the episode and provides evaluation at the same time:

Ex.2: (W)T1-4- This passage is interesting.
The third and last one closes the story by stating its 'point' and accomplishment of the task.

Ex.3: (W)T1-88-I got very embarrassed.

The first sentence in each of the examples just following play the role of an abstract to the story:

Ex.4: (W)T16-1) Yesterday, I and my fiancé went to visit our friend.
Ex.5: (W)T17-1) Two years ago, I was held up.
Ex.6: (W)R2: $\mathbf{W}-1$ ) I had a pretty serious accident back in 1985.
Ex.7: (O)R9-1- (1) This story's about (2) this story's about (3) erm (4)
Fernando's cousin.
Several subjects both in the target and in the reference group produced examples of the use of independent clauses for evaluation as below:

Ex.8: (0)T4-19-(136) [...] (137) I never smiled so much in my life, (138) in this day.

Ex.9: (0)T4-20-(139) Was very very funny.
Ex.10: (0)T8-9-(66) It was very funny.
Ex.11: (O)T9-13-(65) I stayed very embarrassed.
Ex.12: (0)T9-13-(65) [...] (66) That was terrible.
Ex.13: (W)T7-12) I love my big family!
Ex.14: (O)R5 - 9- (42) [...] (43) It was very weird.
Ex.15: (0)R3-9- (58) It was awful. (59) Very awful.
Ex.16: (W)R3-20) Mom, I felt so sorry for Paul.
Ex.17: (W)R4-9) Isn't it terrible?
Ex.18: (W)R6-14) This fell like a bomb.
The next set of examples illustrate the orientational role of independent clauses. Subject R2 provides orientation about the setting and characters of his
story, both in the oral and the written versions, via independent clauses (Examples 19,20).

Ex.19: (O)R2-8-(23) I live at Estreito. (24) Right. (25) In the continent.
Ex.20: (W)R2-2) I was in my house at the neighborhood of Estreito here in Fpolis with my cousin Marcos.

Subject R5 produced only one independent clause in her written version as temporal orientation:

Ex.21: (W)R5-13) (it was a Friday, of course)
Subject T2, in her oral story, resorts to independent clauses to summarize situations she had been trying to explain in the two examples which follow:

Ex.22: (O)T2-3-(19) And l've never been to a lab laboratory. (20) You know. (21) That have computers.. (22) and.. (23) I didn't know how to [...]. (24) I didn't know it.

Ex.23: (O)T2 - 7-(44) You know. (45) It was seven. (46) And I I I haven't done (47) I haven't done? [----] (That's OK.) (48) no no one.

8- (49) So.. (50) on on Friday, (51) I I was.. (52) You know. (53) I was desesp desesperate.

In her written version, she uses an independent clause as a kind of evaluative coda:

Ex.24: (N)T2-4-I was feeling very bad, and very stupid.
Subject T5, like T2, summarizes a situation to make sure the meaning is clear:

Ex.25: (O)T5-10-[...] (42) I wasn't robbed.

Except for the three subjects (T16, T17 and T19) in the target group who show some liking for independent clauses (over $20 \%$ occurrence), the common tendency in the oral version is the production of long sequences of coordinates, either linked by 'and' or by a fall-rise tone or by both.

## 7.2 - Coordination versus Subordination

The relative occurrence of coordination and subordination in the data of this study is similar to that observed in studies of first language discourse (e.g. Kroll 1977, Chafe 1982). That is, the tendency in both the target and reference subjects is to use subordination more frequently in writing than in speech which is dominated by coordination. It is worth noting, however, that the preference for subordination in writing is more accentuated in the stories produced by the reference subjects (fluent speakers) as can be seen in Table 2 below and in Figures 6a and 6b. The figures concerning coordination and subordination correspond to the counting of the syntactic relations, not of individual clauses. This accounts for the possibility of one clause being both coordinate and subordinate and also caters for the fact that coordination is a mutual relation while subordination is not.

Table 2: Coordination x Subordination
Target Group Reference Group

|  | Oral | Written | Oral | Written |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Coord | $266(59 \%)$ | $171(47 \%)$ | $273(53.4 \%)$ | $101(30 \%)$ |
| Subord. | $184(41 \%)$ | $193(53 \%)$ | $238(46.6 \%)$ | $234(70 \%)$ |

The following examples, from both the target and the reference group, show how subordination replaces coordination in the written stories of this sample.

Ex.1: (O)T9-4-(21) They were sleeping. (22) And we were in the.. (23) living.. (24) room.

5- (25) And then the.. (26) the the bell ring.
(W)T9-3) When we were in the living room the bell rang it was her parents.

Ex.2: (O)T12-15-(128) And I sit in a table, (129) to look.. (130) the the party.

16- (131) So.. (132) a man.. (133) now he he has a (134) a bear.. (T.:A beard.) (135) a beard, (136) and he was.. (137) eh (138) more fat, [..]
(W)T12-6-[..] and I was sat on the table when a fat guy came close [...]

Ex.3: (O)T26 - 4- (23) And[i] (24) he look at (25) he look at for me, (26) and[i] (27) she he (28)he look at with er (29) a strange.. (30) er face, [...]
(W) T26-3- When he looked at me he did a ugly face....

Figure 6a: Coordination X Subordination Target Group

$\square$ Coordination Subordination

Figure 6b: Coordination X Subordination Reference Group
Coordination Subordination

Ex.4: (O)R1-2-(26) [...] (32) I didn't want (33) to pass near a man (34) that was sitting (35) in the shadow, (36) so I preferred to go (37) through the water, [...]
(M)R1-3) As there was a guy in the shadow I preferred walk through the water [...]

Ex.5: (O)R1-2-(26) [...] (36) so I preferred to go (37) through the water, (38) and in the middle of it (39) I fall down [...]
(W)R1-4) When I was in the middle of the pool (water) I felt down.

Ex.6: (O)R5-3- (12) And I couldn't speak any English then. (13) No words.

4- (14) A::nd (15) so l:: had some papers, (16 )(----) my passport, (17) all the documents, (18) but I was very scared [...]
(W)R5-3) I had all the necessary documents with me, but as I couldn't speak any English then, and as that was my first experience abroad, I was very nervous.

Ex.7: (O)R9-4-(22) She had to wake up (23) very early in the morning. (24) And it was a long way in the bus. (25) Can you imagine it?

5- (26) So she (27) er (28) started (29) She she was in the bus (30) and she fell asleep.
(W)R9-2) So one day she was going to school which was a long way and fell asleep as she had to get up very early.

Ex.8: (O)R13-5-(25) And.. (26) here comes in this guy. (27) He's about thirty, (28) and he comes in [...]
(W)R13 - 4) [...] And in comes this guy who's about 30 years old.

Ex.9: (O)R13-14-(68) [..] (70) l.. (71) more or less ignored him, 15-[...]
16- (74) And so the class continued on (75) you know? (76) Normally.
(W)R13-8) So I said O.K. and continued my class more or less ignoring him.

Ex.10: (O)R12-2-(6) My mother (7) and and my my brothers and sisters (8) were in the bedroom (9) and I wa:s (10) in the:: (11) in the sitting-room in the living-room watching television.
(W)R12-2) I was watching TV while my sisters and my mother were in the bedroom.

I find it pertinent here to invoke Ong's reference (1982) to the differences between two translations of the Bible -- one dated from 1610 and the New American Bible (1970). The first version, produced in a culture with strong oral residue is totally additive while the second, adjusted to the expectations of a literate world introduces some subordination.

1. In the beginning God created heaven and earth. And the earth was void and empty, and darkness was upon the face of the deep; and the spirit of God moved over the waters.
2. In the beginning, when God created the heavens and the earth, the earth was a formless wasteland, and darkness covered the abyss, while a mighty wind swept over the waters. (Genesis 1 -quoted by Ong 1982:37)

Many of the 'ands' in the ancient version are replaced by subordinating connectives in the more recent translation. What Ong observed in these two extracts is similar to what occurs in examples $1-10$ above.

Chafe (1980) detected among his native-speaker subjects that, sometimes, in an oral story, a subordination begins and is left incomplete. This phenomenon has
also occurred in the data for the present study. In the example below, the subject begins a subordination but, instead of providing the main clause, she feels the need for a parenthetical explanation (14-21), then she seems to have forgotten the subordinate and attempts a new start ((22) So.. (23) we..) which is followed by a self-correction. She, then, resorts to the teacher for unknown vocabulary and produces what might be analysed as the main clause (27-28) to the subordinate left behind (13).

Ex.11: (0)T15-3- (12) And[i] (13) when we arrived at São Paulo, (14) because.. (15) we came from.. (16) United States, (17) and we will.. (18) eh "escalar"!? [...] (20) in.. (21) São Paulo. (22) So.. (23) we.. (24) the:: (25)"eita danou-se". (26) "Aeromoça". (T.: Flight attendant.) (27) Flight attendant. (28) Said that we arrived in Brazil.. (29) everybody.. (30) from here.. (31) "ne".. (32) began to: (33) "jogar travesseiro".

In the written version, subordination flows smoothly as shown below.
Ex.12: (W)T15-11) [...] when the girl that works in the plane said that we had arrived in Brasil, everybody began to play with "almofadas",[...]

Another subject, from the reference group, in the example which follows, starts a subordination whose main clause is taken for granted in a context which could only allow a reporting clause.

Ex.13: (O)R11-9-(35) When I arrived at the:: (36) bus station, (37) you know, (38) 'There isn't any bus 22 here. (39) You must go to tha:t (40) travel information up there'.

### 7.2.1 - Types of subordination

Besides considering subordination in general, this study has also examined the relative frequency of those types of subordinate clauses which appear to be most common in the present data, namely nominal clauses, relative clauses and, among the adverbial clauses, the temporal type. Nominal clauses in this analysis are divided into three subtypes: (a) reported clauses (direct and indirect), (b) that/zerothat clauses and (c) interrogative clauses (wh- and yes/no). The examples below illustrate the three nominal-clause types:
a)

Ex.1: (O)R5-14b-(88) And he said that he had to be very early at home [...]

Ex.2: (W)T5-1) [...] and he said: "Give me all your money!"
b)

Ex.3: (W)T4 - 4) [...] but I didn't know that Cláudia, my friend, knews too.
Ex.4: (O)R3 - 2- (6) [...] (9) we thought it was a main.. (10) erm.. (11) street (12) or avenue whatever [...]
c)

Ex.5: (W)T9-5) [...] at this moment I didn't know what to do and how to $\operatorname{act}[. .$.

Ex.6: (O)R2-13-(51) I don't know if everybody knows Estreito, [...] The counting of the nominal, relative and temporal types, henceforth called elementary (cognitively simpler than the others whose subordination has to be
made explicit by a connective and cannot be replaced by coordination), confirms that, except in the written performance of the reference group, they dominate the picture with $74 \%$ of the total occurrence of subordination in the oral stories of the target group (Fig. 7a), 63\% in the written versions of the same group (Fig. 7b) and $66 \%$ in the oral accounts of the reference group (Fig. 8a). What is significant is that in the written stories of the reference group, other types of subordination (e.g. conditional and concessive) take the lead with $58 \%$ (Fig. 8b). The tendency to reduce the production of the elementary types of subordination in writing is also present in the target group but at a much lower rate than in the reference group.

A closer look at the elementary types shows that, in both groups, the nominal type is the one most affected by the reduction just mentioned. In fact, the reference group has even slightly increased the percentage of relative clauses while drastically reducing the occurrence of nominal clauses from $42 \%$ to $17 \%$ (Fig. 8 b ).

Narrowing the focus onto the subtypes of the nominal type, the difference between the two groups which stands out is the frequency of use of reported clauses (direct and indirect). In the oral stories the reference subjects use reported clauses more frequently than the target group --58\% of the nominal clauses against 46\% (Figs. 9a, 10a). In the written versions, however, the occurrence of reported clauses in the target group is slightly raised (54\%) while in the reference group it is reduced to 49\% (Figs. 9b, 10b).

A separate analysis of the relative clauses in the present data reveals that their occurrence in relation to the total number of subordinate clauses does not differ much across the two groups nor across the two modes in each group.

Figure 7a: Subordinate-clause Types Oral Stories (Target Group)


Figure Ba: Subordinate-clause Types Oral Stories (Reference Group)

Figure 7b: Subordinate-clause Types Written Stories (Target Group)


Figure 8b: Subordinate-clause Types Written Stories (Reference Group)


Figure 9a: Nominal-Clause Types Oral Stories (Target Group)


Figure 10a: Nominal-Clause Types Oral Stories (Reference Group)

Figure 9b: Nominal-Clause Types Written Stories (Target Group)


Figure 10b: Nominal-Clause Types Written Stories (Reference Group)



The greatest difference is in the oral stories -- in the target group, 16\% of the clauses are relative against $9 \%$ of the reference group (Figs.7a,8a). In the written accounts the target group had a decrease of $3 \%$ whereas the reference group increased its production of relative clauses in 2\% (Figs.7b,8b).

An important distinction between the two groups is in the choice of relative pronoun. The target group shows, in both modes, a pronounced preference for 'that' which introduces $60 \%$ of the relative clauses in the oral stories and $56 \%$ of those in the written stories. The remaining clauses are divided among 'who', 'which' and deletion cases (Figs. 11a, 11b). In the reference group, however, the occurrences of 'that' are considerably reduced, specially in the written versions -- only 4\% of the written relative clauses and $35 \%$ of the spoken relative clauses (Figs. 12a, 12b). I see this as a tendency of the non-proficient speakers to avoid situations which demand greater monitoring as would be the case of the 'who/which' choice. The reference group, on the other hand, prefer 'who/which' not only in writing but also in speech.

Deletion of the relative pronoun is another point of contrast. It has been found to be much more frequent in the reference-group stories than in those of the target group. Since only the pronouns which function as objects can be deleted, the occurrence of deletion has been compared to the occurrence of 'who', 'which' and 'that' as objects. It has been detected that, in the reference group, $62 \%$ of the deletable pronouns of the oral stories have in fact been deleted (Fig. 14a); in writing this percentage rises to $86 \%$ (Fig.14b). The target group's percentage of deletion in the oral stories $(42 \%)$ is lower than that of the reference group and gets even lower in the written

Figure 11a: Relative Pronouns Target Group (Oral)


Figure 12a: Relative Pronouns Reference Group (Oral)

Figure 11b: Relative Pronouns Target Group (Written)


Figure 12b: Relative Pronouns Reference Group (Written)


Figure 13a: Deletion Frequency Target Group (Oral)


Figure 14a: Deletion Frequency Reference Group (Oral)

Figure 13b: Deletion Frequency Target Group (Written)


Figure 14b: Deletion Frequency Reference Group (Written)

stories (33\%) (Figs. 13a, 13b). This again must be due to avoidance behaviour. Since not all pronouns can be deleted, it is safer for the non-proficient subjects not to resort to deletion. My conclusion, then, is that the preference for 'who/which' as well as the frequent use of pronoun deletion are signs of higher proficiency level.

The great majority of the temporal clauses, in both groups and across the two modes, are introduced by 'when' -- $96 \%$ in the oral stories and $81 \%$ in the written stories. In the oral stories there are only two occurrences of 'while' (one in each group) and one of 'before' in the reference group. The remaining $19 \%$ in the written stories are represented by six 'while' (four target and two reference), four 'after' and two 'before', evenly distributed between the two groups, and only one occurrence of 'as soon as' in the reference group. The similarity between target and reference performance in this particular aspect can be taken as an indication that this is a feature of the English language, but it is impossible to come to a conclusion without a comparison with native speaker data, which are not presently available. These figures are, nevertheless, descriptively important.

### 7.2.2 - 'Ands' and 'Sos'

Beaman (1984) attributes the greater occurrence of coordination in the spoken language to the presence of 'ands' and 'sos' which do not have a real coordinating function but just play the role of fillers as the speaker gains time for planning the next bit of discourse. In fact, it has been possible to identify in the data for this study
a few 'ands' which function as fillers -- usually lengthened and often followed by a hesitation marker like 'er' -- but most of them are still coordinators as can be seen in the examples which follow. Both the 'and' in c.u. 28 of example 1 and the one in c.u. 7 of example 2, although playing the role of fillers, cannot be denied as coordinators.

Ex.1: (0)T7 - 6- (26) And they started to:: (27) to have a date.. (28) a::nd.. (29) then they were married, [...]

Ex.2: (O)R3 - 2- (6) My boy-friend and I were coming from a restaurant, (7) a::nd er (8) we were on a.. (9) we thought it was a main (10) erm.. (11) street [...]

In the present analysis, only the few 'ands' which completely lack a coordinating function are labeled 'fillers'. Such is the case of the 'ands' in c.u. 14 of example 3, in c.u. 17 of example 4 and in c.u. 9 of example 5 below.

Ex.3: (O)T24-2-(12) I didn't (13) perceive that.. (14) and.. (15) er.. (16) a friend, (17) a girl.. (18) er was all the time looking.. [...]

Ex.4: (O)T9-3-(15) And we are alone.. (---) (16) in her apartment, (17) and.. (18) eh.. (19) with with her two brothers. (20) Younger.

Ex.5: (O)R6-2-(5) [...] (8) I was born in Portugal.
1b- (9) And then er (10) this is a story (11) l've been told many times [...] I have distinguished the following types of 'and' in the present data:
a) Interclausal, which link clauses within a centre of interest.
b) Initial, which initiate a supplementation or a new centre of interest.
c) Repeat, which repeat an 'and' which belongs to one of the other types.
d) Filler, which have no coordinating function at all.

Repeats and fillers, of course, are only possible in the oral accounts since they are a direct consequence of real-time coding.

As to the frequency of 'and' in the oral accounts (Figs. 15a, 16a), the two groups do not differ much. Repeats and fillers together represent 11\% (6\% and 5\% respectively) of the total occurrence of 'and' in the target group against 8\% (4\% each) in the reference group. The interclausal type is a little more frequent in the oral stories of the reference group -- 42\% against $38 \%$ of the target group. Initial occurrence is the same in both groups --51\%.

In the written stories (Figs. 15b, 16b) there are only two types of 'and' -- the interclausal and the initial ones. In both groups, the occurrence of initial 'and' was drastically reduced -- 5\% in the reference group and 7\% in the target
group -- while the occurrence of the interclausal type rose to $95 \%$ in the reference group and to $93 \%$ in the target group.

The overall picture (Fig.17) shows that 'and' occurs with the same frequency in the written stories of the two groups ( $0.2 \mathrm{p} / \mathrm{clause}$ ), while in the oral versions, it is slightly more frequent in the target group ( $0.4 \mathrm{p} / \mathrm{cla}$ ase) than in the reference group ( $0.3 \mathrm{p} / \mathrm{clause}$ ). There is, then, no significant gap between target and reference subjects as to the use of 'and'. This is an indication of the early acquisition of the additive type of coordination by EFL learners.

The 'so' occurrences in this study have been divided into two types:
a) consequential, which introduce a consequence of the previous clause;
b) other, which function either as mere fillers or as discourse markers.

Figure 15a: Target Group 'And' Types (Oral Stories)

Figure 15b: Target Group 'And' Types (Written Stories)


Figure 16b: Reference Group 'And' Types (Written Stories)


On the whole, 'so' occurs more frequently in the reference group than in the target group. Its mean occurrence per clause (Fig.18) in the oral stories is 0.03 for the target group and 0.05 for the reference group. In the written stories, the two groups differ in the same proportion -- 0.02 for the target group and 0.04 for the reference group.

When the 'consequential' type is compared to the other across speech and writing in the two groups, it is noticed that the 'other' type predominates in the oral accounts of the target group with $74 \%$ of the total (Fig. 19a) while in the reference group (Fig. 20a) it represents $56 \%$ of the total of 'sos'. In the written stories of both groups, there is a considerable reduction of the 'other' occurrences which decrease to $40 \%$ in the target group (Fig. 19b) and to $21 \%$ in the reference group (Fig. 20b). The consequential type is, then, rather more frequent in the reference group both in the oral and in the written accounts.

The comparative analysis of the oral and written version of the same story reveals that 'sos' which are not consequential (other) tend to disappear from the written version. This phenomenon occurs in both groups as is clearly demonstrated in the examples which follow.

Ex.6: (O)T1 - 2b-(49) [..] (57) there was a a iss.. (58) Gonzalez.. (59)
who was.. (60) her friend.
4- (61) So.. (62) was terrible.. (63) because I don't know castelhano.
5- (67) So. (68) When I talked to ..[...]

Figure 17: 'And' (Target X Reference) Mean occurrence per clause

$\square$ Oral Written

Figure 18: 'So' (Target X Reference) Mean occurrence per clause


EOA Oral $\mathbb{I V}$ Written
$(\mathrm{N}) \mathrm{T} 1-5)[\ldots]$ to talk to a hotel where was waiting a woman called Mrs. Gonzalez. 6) It was funny because I don't know how to speak Spanish, so I mixed Portuguese, Spanish and English in that talking.

The first 'so' in the oral example above (c.u.60) disappears in the written version while the second one (c.u. 66), which marks a consequential relation is preserved.

Ex.7: (O)T6-3-(18) [...] (35) I could see only the socks. (36) Over the chair.

4- (37) So.. (38) l.. (39) asked to.. (40) enter, [...]
(N)T6-4) I could see his socks. 5) I asked: "May I?" [..]

Ex.8: (O)T14-1-(1) [...] (7) Almost everybody was.. (8) Argentina (R.: Argentinian) (9) Argentinian.

2-(10) So I was.. (11) |:... (12) was going to the:: bathroom.. [...]
(W)T14-2) And almost everybody was Argentinian. 3) One time in the flight I went to the bathroom, [...]

The clearly non-consequential 'sos' of the oral examples just above $(7,8)$ are missing in the similar environments of the corresponding written versions. In example 9 below, the subject, from the reference group, starts $c . u$. 36 with a 'so', is interrupted by a peer's question, which he answers, and goes back to the original track, substituting an 'and' filler for the 'so'. In the written version, neither the 'so' nor the 'and' appears.

Ex.9: (0)R15-6-(31) [...] (35) I couldn't avoid laughing at all.

Figure 19a: 'So' Types
Target Group (Oral)


Figure 20a: 'So' Types Reference Group (Oral)


Other $56 \%$

Figure 19b: 'So' Types Target Group (Written)
Consequential 60\%


Other 40\%

Figure 20b: 'So' Types
Reference Group (Written)


7a-(36) So I took the the the next (P.: What was people's reaction?)
8- (37) I don't know. (38) I didn't pay attention to anybody. (39) I just started laughing at me. (40) Right?

7b- (41) A::nd (42) and I took the other bus, (43) the next bus, (44) right?
(W)R15-7) I burst out laughing and I couldn't avoid that. 8) I took another bus and I was laughing all the drive long.

The findings here are that, except for the predominance of non-consequential 'sos' in the target group stories, the frequency of use of 'ands' and 'sos' do not represent a substantial distinction between the reference and target data. This means that coordinators are not to be blamed for the non-fluent impression caused by the target subjects.

## 7.3 - Noun-Phrase Length

I propose here noun-phrase length as an effective measure of lexical density (number of lexical items per clause), one of the characteristics of writing according to Halliday (1989:75). The complex noun phrase helps pack more information into a clause. Longer noun phrases result in more lexical items per clause and fewer clauses per text, which means integration.

Lexical items very often cluster around nouns as can be seen in the following typical example of written English (taken from Halliday and Hasan 1989:58).

Ex.1: When the channel is phonic, a favourable environment for active process sharing is created.

If we consider the second clause of the example above, we notice that the lexical load is concentrated in the nominal group, which has 'environment' as its head, premodified by 'favourable' and postmodified by the prepositional phrase 'for active process sharing', which includes what Halliday calls a down-ranked noun phrase with 'sharing' as head, premodified by 'active' and 'process'. The noun phrase contains, then, five lexical items while the verb phrase has only one ('created').

Figure 21: Elements in the structure of an NP

| NP | a favourab | environment for |  | ctive proce | process sharing |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Premodifier | Head | Postmodifier |  |  |
|  | Prep.Phrase <br> Noun Phrase |  | Prep. | Complement |  |
|  |  |  |  | Premodifier | Head |

Halliday says that the nominal structures are responsible for the 'enormous elasticity of the clause'. (Halliday 1989:75)

What is at stake here is the recursive principle which permits the noun phrase to be expanded endlessly. A noun phrase can contain a prepositional phrase which can, in turn, contain another noun phrase. An entire clause can also be embedded in a noun phrase as is shown in the example below, which is part of Halliday's definition of 'text' (Halliday \& Hasan 1989:11)

Ex.2: [..] /a product of [a continuous process [of [choices in meaning \{that/ we/ can represent/ [as [multiple paths or passes [through [the networks \{that/ constitute/ the linguistic system\} 1$] 1]\} 1]]$ /

In this example there are two down-ranked clauses: the first is embedded in the NP whose head is 'choices' and the second in the NP whose head is 'networks'.

The symbols used in the example above are an adaptation of the ones in Halliday $1989 . /$ separates clause constituents, $[$ show embedding of phrases and $\}$ indicate embedding of a clause.

For the sake of the present analysis, the NPs have been divided into three groups: two-word Nps, NPs consisting of three to five words and the ones with six or more words. They were detected via a Microconcord search for words following determiners. As it seemed impossible to set up a Microconcord search for one-word NPs, they have been left out of this analysis.

As shown in Figures 22a, 22b, 23a and 23b the predominant type of NP in the four sets of data is the two-word one (determiner + head). The longest type (six or more words) is equally rare in the oral stories of the two groups (4\%) and the three/four/five type is slightly more frequent in the reference group (23\% against $19 \%$ of the target group).

In the written data, the NPs with three to five words increased at the same rate in both groups - from $19 \%$ to $25 \%$ in the target group and from $23 \%$ to $29 \%$ in the reference group. The main difference between the two groups lies in the rate at which the number of six-or-more-word NPs increase in the written mode -- in the target group they rise from $4 \%$ (oral) to $9 \%$ while in the control group they reach 14\%.

The examples below show how different types of noun phrases are used by some of the subjects to express the same piece of information across the two modes.

Figure 22a: Noun-Phrase Length Target Group (Oral)


Figure 23a: Noun-Phrase Length Reference Group (Oral)


Figure 22b: Noun Phrase Length Target Group (Written)


Figure 23b: Noun-Phrase Length Reference Group (Written)


Ex.3: (0)R9 - 1- (1) [...] (2) this story's about (3) erm (4) Fernando's cousin. (5) She's a very funny person. (6) A::nd her looks (7) is very funny too. (8) She's very tall.
(W)R9-1) Fernando's cousin called Ceça who is very tall and a funny person used to study in FOPE (Camaragibe) [...]

The written version above manages to convey, in one extended NP, which includes two embedded clauses, the same amount of information contained in the four NPs scattered over a sequence of juxtaposed clauses in the oral example.

Ex.4: (0)R5-17-(100) [..] (103) and we had to go through this very humiliating queue [...] (107) Eh Europeans, [...] (110) they have a special queue for them
[...] (113) but Latin Americans [...] (115) all Third World people, (116) they have to queue up for ages, [...]
(W)R5-15) I had no choice but to join the long and slow queue of Third World people at the immigration office.

In example 4, the subject uses, in speech, a circumlocution which takes three clauses to describe the kind of queue she had to face at the immigration desk. In the written version, however, she does the same job in one complex NP.

Ex.5: (O)R2-6-(18) that time er I was.. (19) in my house.. (20) with er.. (21) my cousin and my brother. [...]

8- (23) I live at Estreito. (24) Right. (25) In the continent.
(N)R2-2) I was in my house at the neighborhood of Estreito here in Florianópolis with my cousin Marcos.

Subject 2 transmits in one lengthy NP (ten words) the information which in his written version is expressed in two independent clauses.

The next example belongs to the target group. Subject T7 in the following example also shows the tendency to integrate in nominal structures the fragmented sequences of her oral story.

Ex.6:(O)T7 - 4- (16) [...] (17) and my father knew a woman. (18) And she was called Jerusa.

5-(19) She had three sons.
(W)T7 - 4) My father met a woman called Jerusa who had three daughters [...]

Here again the information contained in the three separate clauses of the oral example are conjoined in one clause whose object is a noun phrase with two downranked clauses.

There are two sides to this phenomenon. Firstly it is favoured by the different planning conditions of the two modes of linguistic production. In writing it is possible to mentally put ideas together in an integrated whole before actual production while in speech, on-line processing is responsible for the fragmented output. Secondly there is the aspect of proficiency level. The advanced learner, more capable of handling embedding is more likely to produce the nominalized structures which characterize the written language among natives. This explains the fact that the difference in noun-phrase length between oral and written stories is more accentuated in the reference group.

## 7.4 - Conclusion of the Chapter

As to the coordination $x$ subordination feature, both groups of non-native speakers show preference for coordination in the spoken mode while in the written mode subordination is more frequent. However, the preference for coordination in speech is more accentuated in the target group, and the preference for subordination in the written mode is more accentuated in the reference group.

Under subordination I have also examined the occurrence of what I called the elementary types of subordination (nominal, relative and temporal) and found that they predominate in the target group across the two modes whereas in the reference group this predominance is limited to the oral stories. It is worth mentioning that the sharp decrease of the elementary types in the written stories is, in fact, a reduction of the nominal type ( $42 \%$ oral to $17 \%$ written) since the other two do not show any significant variation across modes.

As part of the analysis of relative clauses, the choice of relative pronouns and their deletion have also been investigated. It has been found that 'that' is preferred by the target group in both modes ( $60 \%$ oral and $56 \%$ written). In the reference group, however, the occurrences of 'that' fall to $35 \%$ in the oral stories and to only 4\% in the written versions. Cases of pronoun deletion also make a distinction between the two groups: they are considerably more frequent in the reference group, especially in the written mode.

As to temporal clauses, the two groups have very similar results -- the great majority of the clauses of this type in both groups are introduced by 'when'.

In relation to coordination, the occurrence of different types of 'and' and 'so' have also been examined. The findings are that 'and' occurs more frequently in the oral than in the written stories of both groups. The greatest 'and' frequency is found in the oral stories of the target group. As the different types of 'and' are taken into account, one can observe that the two groups tend to increase their use of interclausal 'ands' in the written mode as the initial type becomes less frequent. 'So' is generally more frequent in the reference group. The consequential type predominates in the written stories of both groups but this predominance is greater in the reference group. The 'other' type is more frequent orally in both groups but this preference for the non-consequential 'so' is more pronounced in the target group.

Noun-phrase length is very similar across the two groups in the oral stories but in the written mode, longer noun-phrases (six or more words) are considerably more frequent in the reference group.

## CHAPTER EIGHT

## INVOLVEMENT VERSUS DETACHMENT

The spoken and written language of L1 speakers have been found by Chafe to vary along the dimension of involvement X detachment. The greater involvement detected in speech seems to be due to the circumstances of production. In a typical speech situation the participants share the spatial and temporal context, they can see and listen to each other, which makes possible immediate feedback and direct questioning. In writing, the typical situation is quite the reverse -- the physical distance between participants is responsible for a different kind of interaction in which the writer can only anticipate the reader's reactions and the reader, in turn, tries to reconstruct the writer's intentions at the time of writing.

This chapter reports the analysis of the oral and written stories in this study in terms of the following features of interpersonal involvement:
a) Reference to first and second person (I, me; we, us; you),
b) Reference to the speaker's mental processes ('I think', 'I can remember', 'I don't know why'),
c) Monitoring the communication channel ('Well', 'I mean', 'you know'),
d) Fuzziness ('something like that', 'sort of', 'kind of')
e) Proximal deixis (this, here),
f) Evaluation of reportability (e.g. 'I have a very interesting story to tell you'. 'It was horrible'.)

Story length, which appears to be related both to the integration $X$ fragmentation dimension and to that of involvement $X$ detachment is also discussed in this chapter.

## 8.1 - Reference to First and Second Person

The use of first and second person pronouns can also be taken as indicative of interpersonal involvement since they refer to the two participants in the communication process. In the narrative data being analysed, the singular forms of the first person pronoun ( $1, \mathrm{me}$ ) are by far the most frequent in both groups and across the two modes of expression. The highest frequency of 'l'/'me' (Fig.24) has been achieved by the oral stories of the target group ( 0.5 per clause). First person plural (we, us) and second person (you), both subject and object, are equally frequent (0.1) in the oral stories of both groups. The differential aspect lies in the lesser frequency of 'you' in the written versions of both groups. In the target group the frequency of 'you' falls from 0.1 to 0.02 and in the reference group from 0.1 to 0.04 (Fig.24). The slightly higher 'you' frequency in the reference group in this case must be due to the two subjects who have written their stories in the form of personal letters, which are a highly interactive kind of writing.

The striking difference in frequency between the first person singular pronoun and the others can be explained by the fact that in a personal narrative, '1/'me' has a double reference -- a participant in the communicative situation and a character in the story.

Ex.1: (O)R7-1- (1) [...] (3) / wouldn't say (4) it was an embarrassing situation, [...] (10) and / was coming back (11) from Maceió, (12) / had spent a week there, (13) and when I came back home (14) about midnight, (15) I:: (16) found that my house.. (17) had been robbed.

2- (19) / mean (20) somebody had got (21) inside the house, (22) had took the TV set (23) a::nd er (24) not money, (25) but a few objects.

The 'I' occurrences in c.u. 3 and c.u. 19 in the example above refer to the teller as a participant in the interaction. The other instances, however, refer to the teller as a character in the story.

The equal frequency of first person plural and second person is a result of their maximally differentiated roles -- while the former refers exclusively to characters (the teller and somebody else) as in example 2, the latter represents the addressee in the story-telling situation (examples 3 and 4 ).

Ex.2: (O)T8-5-(37) So we picked.. (38) from the... (39) ground.. (40) two.. [...] (43) stones [...]

7- (53) So we had to pull.. [...]
Ex.3: (O)R13-4-(17) I think I told you.
Ex.4: (O)R3-1- (1) My name's C., (2) and l'd like to tell you::..(3) a kind of (4) bad experience (5) that happened to me yesterday.

## 8.2 - Reference to the Speaker's Mental Processes

In the present data, references to the speaker's mental processes are more commonly encountered in the oral stories of the reference subjects ( 0.03 per clause). The target group had a score of 0.02 in the oral stories and 0.01 in the written versions. This reduction in the use of reference to the speaker's mental processes in the written stories was even greater in the case of reference subjects -from 0.03 (oral) to 0.01 (Fig. 25).

The references searched for in this study are the ones which contain the verbs 'think', 'know' and 'realize' as in the examples below.

Ex.1: (O)R2-18-(93) [..] (103) I don't know what might have happened.
Ex.2: (W)R12-15) I think he is sick or something like that.
Ex.3: (0)T12 - 24- (162) [...] (165) And I think (166) he is a "homossexual", [...]

Ex.4: (W)T5 - 2) I think the reason of my "cold argument" was because I didn't realized it was a robbery, [...]

## 8.3-Monitoring the Communication Channel

The presence of the audience in a situation of face-to-face story-telling enables the narrator to constantly check if the
message is being successfully transmitted. By merely looking at the audience, the speaker receives non-verbal feedback --
eye-contact, facial expression, posture, nods -- but there is a tendency among L1 speakers to stimulate those and other reactions from the audience by means of the verbal devices which follow:
a) Interactive particles and phrases (yes/yeah, ok, no, right/alright, well, you know, I mean)
b) Directives (look, listen, imagine)
c) Questions (Can you imagine? Do you understand?)

Interactive particles - A Microconcord search of the interactive particles and phrases in the present data reveals that 'yes' and 'no' are the most frequent in the oral stories produced by the target group ( 0.08 per clause) followed by 'OK'/'(all)right' (0.03) and 'you know' (0.02). 'OK' and '(all)right' are the most frequent in the oral stories of the reference group ( 0.06 per clause), followed by 'yes'/'no' with 0.04 and 'you know' with 0.03 . 'Well', the least frequent in the oral stories of the reference group (0.01), is practically absent from the oral production of the target group (0.001). Except for 'well', whose degree of frequency is slightly raised in the written versions of the target group and kept constant across the two modes in the reference group, all the other interactive expressions (Fig.26) under analysis here drop to exceedingly low levels of frequency in the written mode. There are only three occurrences of 'I mean' in the oral data of two reference subjects and one in the written account of a target subject.

Figure 24: 1st and 2nd person Target X Reference


Figure 25: Speaker's mental processes (Target X Reference)

$\square$ OralWrittan

Directives and monitoring questions - Directives and questions like 'Do you understand?' and 'Can you imagine?' addressed to the audience are rather rare in these data. Most of the examples have been produced by the reference subjects. The search has included the verbs 'look', 'listen', 'imagine' as in the examples below.

Ex.1: (0)T4 - 20- (139) [...] (140) Imagine. (141) All.. (142) everybody in silence, [...]

Ex.2: (O)R6 - 9- (45)[...] (46) Imagine the scene.
Ex.3: (O)R9-4-(22) [...] (25) Can you imagine it?
R3 and R4 (examples 4 and 5) who chose to write letters as their written versions use 'imagine' in ways which seem to be in the middle of the oral-literate continuum -- The former being slightly more literate than the latter.

Ex.4: (W)R3-8) You can imagine our shock when we saw a truck [..]
Ex.5: (W)R4-7) You can imagine what happened, can't you?

## 8.4 - Fuzziness

In his comparison of the spontaneous conversational language and the formal academic prose of native speakers of English, Chafe has found vagueness and hedges to be more used in speech. As he puts it, those features may be the expression of 'a desire for experiential involvement as opposed to the less human kind of precision which is fostered by writing' (Chafe 1982:48).

The comparison carried out in this study has shown the resort to fuzziness to be, on the whole, much less frequent in the target group than in the reference group. In the latter, however, features of fuzziness have been considerably reduced in writing -- 0.05 (oral) to 0.03 -- which resembles the tendency observed by Chafe in his native-speaker data. As for the former, the features at stake are quite rare in the oral stories (0.01) and almost inexistent in their writen counterparts (only one example) (Fig. 27).

The following are examples of the use of fuzziness in the present data:
Ex.1: (O)R14-4- (13) Anyway. (14) She was four or five or six (15) whatever.

Ex.2: (0)T13-3-(13) [...] (15) I was ten years.. (16) ten years old.. (17)
or.. (18) eleven.. (19) something like that [...]
Ex.3: (O)R2-12- (46) And in.. (47) in a space I would say er.. (48) not one kilometer.. [...]

Ex.4: (O)T12-15-(121) So.. (122) two or three years ago.. (123) I was in a club, [...]

## 8.5 - Proximal Deixis

The examination of the use of deictics by the subjects of this study shows an accentuated preference for 'this' in the target group across the two modes -- 78\% in the oral stories and 69\% in the written stories. The remaining $22 \%$ (oral) and $31 \%$

Figure 26: Interactive particles Target X Reference


Figure 27: Fuzziness
Target X Reference

(written) are represented by 'that' (Figs. 28a, 28b). In the reference group, however, the preference for 'this' ( $61 \%$ ) characterizes the oral stories while in the written data 'that' takes the lead with $56 \%$ against $39 \%$ of 'this'. These results are an index of the target subjects' insufficient awareness of the oral/written distinction. They fail to notice that proximal deixis is more appropriate in spoken discourse. 'These' and 'those' also appear in the reference group but in a very small scale ( $9 \%$ oral and 5.5\% written). (Figs. 29a, 29b) A few cases of a special use of 'this', which is typically oral, has been found in the reference group stories in both modes as in the examples below.

Ex.1: (O)R13 - 3b- (19) I had this new student (20) coming in my classroom, [...]

Ex.2: (O)R15-11-(54) [...] (57) there was this enOR::mous line.
Ex.3: (W)R5-6) I met this Jewish guy who dealt in diamonds [...]
The use of 'this' in the two examples above, with no indication of proximity, is quite idiomatic and, as such, usually acquired late. So it is predictable that it should not occur in the target data.

## 8.6 - Evaluation of Reportability

The evaluative element in a story is an indication of the teller's awareness of the need for reportability. This concern for reportability is a sign of interpersonal involvement since it results from the teller's taking into account the addressee's

Figure 28a: Deictics Target Group (Oral)


Figure 29a: Deictics Reference Group (Oral)

Figure 28b: Deictics
Target Group (Written)


Figure 29b: Deictics Reference Group (Written)
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29\%
reaction to the story. You only have a story when you have a reportable experience. What makes a series of events reportable is the element of surprise disrupting the natural order of events. It would be very strange if you said to a friend: 'Do you know what happened to me this morning? I woke up early as usual, had my breakfast and went to school. After class I drove home for lunch.' The dull routine description would certainly frustrate the expectation triggered by the initial question.

A successful story has a 'point' which is recognized by the audience. The aim of 'evaluation' in a story is, then, to convince the audience of its reportability. It seems that in a face-to-face situation, the teller is doubly concerned with making her/his story sound interesting in order to avoid the embarrassing 'so-what' look in the listener's face.

As was explained in chapter 4, Labov's evaluative categories have been used in this study with some adaptations. The distinction between internal and external evaluation has been maintained as well as the subtypes of the external type. The internal type, however, in this study, comprises only the 'intensifiers' from Labov's model plus quoted speech, which is considered by both Tannen (1982) and Wolfson (1982) a feature of evaluation (dramatization in Wolfson). The non-native speaker data in this study have, then, been analysed according to the following set of categories.

## 1- External evaluation

a) Totally external - The teller either frames the story with evaluative comments (in the abstract, in the coda or in both) or interrupts the story to express her/his evaluation of the experience being told.

Ex.1: (O)T6-1- (1) | have er:... (2) very interesting story to.. (3) to tell you.

Ex.2: (O)R4-2-(15) [...] (23) But (24) what happened, (25) ended up being very funny for me (26) I think.
b) Embedded evaluation - The narrator quotes an evaluative comment either from him/herself as a participant at the time of the events or from another participant.

Ex.3: (W)T24-4) After the party, my sister said "did you see her? She was very angry with you."

Ex.4: (W)R5 - I found all that very weird, but I still hoped to get some help from him once in London.
c) Evaluative action - The narrator reports actions which show the emotional reactions of the participants in the events.

Ex.5: (O)T4-19-(136) I never smiled [laugh] (137) I never smiled so much in my life, (138) in this day.

Ex.6: (N)R3-11) he asked me to stay in the car, 12) (well, he needn't do that for I couldn't move. Not because I was injured but bec. I was in shock).

## 2- Internal evaluation

a) Intensifiers
i) gestures often accompanied by a deictic
ii) sound effects
iii) expressive phonology
iv) laughing
v) repetition
vi) quantifiers (boosters, downtoners and quantity words)
b) Attitudinal disjuncts (e.g. 'fortunately')
c) Quoted speech

### 8.6.1 - External Evaluation

The three subtypes of external evaluation (totally external, embedded and evaluative action) have all been detected in the data of this study. Evaluative action predominates across the two modes in the target group. This predominance, though, is more accentuated in the written versions -- 75\% of the total occurrence of external evaluation against $59 \%$ in the spoken mode. Embedded evaluation is rare (5\%) in the target-group stories in both modes and appears at a low frequency rate in both modes of the reference group -- 14\% oral and $16 \%$ written. The remaining cases of external evaluation in the reference-group stories are evenly distributed between the totally external type and evaluative action (42\% each) in the written mode while in the oral mode evaluative action is a little more frequent ( $45 \%$ against 40\% of the totally external type). (Figs. 30a, 30b, 31a, 31b)

The two groups differ mainly in the written mode due to the high frequency of occurrence of evaluative action in the target group -- $75 \%$ against $42 \%$ in the reference group. I think, however, it would be premature to associate that to level

Figure 30a: External evaluation Target Group (Oral)


Figure 31a: External evaluation Reference Group (Oral)


Figure 30b: External evaluation Target Group (Written)


Figure 31b: External evaluation Refeerence Group (Written)

of linguistic ability. We could even raise the question whether the ability to evaluate is tied to linguistic skills.

### 8.6.2 - Internal Evaluation

Intensifiers - Some of the intensifiers used for internal evaluation can only be used in speech. The immediacy of spoken interaction -- participants can see and listen to each other -- enables the teller to make use of gestures, sound effects, expressive phonology and laughing. I cannot give here an accurate picture of the use of gestures in the oral stories since they have not been videotaped. Only the cases (5 in the target group, 2 in the reference group) in which the gesture is accompanied by a deictic are retrievable from the audiotape. One of the target subjects stands out from the others for the frequency and intensity of her gestures. She produced 4 of the 5 gestures accompanied by deictics in the target group as shown in the examples below.

Ex.1: (O)T4-13-(94) [...] (98) When I saw, (99) Claudia saw too, the "bolsa", (101) Company, (102) has this \{points to a green label on the bag\}.[...]

14- (104) And Adriana.. (105) was.. (106) there. (107) With the "bolsa assim" \{shows her own bag open\}. (108) "Aberta". (109) Open.

15- (110) Then.. (111) when I saw the the the green, (112) I I did this \{hits the bag with her hand\}.

Sound effects are rather infrequent in both groups -- only two examples have been detected in the target group and three in the reference group.

Ex.2: (O)T20-7-(47) [...] (50) And she screamed very much \{imitates the sound of a scream\}

Ex.3: (O)R1-2-(26) [...] (36) so I preferred to go (37) through the water, (38) and in the middle of it (39) I fall down [frrrrr] (40) in the (41) in the water..

## [..]

Expressive phonology like the lengthening of phonemes and extra-high pitch occurs more frequently in the reference group ( 0.04 per clause) than in the target group ( 0.03 per clause). This means 1 case in every 23 clauses in the reference group and 1 in every 38 clauses in the target group. The examples below show a case of pitch emphasis and another of vowel lengthening plus pitch emphasis.

Ex.4: (O)T16-3-(12) [...] (13) 'Oh! (14) You are very THIN, (15) you are very WHITE.

Ex.5: (O)R15-11-(54) [...] (56) When I when I got to the to the bus stop, (57) there was this enOR::mous line.

Laughing is difficult to quantify. Three target subjects and one reference subject laugh throughout the story but there are others who give only a short laugh once in the story. I can only state that half of the target subjects and a third of the reference subjects make some use of laugh.

Cases of repetition for evaluative purposes occur with the same frequency in the oral stories of both groups -- 0.02 per clause. Instances of repetition which sound like stuttering, and whose function is similar to that of fillers have been
excluded from this count. The examples below, in which the repeated expressions are underlined, are clearly evaluative:

Ex.6: (0)T12-3-(12) [...] (13) I was looking.. (14) all all fishes. (15)
Beautiful fishes. (16) And.. (17) there.. (18) there was a.. (19) eh:: a.. (20)
beautiful fish. (21) Only one. (22) Very beautiful.
Ex.7: (O)R15-6- (31) And I started LAUGHing at myself.[...] (35) I couldn't avoid laughing at all.

8- (37) [...] (39) I just started laughing at me.
9- (45) And I was.. (46) LAUGHing in the bus.[...]
Repetition rarely appears in the written stories of the target group (0.01 per clause) and occurs only once in the written stories of the reference group.

Ex.8: (W)T9 - 4) [..] we didn't know what to do [...] 5) [...] at this moment I didn't know what to do and how to act.

Ex.9: (W)R15-7) I burst out laughing and I couldn't avoid that.
8)[..] And I was laughing all the drive long.[...]
11) I was still laughing and laughing at myself [...]

The subcategory quantifiers, in this analysis, subsumes, besides quantity expressions like 'many', 'much', 'a lot', what have been called by Quirk (1973) 'intensifiers' (amplifiers, emphasizers and downtoners).

Intensifiers are not limited to indicating an increase in intensity; they indicate a point on the intensity scale which may be high or low. Emphasizers have a general heightening effect; amplifiers scale upwards from an assumed norm; downtoners have a lowering effect, usually scaling downwards from an assumed norm. (ibid:214)

The emphasizers searched for in the present data are 'really', 'actually', 'exactly', 'just' (meaning exactly), 'quite', 'rather' and 'particularly'. Except for one 'quite' example in an oral story of the reference group, 'quite', 'rather' and 'particularly' have not been detected in either mode of production. The others are rather infrequent in both groups across the two modes.

Amplifiers ('very', 'too' and 'so') are by far the most frequent of all intensifiers ( $67 \%$ in the oral stories and $71 \%$ in the written stories). Due to the very low frequency of emphasizers and to their semantic similarity to amplifiers, I have chosen to put the two types together under the label 'boosters'.

As to the use of boosters across speech and writing, the data suggest that the two groups have opposing tendencies -- while in the target group the frequency of boosters is raised from 0.07 per clause (oral) to 0.08 (written), in the reference group there is a fall from 0.08 (oral) to 0.06 (written).

Downtoners ('only', 'just', 'kind/sort of', 'slightly') are not very frequent. Their frequency rate is higher in the reference group in both modes but the two groups had a decrease in their use of downtoners in the written stories. The target group fell from 0.02 per clause orally to 0.01 in writing and the reference group had their 0.03 (oral) reduced to 0.02 in the written stories.

Quantity expressions have been more frequent in the target group -- 0.03 oral and 0.02 written. The reference group had a very low frequency of quantity expressions, especially in writing ( 0.01 oral and 0.006 written).

Figures 32 and 33 show the relative frequency of the three types of quantifiers in the two groups and across the two modes.

Figure 32: Quantifiers Target Group (Oral X Written)

$\square$ Oral ED Written

Figure 33: Quantifiers Reference Group (Oral X Written)

$\square$ Oral Written

Attitudinal disjuncts are expressions which show the speaker's attitude about his/her utterance. Occurrences of 'fortunately', 'luckily', 'probably', 'obviously', 'of course' and 'strange as it may seem' have been found rather infrequently in the data.

Ex.10: (W)R2 - 10) Strange as it may seem, I was not wearing my helmet, [...]

Ex.11: (W)T14-3) [...] so I stepped on his foot, not propously (of course).
The target group have only produced 'of course' (two written examples -0.003 per clause) and 'probably' (one oral example -- 0.001 per clause). The other disjuncts cited above have been found in the reference group at a slightly higher frequency in the oral $(0.007)$ than in the written stories $(0.006)$.

On the whole there are not significant distinctions between the two groups as to the use of intensifiers. The main difference is in the relative use of downtoners and quantity expressions. The former are more frequent in the reference group and the latter in the target group. This leads to the conclusion that downtoners are a more sophisticated device than quantity expressions and as such reveal a higher level of communicative competence.

Quoting - Quoting or direct speech has been considered (Tannen 1982; Wolfson 1982) a very effective way of emphasizing the point of the story. It makes the story more vivid and shows the involvement of the teller in the action reported.

In native language use, quoted speech has been reported as much more frequent than indirect speech in the oral mode while in writing, indirect speech is preferred. In the non-native speaker data of this study, the preference for quoting
characterizes the spoken stories in both groups -- 69\% (Fig. 34a) of the reported utterances in the target group and $77 \%$ in the reference group are quotations (Fig.35a). In the written stories, however, the two groups behave differently. While in the target group, quotations still retain almost half (47\%) of the reported utterances (Fig. 34b), in the reference group those are reduced to only $19 \%$ (Fig. 35b). The reference-group performance in this aspect is, therefore, more similar to that of native speakers.

The utterances in this count are introduced by 'say', 'tell', 'ask' and 'think' but I have also detected quotations
in which the reporting verb is omitted. These are even more powerful in their contribution to evaluation. On more than one occasion subject R11 uses this device as in the example below.

Ex.12: (O)R11-9-(35) When I arrived at the:: (36) bus station, (37) you know, (38) 'There isn't any bus 22 here. (39) You must go to tha:t (40) travel information up there.'

In the example which follows, subject T26 omits the reporting verb in two reported utterances.

Ex.13: (0)T26 - 4- (23) [...] (31) then I (32) 'Oh my
God! (33) I thought you were a friend of mine!'
5- (35) And he look at for me, (36) 'Oh no! (37) My name is not João.'
Subject T12 also omits the reporting verb in a series of reported utterances.
Ex.14: (O)T12-19- (147) And I look.. (148) 'No no no (149) Thank you.'

Figure 34a: Quoted X Indirect Speech Target Group (Oral)


Figure 35a: Quoted X Indirect Speech Reference Group (Oral)

Figure 34b: Quoted X Indirect Speech Target Group (Written)


Figure 35b: Quoted X Indirect Speech Reference Group (Oral)


20- (150) And.. (151) 'No. (152) Come on. (153) Let's drink some beer.'

21- (154) 'No no, (155) thank you.'
These examples give one more indication that story-telling ability does not necessarily depend on the level of proficiency in the language. Specially in the oral mode, it is possible for a non-proficient speaker to persuade the listener of the reportability of her/his story.

## 8.7- Mean Length of Text

There is a general tendency in both groups of subjects to produce shorter texts in writing than in speech. This tendency is, however, more constant and more accentuated in the reference group. The only reference subject to produce a longer written story was the one who chose to write her story as a letter to her mother. This is hardly surprising since personal letters are near the oral end of the oral-literate continuum, i.e. they resemble typical spoken interaction in many respects.

In the target group 34\% of the subjects produced written stories which are either the same length or slightly longer than the corresponding oral ones.

Subjects T1, T2, T4 and T12 stand out for the great difference in length between their two versions. T1 produced 49 clauses in his oral story but only 22 in his written version. T2 had 42 clauses orally but only 13 in writing. T4's oral story is

43 clauses long while her written account is only 13. The greatest difference in length was found in T12's stories -- 78 clauses in speech against 27 in writing.

Reference-group stories are generally longer than the ones produced by the target group. The mean length of oral stories is 27.7 clauses in the target group and 54.7 in the reference group. For the written stories the mean length is $\mathbf{2 1}$ clauses in the target group and 32.3 in the reference group. The mean length of stories across groups and modes of production is shown in Figure 36.

A possible interpretation of the figures concerning text length in this study is that the tendency for reduction in writing is due to the subject's awareness of the permanent nature of writing which might lead to avoidance behaviour. As this tendency, however, is more pronounced in the reference subjects, I find it more plausible to attribute it to the interactive impulse to provide more evaluation and concrete details in the speech situation. The examples below illustrate this possibility.

Ex.1: (W)T1 - 6) It was funny because I don't know how to speak Spanish, so I mixed Portuguese, Spanish and English in that talking.

With the four-clause sentence above, T1 summarizes a long sequence (thirty-four clauses in all) of dramatized oral
dialogue framed by external evaluation which goes from c.u. 60 to c.u. 161 at the very end of the story.

The evaluative sequence (seven clauses) which goes from c.u. 35 to c.u. 46 of T13's oral story is completely absent from his written version. Subject R2 also omits in his written story many of the details he gives in his oral account. The
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sequence in which he tells how he was affected by the accident in his written story consists of the five clauses which follow.

Ex.2:(W)R2-6) In the middle of the ride, a car crossed our way and hit the motorbike right at the back where I was. 7) With the impact of the crash, I was thrown to the sidewalk and had only my left leg broken.

His oral version (example 3) is full of other details such as the traffic, the movement of the motorbike, and he also emphasizes the fact that he could have been more seriously injured.

Ex.3: (O)R2-17-(77) [...] (80) there was not traffic at all. (81) It was eleven. [...]

18- (93) [...] (95) But I didn't have any injury. (96) Thank God. (97) Any any injury in the arms, (98) and er in the back, (99) or in the head, [...]

## 8.8 - Conclusion of the Chapter

Among the features of involvement $X$ detachment hypothesized by Chafe to differentiate speech and writing, what mainly distinguishes the performance of the two groups of subjects in this study are the use of deixis, the resort to fuzziness, the relative frequency of the three types of external evaluation (totally external, embedded and evaluative action) and, within internal evaluation, the use of quantifiers and quotation in the written stories.

The deictic 'this' is prevalent in the two modes of the target group, but in the reference group it predominates only in the oral mode, while in the written stories 'that' takes the lead. Fuzziness of expression appears much more frequently in the reference group than in the target group in both modes and, as was expected, more frequently in speech than in writing. As to external evaluation, the target group is characterized by the preference for evaluative action, especially in the written stories, while embedding is very rare. In the reference group, evaluative action and totally external evaluation are equally frequent and embedding appears at a more significant frequency rate than in the target group. Concerning boosters, target and reference group show opposing tendencies: while the former use boosters more frequently in writing than in speech, the latter tend to reduce their frequency in writing. Quoting, although preferred by the two groups orally, is reduced to only $19 \%$ in the written stories of the reference group while in the written stories of the target group it is still responsible for half of the reported utterances.

In respect to other features of involvement such as reference to first and second person, reference to the speaker's mental processes and the use of interactive particles, the two groups do not differ much. As the data consist of personal narratives, first person singular has the same degree of frequency across group and mode, except for the oral stories of the target group which use ' $1 / \mathrm{me}$ ' at a slightly higher frequency rate. 'We/us' is equally frequent in the four sets of data, while 'you' is more frequent orally than in writing. Reference to the speaker's mental processes is generally more frequent in the oral stories, but the reference group
stands out for bringing the most references of this type in the spoken mode. Interactive particles, on the whole, are more frequent in the oral data.

The fact that reference-group stories are generally longer than those of the target group may be taken as an indication of the higher level of linguistic proficiency of the reference group. The more pronounced difference in text length across speech and writing in the reference data, however, is to be seen as a sign of greater awareness of register distintion.

## CHAPTER NINE

## COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES

One of the sources of differences between written and spoken discourse, specially that of non-native speakers, is that in the former most communication strategies are not apparent whereas in the latter most of them are readily available for analysis. In the case of writing, therefore, the analyst, in order to have access to the underlying strategies, has to rely on the subject's introspection while the analysis of speech is not only independent of introspective accounts but can also throw light on what happens in the planning and execution of writing.

Faerch and Kasper (1983) distinguish two different types of communication strategies in the speech of FL learners which are related to different attitudes towards communication in the target language. In the case of a planning/execution problem the speaker may prefer to avoid it by changing his/her original goal (avoidance behaviour) or she/he may maintain her/his goal and try an alternative plan (achievement behaviour).

## 9.1 - Reduction Strategies

Reduction strategies can be of either a formal or functional nature. Formal reduction occurs when the speaker, usually an FL learner, wants to avoid mistakes or nonfluent speech, or when a native speaker wants to match the listener's receptive resources in the case of, for example, a child, a foreigner, an FL learner, or even a less educated adult native speaker.

Formal reduction can be applied to the different linguistic levels: phonological, morphological, syntactic and lexical.

Functional reduction occurs when 'learners experience problems in the planning phase (due to insufficient linguistic resources) or in the execution phase (retrieval problems), and if their behaviour in the actual situation is one of avoidance, rather than achievement'.(Faerch and Kasper 1983:43).

Functional reduction may affect global goals when problems are experienced in the planning phase or one or more local goals when problems appear in the execution phase.

Any of the three elements of the communicative goal (actional, modal and propositional) are subject to reduction. The speaker can have difficulty in performing a particular speech act (actional element), which will tend, then, to be avoided, or in marking utterances for politeness or formality (modality). The propositional element can be reduced by means of strategies such as 'topic avoidance', 'message abandonment' and 'meaning replacement'. (Faerch \& Kasper 1983:43)

Topic avoidance is a decision made in the planning phase when the learner (speaker) feels that his/her linguistic resources are insufficient for the transmission of a certain message. When the speaker chooses meaning replacement, $s /$ he does not give up the topic completely but contents him/herself with an approximation. There is also the situation in which the speaker starts talking about a certain topic only to find out that $\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{he}$ will not be able to proceed. This is known as message abandonment.

Reduction strategies are not easily identified. One cannot be sure whether a certain linguistic structure is being avoided or is simply not available nor whether the topic expressed is exactly the intended one or just an approximation due to insufficient means of expression. Message abandonment seems to be, at least in spoken discourse, the only reduction strategy detectable without resorting to the speaker's introspection.

For the reasons stated above, the present study will limit itself to the analysis of achievement strategies.

## 9.2 - Achievement Strategies

It is said that a learner is using an achievement strategy when, instead of adjusting the message to his/her limited means, s/he tries to expand his/her communicative resources so as to ensure transmission of the intended message. (Corder 1983:17)

The achievement strategies detected in the data under analysis here can be grouped into the following types: (1) $L_{1}$-based, (2) interlanguage-based, (3) metacommunication and (4)non-verbal.

### 9.2.1 - $L_{1}$-based Strategies and $L_{1}$ Slips

When communication in the $L_{2}$ takes place between participants who share the same native language, the presence of the $L_{i}$ is a performance feature which stands out in the form of $L_{1}$-based strategies of various degrees of consciousness or as slips of the tongue, which are largely unconscious. The former are motivated by a communication difficulty due to insufficient linguistic resources while the latter are caused by the interference of the more highly automatized $L_{1}$. For obvious reasons, $L_{1}$ slips only occur in spoken discourse. $L_{1}$-based strategies, in their turn, can also be found in the written language, although one of them (borrowing) seems to be more common in speech.

In the present data I have detected several different instances of $L_{1}$ use. On the strategic side there have been cases of (a)borrowing, and (b)interlingual transfer.

### 9.2.1.1 - Borrowing

Sometimes a Portuguese word or phrase is incorporated into the English text without any modification.

Ex.1: (O)T1-4-(61) [...] (63) because I don't know "castelhano".
Ex.2: (O)T4-13-(94) [...] (100) the "bolsa", Company, has this \{points to a green label on the bag\}.

The two subjects above introduce the Portuguese lexemes "castelhano" (Spanish) and "bolsa" (schoolbag) without any interruption of the flow of speech.

Ex.3: (O)T12 - 24- (162) [..] (165) And I think (166) he is a "homossexual",...'

If Subject T12, in the above example, had tried a phonological adjustment, he would probably have got the correct English form but he pronounced it in Portuguese [omosekswáw].

Ex.4: (0)T15-3- (12) [...] (29) everybody.. (30) from here.. (31)"né"..
(32) began to:: (33)"jogar travesseiro".

Besides using an $L_{1}$ filler ("né"), T15 borrows a Brazilian phrase to replace the English expression 'throw pillows'.

At another point in her telling T15 uses the same strategy and describes the excitement of the passengers as they arrive in Brazil with a Brazilian slang expression:

Ex.5: (O)T15-5- (39) And when we arrived here.. (40) in Brazil.. (41) everybody.. (42)"com a maior zona".

As the other learners laugh at this, she resorts to a metalanguage strategy: 'How can I say?' which rather than an appeal to authority sounds as a justification for having used the $L_{1}$. The teacher responds to it as an appeal and suggests 'was happy' but she seems to ignore it and goes on with her telling.

One of the subjects -- T4 -- makes consistent use of a strategy which seems to me a clear indication of the presence of the mental image of the $L_{1}$ form between the verbally neutral representation of the experience in the speaker's mind and the production of the target language form. Very frequently, though she knows the word to be uttered in English, she first says it in Portuguese and immediately afterwards gives the English form as in the examples which follow.

Ex.6: (O)T4 - 5- (23) [...] (26) And Gracia.. (27) eh.. (28) give give us the the "ficha". (29) You know? (30) The paper.'

Ex.7: (0)T4 - 6- (33) [...] (36) I.. (37) me and Cláudia, (38) er.. (39) say say [---] (40) 'Into my life'. (41) "Juntas". (42) Together. (43) You know?

Ex.8: (O)T4 - 7- (44) And you know er.. (45)"verde e vermelho"? (46) Green and red?'

Ex.9: (O)T4 - 14- (104) And Adriana.. (105) was.. (106) there. (107) With the "bolsa assim. \{mimes\} (108) Aberta" . (109) Open.'

Ex.10: (O)T4-16-(113) [...] (116) Cláudia, (117) in the same time, (118) "pulou".. (119) jumped,[...]

Ex.11: (0)T4 - 20- (139) [..] (142) everybody in silence, (143) then "acontece" happen every.. (144) this.

The same strategy is used by T12 once:

Ex.12: (O)T12-7-(59) [...] (64) and he:: (65) eh.. (66) "pediu".. (67)
asked.. (68) asked me.. (69) eh.. (70) money.
Borrowing rarely appears in the written data -- only four subjects resort to it. T4, whose oral account is full of instances of borrowing, uses it twice in writing.

Ex.13: (W)T4-5) And I remember that Britanic had a picture on the "parede",[...]

Ex.14: (W)T4-7) [...] Adriana thought that it was a "barata",[...]
As she lacked the English forms for "parede" (wall) and "barata" (cockroach) she simply inserted the Portuguese words into the English sentence marking their foreigness with quotation marks. In the same way T15 used the word "almofadas" for 'cushions' in the example below.

Ex.15: (W)T15-11) [...] everybody began to play with "almofadas".,[...]
In a similar way, Subject T7 used the Portuguese expression for 'bridesmaids' in the example which follows.

Ex.16: (W)T7-8) [...] All the soons were "damas de honra".
The fact that they did not ask either the teacher, the researcher or one of the peers to provide them with the English forms may be due to the instructions they received at the beginning of the task when I told them that my concern was not correctness, so they should prioritize the content of their stories.

In the reference group, only three examples of borrowing were found. They occurred in the oral versions as shown below:
Ex.17: (O)R2-23-(142) He has some er "sequelas" [...]

The subject uses the word "sequelas" (sequels) to refer to the state of his cousin who is not likely to recover completely from the lesions he suffered in the accident reported.

Ex.18: (O)R5-26-(153) [...] (154) She gave me three years eh "visto".
Ex.19: (0)R10 - 9- (42) [..](45) And she started swimming (46)
"cachorrinho"?
By "visto", R5 means 'permit to stay in a foreign country', and R10 uses "cachorrinho" (doggy) to describe a peculiar way of swimming.

### 9.2.1.2- Interlingual Transfer

Interlingual transfer occurs when the learner combines features of his/her interlanguage and the $L_{1}$ (Faerch \& Kasper 1983:46). The types of interlingual transfer detected in these data are (a) adjustment of an $L_{i}$ lexical item to IL phonology and morphology and (b) literal translation of $L_{1}$ items into the interlanguage.
a) Phonological and morphological adjustment

Ex.1: (0)T2-15-(80) I became desesperate [di'zispireit] (81) because l'd never been (82) to a laboratory.

Ex.2: (O)T3-7-(25) And I was becoming empolgated.. [...]
Ex.3: (0)T10 - 8- (51) And the com (52) and the thing that was combinated,[...]

In the examples above, the words 'desesperate', 'empolgated' and 'combinated', whose intended meanings are 'desperate', 'excited' and 'agreed', result from the application of English inflections, already part of the learners' IL, to Portuguese stems.

In the written stories, I found example 4 in which subject T14 coins the word 'propously' by blending a stem which resembles the Portuguese word "proposito" (purpose) and the suffix which forms the adverb of manner in English.

Ex.4: (W)T8-3) I stepped on his foot, not propously (of course).
In the next example, the subject first uses 'puli' for 'jump', presumably because of the similarity of the former with the Portuguese form "pular", and then provides the correct form.

Ex.5: (0)T8-7-(53) So we had to pull.. (54) eh.. (55) to jump.. (56) into..
(57) a high.. (58) eh.. (59) gate.
b) Literal translation

The hypothesis that learners depart from $L_{1}$ forms while communicating in the $L_{2}$ seems to be supported here by the use of target language forms with meanings which are only possible in the $L_{1}$. The strategy is only detectable when it results in a mistake.

A very frequent case, found in both oral and written accounts, is the transfer of the polysemy of a lexical item in the $L_{1}$ into the IL. In the example below (6) the subject uses the word 'sons' referring to three girls, as an inadequate translation of "filhos" which in Portuguese can mean both 'sons' and 'children'. It's worth mentioning that in the written version she uses the correct form 'daughters'.

Ex.6: (0)T7-5-(19) She had three sons.
Ex.7: (W)T7-4) My father met a woman called Jerusa who had three daughters [...]

The same subject also uses, in the written version, the word 'brothers' in a generic sense for both 'brothers' and 'sisters' by analogy with the Portuguese word "irmãos" which is both the plural for the masculine "irmão" (brother) and a generic term for male and female siblings.

Ex.8: (W)T7-1) [...] Me, Mom, papa and three brothers (one was a boy and the others were girls).

A similar instance is the use of 'yet' as a mistranslation of "ainda", which can mean both 'yet' and 'still', in examples 9 and 10.

Ex.9: (0) T13-13-(65) I have yet.. (66) a lot of er... [...]
Ex.10: (0)T19-1-(1) [...] (6) When I was young.. (7) yet.
Similarly, subject T9 ventures 'fathers' for 'parents' since "pais" in Portuguese embraces the two meanings -- 'fathers' and 'parents'. In the written version, however, he seems to have solved his problem and uses the term 'parents' (example 11).

Ex.11: (O)T9-2-(5) [...] (7) and her fathers... (8) her father and her mother. (9) Didn't know.

Ex.12: $(\mathbb{W}) T 9-3)[.$.$] the bell rang it was her parents.$
Subject T14, in her written version (example 13), uses 'bathroom' when she means 'toilet', as a result of the possibility of using "banheiro" in Portuguese to mean both 'bathroom' and 'toilet'.

Ex.13: $(\mathbb{W}) \top 14-3)$ One time in the flight I went to the bathroom,[..]
Also 'stay' is used by three of the subjects with the meaning of 'become', another possible English translation of Portuguese "ficar". Without taking the specific context into account, the subjects produced the inapropriate sequences which follow.

Ex.14: (O)T9-6-(32) and I.. (33) stayed very nervous.. [...]
Ex.15: (0)T9-13-(65) I stayed very embarrassed.
Ex.16: (O)T16-4-(18) [...] (21) He:: start to stay white and [laugh] very.. (22) bad.

Ex.17: (O)T16 - 5- (23) [...] (25)I..(26) stayed..(T.: Nervous?) (27) nervous.

Ex.18: (W)T15-4) Everybody loved this travel but happened in the end of the travel things, that everybody stayed stayed afraid.

Ex. 19: (W)T21-4) [...] and I stayed frightened and began to run away.
Ex.20: (N)T22-4) He stayed very angry [...]
In example 18, Portuguese word order is another feature that stands out as well as in the next example by the same subject.

Ex.21: (W)T15-7) Were days very bad [...]
It is worth pointing out that the teacher in example 17 offers a completion for the student's utterance which is in line with the interlanguage meaning of stay (become). This is understandable since her $L_{1}$ is the same as the student's and she is trying to help her achieve her communicative purpose and not to correct her language.

Subjects T14 and T15, in their written accounts, and Subject T16, in her oral story, use the word 'after' meaning 'later' or 'afterwards' by analogy with Portuguese "depois", which can convey any of these meanings (examples 22-24).

Ex.22: (W)T14-7) After I discovered why the man was so angry, and I started to laught.

Ex.23: (W)T15-8) But, after we can come back.
Ex.24: (O)T16-8-(37) After he.. (38) returned to.. (39) to normal, [laugh] (40) and we:: went to:: (41) our our home.

The phrase 'creation of chickens', used by Carol in both oral and written versions (examples 25,26 ), is a transfer of one of the meanings of "criação" -- the raising of animals -- in Portuguese which does not exist in English.

Ex.25: (O)T8-3-(8) [..] (10) there was a man, (11) that.. (12) he had a.
(13) cre creation. (14) Of chickens.

Ex.26: (W)T8-3) Ther was an old man who had a creation of chickens

## [..]

Subject T10, in both versions (examples 27, 28), uses the word 'passioned' followed by the preposition 'for' to describe the state of 'being in love with someone' which resembles the use of "apaixonado(a)" in Portuguese but sounds awkward in English.

Ex.27: (O)T10-4-(26) She was passioned for me, (27) in a long time, [...]

Ex.28: (W)T10 - 2) [...] she said that she loved me and she was passioned for me a long time ago, [...]

Subject T12 produces the following example of morpho-syntactic transfer.
Ex.29: (N)T12 -6) [...] and I was sat on the table [...]
The use of 'sat' for 'sitting' in the example above is clearly a literal translation from Portuguese, which uses the past participle and not the gerund to express that meaning.

Such expressions as 'flight of the back' (return flight) and 'we were with miss of our country' (we were homesick), produced by T15 in her written version (examples 30,31 ), though not really literally translated, resemble in construction their Portuguese counterparts "vôo de volta" and "estávamos com saudade de nosso pais".

Ex.30: (W)T15-5)[...] because the own of the company didn't pay our flight of the back.

Ex.31: (W)T15-11)[..] because we were with miss of our country.
In the reference group, only the use of 'even' in the example below seems to have been literally translated from Portuguese.

Ex.32: (W)R2-8) My cousin on the other hand, had a serious head injury even wearing a helmet.

### 9.2.1.3- $\mathrm{L}_{1}$ Slips

Although English sequence markers like 'then', 'so' and 'and' are already known to them, some of the subjects still use the Portuguese markers functioning either as
smoothers of the flow of speech ("ne" - English 'isn't it') or markers of sequence ("ai" - English 'then'), change of tack (Warren 1988:145) or self-correction ("ou" - English 'or'). The indication that these slips happen unconsciously is that they are not normally followed by self-correction. In the present data they seem to pass unnoticed by the speaker in spite of the hilarious effect they produce in the audience.

Ex.1: (O)T4-15-(113) "Al", (114) everybody [--] (laugh)
Ex.2: (O)T4-16-(113) [...] (115) "Af", (116) Cláudia, (117) in the same time, [...]

Ex.3: (O)T10-5-(31) "Al".. (32) I didn't know (33) what to do.
Ex.4: (O)T11-4-(19) [...] (25) And we.. (26) broke the door "ne"?..
Subject T22, in the centre of interest below, marks her doubt about the verb to be uttered after 'he' with the Portuguese "como é", goes back to the beginning of the sentence and completes it using the form 'talked' in place of what had started to be uttered as 'spoke' or 'said'.

Ex.5: (O)T22-4- (31) Then eh.. (32) he he s (33) "como e" [---] (34) Then he... (35) he talked to me, (36) to:: (37) to go away. Two other subjects use the alternative connective "ou", which is very common in Portuguese as a marker of a change of tack, to mark the abandonment of a c.i. and the beginning of another (example 6) or a correction (example 7).

Ex.6: (O)T16-2-(6) [...] (9) and the.. (10) this friend[].. (11) "Ou".
3- (12) Then my fiance (13) 'Oh! (14) You are very thin,[...]

Ex.7: (O)T18-4-(23) So we passed the::re (24) abou::t (25) twenty year.. (26) "Ou". (27) Twenty year, (28) no. (29) Twenty days.

The learners in this study are also betrayed by their L1 habits in the kind of fillers they use to avoid silence. Those are congruent with the phonological system of Brazilian Portuguese. The English filler 'er' $[\partial:]$ is very often replaced by the "eh" [e] in the speech of these learners (example 8). The connective 'and' when used as a filler in English has the unstressed vowel [ $\partial$ ] replaced by [ $\varpi]$ which can be lengthened. A frequent tendency among these Brazilian learners is the lengthening of the 'and' via the addition of a final [i] which can be as long as necessary (examples 9,10 ). This also happens to words finishing in a consonant which need to be lengthened to allow the speakers more thinking time (example 10).

Ex.8: (0)T12-6- (42) [...] (45) Eh.. (46) there is.. (47) eh.. (48) one month.. (49) I want.. (50) eh (51) I was.. (52) wanted buy.. (53) this fish.

Ex.9: (O)T16-6- (28) [...] (31) And[i] (32) he didn't answer. (33) And[i] (34) my fiancé \{gesture\} (T.: Fainted?) (35) Fainted.

Ex.10: (O)T23-2-(11) [...] (15) and[i] (16) I was.. (17) in front of my.. (18) my friends. (----) (19) And I (20) I'm[i] (21) how can I say (22) "enrolada"?

### 9.2.2 - Interlanguage-Based Strategies

In trying to overcome communication problems in the target language, the learner very frequently resorts to his/her own interlanguage system. According to Faerch and Kasper (1983:220) the IL user's repertoire is characterized by
a) the psychological presence of more than one linguistic system;
b) different degrees of availability of rules and items belonging to the IL system.

They distinguish the following types of IL-based strategies: (a) generalization, (b) paraphrase, (c) word coinage and (d) restructuring. The same terminology will be used in this study except for 'restructuring' which will be replaced by 'reformulation' which seems to me more appropriate as an umbrella term for 'change of tack' and 'self-correction'. Since self-correction sometimes refers to an individual lexical item, it would be inappropriate to consider it a case of restructuring.

In the present data, the most frequent IL-based strategy is reformulation followed at a distance by paraphrase, and the least frequent is word coinage, with only one example. The few instances of generalization can also be attributed to the L1 influence.

## a) Generalization

The strategy of generalization consists in extending the use of an IL lexical item to other contexts. The cases of generalization found in the data can also be seen as instances of interlingual transfer (literal translation). Subject T7, for example, uses the word 'marriage' to mean 'wedding'. Subject T14, similarly, uses 'bathroom' for 'toilet'. In the reference group there was one instance of generalization of the vicarious use of 'did' as below:

Ex.1: (W)R6 - 2) I was born in Portugal and when I did my father had already come to Brazil.
b) Paraphrase

Some learners in these data resort to paraphrase when they lack the adequate target form.

Ex.2: (O)T25-3- (16) And once I was.. (17) playing with a.. (18) chicken son, (19) a small a small chicken. (R.: Chick.)

Since subject T25 did not know the word 'chick', she paraphrased it as above.

Subject T9, in the next example, is not sure of the appropriateness of the expression 'to be a couple' to describe the relationship between his girlfriend and himself and tries out the even more awkward 'to be a relationship'.

Ex.3: (0)T9 - 2- (5) [...] (9) Didn't know that.. (10) we were.. (11) we were.. (12) a couple. (13) Yes, (14) we were a relationship.

After struggling for a moment with the word 'assistant', subject T6 changes his mind and uses a paraphrase for 'cleaner'.

Ex.4: (0)T6 - 7- (62) Two minutes after (63) entered a a a assis.. (64) assis (65) assistant.. (66) er er.. (67) a man who keeps the the.. (68) the place clean.

Subject T1, in his written story, also uses a circumlocution to refer to an English speaking country in example 5.

Ex.5: (W)T1-2) It was the first time that I went to an English country, I mean a country which have English as its language.

Subject R7 uses in her oral story a paraphrase that does not seem to be caused by a communication difficulty but by the intention of giving a more detailed account of the incident as can be seen in the next example.

Ex.6: (O)R7-1- (1) [..] (15) I:: (16) found that my house.. (17) had been (18) robbed. (19) I mean (20) somebody had got (21) inside the house, (22) had took the TV set, [..]
c) Word coinage

There was only one example of word coinage in the stories produced by these learners. By combining the words 'phone' and 'girl', which already belong to his interlanguage, Subject T1 uses, in his oral story, the noun phrase 'phone girl' meaning 'telephone operator'. He seems, however, to be hesitating about its appropriateness and, in fact, in the written version, he replaces it with the acceptable 'telephonist'.
d) Reformulation

Under the label 'reformulation', I will list instances of 'change of tack' and 'self-correction'. Although reformulation is also present in the writing process, it is only detectable in speech, which is characterized by the inseparability of process and product. All the examples below are, then, from the oral data.
i) Change of tack occurs when the speaker starts expressing a centre of interest in a certain way and then changes to a different syntactic arrangement. It does not always indicate a communication problem but can be a mere consequence of the 'on-line' nature of unplanned speech.

Ex.7: (0)T1-5-(67) [...] (80) I er.. (81) was terrible.. (82) because I was not looking at her.

Ex.8: (0)T13-14b-(78) [...] (80) he had er:: (81) a gun with.. (82) there is a a special (83)a special gun for.. (84) for birds.

Ex.9: (O)T14-1- (1) [...] (4) So.. (5) in the plane.. (6) there was... (7) almost everybody was.. (8) Argentina. (S.: Argentinian.) (9) Argentinian.

Ex.10: (O)T3-1- (1) Eh (2) last year.. (3) when I was.. (4) when I traveled [..]

Ex.11: (0)T8-3-(8) And me and my friend, (9) at the beach, (10) there was a man, (11) that.. (12) he had a..(13) cre creation . (14) Of chickens.

Ex.12: (0)T10-9- (57) [...] (64) And I can't.. (65) eh.. (66) take.. (67) I can't take.. (68) couldn't meet with her.

The reference group produced several instances of reformulation. Most of them are cases of change of tack as in the examples below.

Ex.13: (0)R3-2-(6) [...] (8) we were on a.. (9) we thought it was a main..(10) erm.. (11) street [..]

Ex.15: (O)R3-3-(19) A::nd we thought our.. (20) we had the way, (21) but we didn't.

Ex.16: (0)R3-10-(60) [..] (70) we we::re (71) we thought (72) we didn't need this.

Ex.17: (O)R5-1- (1) [...] (3) And I::'m.. (4) the experience l'm going to tell i::s [...]

Ex.18: (O)R6 - 8- (36) [...] (40) There was a problem and the ship couldn't.. (41) er my father was so anxious to see us [...]

Ex.19: (O)R6 - 9- (45) Then they.. (46) Imagine the scene. (47) He was.. (48) my sister he already knew [...]
ii) Self-correction is frequently used by the learners in these data when they think they have made a lexico-grammatical mistake. In most of the examples the assumed error would not have impeded communication if it had been left uncorrected.

Ex.20: (O)T6 - 2- (4) I was at er.. (5) Senai, (6) one time.. (7) er.. (8) making.. (9) a course.. (10) making a course (11) doing a course. (lexical choice)

Ex.21: (O)T6 - 3- (18) And I entered the in the.. (19) in the class. (preposition)

Ex.22: (0)T6 - 5- (43) And.. (44) at moment he interrupt me.. (45) interrupted me. (verb inflection)

Ex.23: (0)T12-12-(96) [...] (98) I don't know eh.. (99) when.. (100) no. (101) Where he live, [...] (meaning of wh-word)

Correction in the example above is marked by the metalinguistic ' $n o$ '.
Ex.24: (0)T12-31- (203) - [...] (212) and you... (213) send me money.. (214) lend me money.. (215) to buy a fish. (lexical choice)

Ex.25: (O)T2-6-(37) [...] (41) And[i] I didn't.. (42) I haven't thought any.. (43) no one of them. (tense)

Ex.26: (O)T2 - 9- (56) [...] (57) And[i].. (58) I leave.. (59) I left the laboratory crying a lot. (tense)

Ex.27: (0)T4-1-(1) I have a funny.. (2) a funny.. (3) thing to told to tell. (verb inflection)

Ex.28: (O)T4 - 16- (113) [...] (116) Cláudia, (117) in the same time, (118)"pulou".. (119) jumped, (120) here to to this. (121) To there. (122) To there. (this/there)

Ex.29: (0)T1 - 5- (67) [..] (83) I was in the.. (84) on the phone. (preposition)

Ex.30: (O)T1-6-(85) [...] (115) So I returned to the cas to the Mexican girl. (lexical choice)

Ex.31: (0)T8-7-(53) So we had to pull.. (54) eh.. (55) to jump.. (56) into.. (57) a high.. (58) eh.. (59) gate. (lexical choice)

Ex.32: (O)T10-14-(96) [...] (107) the people don't choice.. (108) don't choose the person who love, [...] (lexical choice)

Most cases of self-correction produced by the reference group do not focus on form but are conceptually motivated.

Ex.33: (O)R6-1a-(1) Well I I can.. (2) it's not really (3) something that (4) I can remember.

Ex.34: (0)R5-14a-(71) [..] (73) after twelve hour (74) a fourteen-hours flight, [...]

Ex.35: (O)R5 - 23- (134) [...] (135) she:: discovered (136) I we discovered. [...]

Ex.36: (O)R2 - 18- (93) [...] (104) I just know that he.. (105) lost the helmet before.. (106) during the the crash. (107) OK?

Ex.37: (O)R2-5-(15) But I was very fun.. (16) er I was very.. (17) lucky.
Ex.38: (O)R15-1-(1) it's a very funny story. (2) Well, (3)it was a very funny story (4) when it happened a LONG time ago.

### 9.2.3 - Metacommunication Strategies

Except for the abstracts and codas which are frequent in both the written and oral modes and the two cases in which subjects provided the Portuguese translation of a mis-spelt word in order to ensure comprehension, metacommunication is totally absent from the written versions which is understandable in this case. Unlike most writing situations, the written stories under analysis here were produced in the
presence of the audience (the researcher). Eventual references to the text were, then, carried out orally, therefore off-the-record.

As in spontaneous speech utterances are planned in the course of the execution and in the presence of the audience, monitoring is shared by the participants in the communicative event. Metacommunication plays, then, especially in the case of FL learners, a crucial role in spoken discourse.

In the oral stories of these learners, meta-communication can be either (1) content-orientated or (2) code-orientated.

1) Metacommunication is said to be content-orientated when it deals with the message being conveyed and aims at monitoring comprehension as can be seen in the examples below.

Ex.1: (O)T3-4-(13) [...] (16) I'm the MAximum. (17) Do you understand?
5- (18) Because the.. (19) the woman was talking (20) and I was understanding Everything.

Ex.2: (O)T5-1-(1) [...] (2) I'll tell a story about a robbery.
Ex.3: (0)T5-15- (65) And.. (66) That's all. (67) OK?
Ex.4: (O)T8-1- (1) [...] (2) And I'm going to:: (3) talk about a funny story story I had.

Ex.5: (0)T10-1-(1) [...] (3) and I'll tell a story (4) that embarrassed me too much.

Ex.6: (O)R1-1-(1) [...] (3) I will tell you (4) an embarrassing situation [...]
Ex.7: (O)R7) - 1- (1) [...] (15) l:: (16) found that my house.. (17) had been (18) robbed. (19) I mean (20) somebody had got (21) inside the house, [..]

Ex.8: (O)R8-1-(1) I'm going to tell you (2) about an embarrassing.. (3) situation.
2) Metacommunication which refers directly to the code seems to be typical of non-native speakers, FL learners in particular, and indicates the presence of problems in the planning/execution of discourse.

Ex.9: (0)T1-2a- (32) [...] (45) er.. (46) a phone girl.
3- (47) Do you know? (48) Phone girl.
The narrator is not just monitoring communication but is trying to check the acceptability of the term 'phone girl'.

Ex.10: (O)T2 - 1- (1) [...] (5) situation.. (6) that I spent.. (7) yes.. (8)
spent.. (9) last.. (10) last week.
The 'yes' here seems to mark the subject's certainty as to the appropriacy of the lexical choice 'spent' after a moment of hesitation.

Ex.11: (O)T2-7-(44) [...] (45) It was seven. (46) And III haven't done.. (47) haven't done?[--] (R.: That's OK.) (48) no no one.

The rising intonation after the second 'haven't done' seeks for the listener's approval of either the tense or the lexical item. A back-channel response follows and the subject completes the utterance ignoring the intonational break.

In the following example there is a parenthetical dialogue between the learner and the teacher in which the former asks for help concerning morphology.

Ex.12: (O)T13-14a-(71) [...] (73) my father er.. (74) hunting..
15- (75) how can I say that? (T.: He was a hunter?) (76) Yes. (77) He was a hunter. [...]

14b- (78) He was hunting, (79) and er.. [...]

The same subject, in example 13, makes a comment about his retrieval difficulties.

Ex.13: (O)T13-14b-(78) [...] (86) Spheres of metal inside the cart er..
(87) it's hard to say.

Again, in example 14, subject T13 appeals to the teacher for the verb complement.

Ex.14: (O)T13-6- (28) And I fall down and I stayed er.. (29) what? (T.: Unconscious?) (30) Unconscious for .. (31) for one hour.. [...]

Ex.15: (O)T25-4-(34) [...] (40) something as er (41) a tank? (42) OK?
By means of the rising intonation on 'tank' and the 'OK?', the subject above checks the adequacy of the lexical item 'tank'.

In example 16, subject T23 apologizes for her retrieval difficulties.
Ex.16: (0)T23 - 3- (24) [...] (31) And I I [---] (32) Sorry. (33) And I (34) I

## read [...]

Ex.17: (O)R1-2- (26) And there was a big.. (27) er (28) how can I say that? (S.: pool?) (29) Not pool but.. (30) the sidewalk was full of water [...]

In the example above, the subject appeals for the adequate word, accompanying the request with a gesture. Then she refuses the researcher's suggestion and resorts to a paraphrase.

Many of the metalinguistic utterances found in these data make use of the $L_{1}$ in the ways listed below.
a) The speaker asks a question in English about a Portuguese word or phrase.

Ex.18: (O)T23-2-(11) [...] (20) I'm[i] (21) how can I say (22) "enrolada"?
Ex. 19: (0)T25-6a- (59) [...] (63) let me..'

7- (64) how can I say (65) "enterrá-lo"? (S.: Bury.)
6b- (66) 'Let me bury it.'
b) The speaker code-switches to express his/her difficulty in Portuguese.

Ex.20: (0)T4 - 9a- (58) [...] (64) I stay.. (65) eh
10- (66) "Procurando? (67) Como e?"
Ex.21: (O)T15 - 3- (12) [...] (24) The:: (25)"eita danou-se. (26) Aeromoça!?" (T.: Flight attendant.)

In the example above, the subject starts a noun phrase which she isn't able to complete, due to the lack of the suitable English noun, and evaluates her difficulty with the interjection "eita danou-se!"
c) The speaker says the problem word in Portuguese with a characteristic intonation which is promptly understood by the audience as a request for the English word which is provided either by the teacher, the researcher or a classmate.

Ex.22: (O)T15-3- (12) [..] (17) and we will.. (18) eh "escalar"!? (T.: Stop.) (19) "Como?" (Stop.) (20) in.. (21) São Paulo.

Ex.23: (O)T15-3-(12) [...] (24) the:: (25) "eita danou-se! Aeromoça!?" (T.: Flight attendant.)

Ex.24: (0)T20-6-(33) [...] (34) I was wearing er:: (T.: Night gown.) (35) night "camisola". (T.: Night gown.) (36) Ah! (37) Night gown.
d) In the written data, two learners, who were not sure about the spelling of a certain word, provided the Portuguese translation in the margin or in brackets.

Ex.25: (W)T7-7) Jerusa was widle, too. viúva
The subject's hypothesis for the spelling of 'widow' reflects a pronunciation difficulty caused by $L_{1}$ interference. As in most variations of Brazilian Portuguese, postvocalic $/ / /$ is reduced to a semivowel, Brazilian learners of English tend to pronounce the syllabic $/ / /$ in 'needle' and the diphthong in 'widow' in the same way.

Ex.26: (W)T14 - 1) [...] there was a kwill (fila),[...]
During her oral telling, T14 borrowed the word "fila" (queue) from Portuguese. The teacher provided 'queue' which she incorporated to her story. At the time of writing, as she didn't know how to spell 'queue', she ventured 'kwill', which again reflects the difficulty in distinguishing $/ W /$ from $I /$, and wrote the Portuguese translation in brackets to ensure comprehension. The ' $k w$ ' and the 'Il' serve the purpose of making the word look foreign.

In discussing metacommunication, I find it worth mentioning those instances which, in spite of their metalinguistic appearance, have lost their original meaning and become mere fillers as shown below.

Ex.27: (O)T4-11-(74) [...] (82) And I looked, (83) in the picture. (84) You know?

Ex.28: (O)T4-12-(85) [...] (91) And me and Claudia, (92) pay attention on the green. (93) You know?

This seems to be the case with all the 'you knows' and 'oks' produced by the reference group as in the examples below.

Ex.29: (O)R4-3-(27) [...] (39) I was laughing so much (40) you know (41) that I thought [..]

Ex.30: (O)R8 - 4- (15) [..] (32) And he passed (33) my street. (34) OK?
Ex.31: (O)R15-6-(31) And I started LAUGHing at myself. (32) Mainly because the bus left. (33) Right?

### 9.2.4 - Non-verbal Strategies

In typical spoken communication the physical presence of the audience is
responsible for a great reliance on body language. Oral discourse tends, then, to be less explicit than written discourse. In the case of non-native speakers, this tendency to resort to non-verbal means is reinforced by the insufficient linguistic resources. Non-verbal strategies can be used by themselves or in conjunction with other strategies.

Although in this study the data were not videotaped, I have been able to note down a few instances of non-verbal strategies. Some of the subjects, instead of asking how to say a certain word in English, signal their difficulty by means of gestures, inducing the audience to provide the required expression.

Ex.1: (0)T16 - 5- (23) [...] (25) I... (26) stayed.. (T.: Nervous?) (27) Nervous.

Ex.2: (O)T16-6- (28) [...] (33) And[i].. (34) my fiance [----] (T.: Fainted?) (35) Fainted.

Ex.3: (O)T18-14-(120) And I \{miming\} (T.: I had a plaster cast put on my arm. Plaster cast.) (121) And the.. (122) after.. (123) one day after [...]

In example 3, differently from the previous one, the subject does not repeat the teacher's suggestion. In the following example, the subject behaves in a similar way. He seems to accept the completion but does not try to incorporate it to his utterance.

Ex.4: (0)T6-7-(62) [...] (71) Sir (72) the smell of the dedetization is.. (R.: Disturbing you?) [----]

In example 5 below, subject R12 uses miming to substitute for a lexical item which is not available on the spot.

Ex.5: (O)R12 - 28- (134) [...] (145) Let's stay here (146) because if they enter we.. \{hits the desk\}

## 9.3-Summary of the Chapter

The use of communication strategies is, on the whole, much more frequent in the target group than in the reference group. Also, as I had expected, the vast majority of the communication strategies investigated here were found more frequently in the oral narratives than in the written ones. Only literal translation. ( $L_{1}$ based) and generalization (IL based) had the same frequency in both modes. Word coinage (IL based) was extremely rare; it appeared only once, in an oral story.

Reformulation was quite frequent in the oral stories. The fact that it never appears in the written versions does not imply that it is absent from the writing process. This is only a consequence of the difference in the relation between process and product across speech and writing. We all know from our own experience and from the observation of other people's rough drafts that reformulation is a constant feature of writing.

Metacommunication strategies, quite frequent in the oral stories, were reduced, in the written versions, to a few abstracts and codas.

# CONCLUSIONS, PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH 

The research questions which have orientated this thesis anticipate three different aspects of the analysis. The first question sets the basis for the analysis of the data, that is, the findings of previous $L_{1}$ studies of the oral/written contrast. The second question, which is an outgrowth of the first, specifies the type of data and the nature of the analysis (comparative). The third narrows down the focus of the study to a set of phenomena which are mainly encountered in the spoken mode, namely, strategies of communication.

Throughout the analysis I have also considered the hypothesis that the simultaneous attention to the production of acceptable language and to the interactive aspects of the speech situation may be a source of problems for the nonproficient speaker.

The findings of this research do not, on the whole, contradict the $L_{1}$ standards of writing as more integrated than speech, and of speech as more involved than writing. There are, however, clear indications that the distinction between spoken and written discourse in the $L_{2}$ of non-proficient speakers, in terms of the dimensions integration $X$ fragmentation and involvement $X$ detachment, is less defined than that observed among proficient non-native speakers.

Concerning the dimension integration $X$ fragmentation, the revealing feature is the relative frequency of coordination and subordination. The preference for coordination in speech is more accentuated in the target group while the preference for subordination in writing is more pronounced in the reference group. Also the more integrating types of subordination are more frequent in the written stories of the reference group (58\%).

Surprisingly, the oral phenomena labelled by Chafe (1980) perturbations of the expression of centres of interest have very similar frequency of occurrence across groups. Only insertions differ significantly as to their type of focus: in the target group focus on form and focus on content occur with the same frequency whereas in the reference group the preferred focus is content. Perturbations appear to be, then, a natural consequence of the on-line nature of speech and as such not related to level of linguistic proficiency.

Relative length of text (Fig.36) is pertinent to both integration and involvement. On the integration side one could say that the packing of more information into a clause than is possible in on-line spoken language production usually makes a written text shorter than its oral version. On the involvement side the observation is that the direct kind of interaction in oral story-telling fosters the tendency to give more detailed accounts. In the case of the present data the tendency for reduction of text length in writing is much more accentuated in the reference group ( 32.3 clauses per written text against 54.7 clauses per oral text) than in the target group ( 21 written and 27.7 oral).

Among all the other involvement features analysed here, only in relation to proximal deixis and quoting do the two groups differ significantly. The target group prefer 'this' across the two modes while in the reference group, despite their preference for 'this' $(61 \%)$ in the oral stories, 'that' is more frequent $(56 \%)$ than 'this' $(39 \%)$ in writing. This denotes greater awareness of register distinction on the part of the reference subjects. The preferential use of proximal deixis is a result of the immediacy of interaction which characterizes the speech situation. The target subjects do not seem to take into account the lack of temporal and spacial commonality of written communication.

The relative frequency of quoting and indirect reports in the oral and written
stories is another aspect which distinguishes the target group from the reference group. In the latter the preference for quoting in the oral stories makes them much more involved than their written counterparts, in which indirect speech represents 81\% of all reporting. Target subjects, in their turn, do not seem conscious that indirect report is more appropriate than quoting in written story-telling. Quoting still retains $47 \%$ of the total occurrence of reports in their written stories.

Concerning strategies of communication, our findings suggest that the resort to those tends to decrease as fluency develops. In the data for this study they are rather more frequent in the target group than in the reference group.

Some of the above-mentioned strategies can also be related to Chafe's dimensions of involvement $X$ detachment and fragmentation $X$ integration.

The occurrence of $L_{1}$-based strategies, especially borrowing, is a sign of awareness of the specificity of the audience -- most of them with the same $L_{1}$ as the teller. Metacommunication, as well, indicates interpersonal involvement.

Among the IL-based strategies we might say that reformulation,_also frequent among proficient subjects, contributes to the fragmentation of the oral stories while it is neutral in terms of the involvement $X$ detachment axis. The other strategies in this group do not seem to have any influence on either of these dimensions.

The findings of this research do not provide sufficient evidence to either confirm or disprove the hypothesis according to which lack of proficiency may hinder interaction.

Besides the two dimensions proposed by Chafe, in the case of $L_{2}$ learners 1 feel the need to take into account an additional dimension which has on one side focus on form and on the other focus on either content or interpersonal involvement.

Native speakers do not usually focus on form, except on very formal occasions if there is an effort to do so. The situation of non-proficient $L_{2}$ speakers is
quite the opposite -- their difficulty to achieve naturalness in communication is a direct consequence of their concern with form.

Metacommunication, when code-orientated, is a good example of focus on the form of the message. The content-orientated kind results from the reverse tendency.

Paraphrase and reformulation can show either of the two focuses. Both these strategies can be motivated either by the desire to clear the channel of communication or the concern with the production of acceptable language.

The non-proficient EFL learner's profile which emerges from the analysis of the data has the following characteristics which distinguish him/her from the proficient speakers:
a) preference for the elementary types of subordinate clauses in writing (nominal, relative and temporal);
b) preference for 'that' as a relative pronoun in both speech and writing;
c) moderate use of relative pronoun deletion;
d) more 'ands' and fewer 'sos' in speech than is found in proficient speakers' data;
e) fewer references to mental processes than in proficient speakers' data;
f) much less frequent resort to fuzziness;
g) preference for proximal deixis (this) in both modes;
h) less frequent use of downtoners;
i) more frequent resort to quantity expressions;
j) use of quotations in writing almost as frequent as the use of indirect speech;
k) preference for 'yes'/'no' as interactive particles;
I) frequent use of communication strategies (especially the L1-based borrowing and literal translation);
m) preferential focus on form (e.g. insertion of side interest and metacommunication strategies);
n) frequent $L_{1}$ slips (e.g. $L_{1}$ phonology applied to fillers)

It seems that the splitting of the focus of consciousness into form and content, which necessarily occurs in the language production of non-proficient speakers of a foreign language, demands a greater cognitive effort than the one needed in an $L_{1}$ situation. This leads to a kind of behaviour which avoids certain linguistic items which would introduce additional demands in the communication process.

Between two alternatives of expression, the non-proficient speaker would tend to opt for the one which demands the least cognitive effort -- the one which requires less decision-making and does not contradict $L_{1}$ intuitions. This seems to be the case of the preference for 'that' as relative pronoun. It reflects the relative "que" in Portuguese with no choice to be made as to the semantic features 'human' versus 'non-human', which would have to be taken into account in the case of a 'who'/ 'which' choice.

Deletion of the relative pronoun, which does not occur in Portuguese, the subjects' $L_{1}$, would also imply conscious decisions as to the contexts which permit this kind of deletion.

The avoidance of structures which are conceptually more complex like concessive and conditional subordination can also be attributed to the wish to reduce the cognitive effort.

The implications of these findings for second language pedagogy are related to the importance of taking into account the first language of the learner and of sensitizing him/her to register variation.

Learners should be exposed to different communicative situations both as an observer and as a participant. Declarative knowledge of a language system enables
you to reason and make conscious decisions about it, to monitor your linguistic production and that of others but is not responsible for fluency which is the domain of procedural knowledge. You may know very well how a language works and still make elementary mistakes during on-line production. Declarative knowledge serves as crutches before the learner is able to rely on the automaticity of procedural knowledge.

In training learners to differentiate between speech and writing in the $\mathrm{L}_{2}$, 1 suggest they should first be made aware of the devices used by native speakers to make up for the fragmentation of the speech flow due to the lack of planning (e.g. hedges, fillers and reference to mental processes). It would also be useful to make them look for similar features in their $L_{1}$ speech and compare them to the ones of the target language. In this way hesitational phenomena would be treated as natural features of unplanned speech to which not even native speakers are immune. Realizing this would encourage the learner to start speaking without much previous planning. Learners should, however, be taught to produce fillers that fit into the phonological system of the target language.

Too much on-the-spot correction encourages avoidance behaviour and induces the learner to keep tapping declarative knowledge to overmonitor his/her communication process. Second language teachers should, then, provide the learners with a great deal of opportunities for spontaneous unplanned speech. One possibility would be to fix 'real communication periods' when the learner would be made to feel that his/her audience is mainly interested in what he/she says -- 'how he/she says it' being only of peripheral interest. Help with the language on these occasions would only occur if required by the learner.

On other occasions dealing with declarative knowledge is necessary.

Learners should be stimulated to use linguistic features which are different from those of their $L_{1}$. The generalized use of 'that' as a relative pronoun, for example, is an avoidance strategy. If a learner adopts this kind of behaviour, the teacher should challenge her/him to use also 'who' and 'which' and to delete the pronoun when possible.

Resorting to declarative knowledge is also recommended when the learner appears incapable of transfering to the second language features which she/he uses automatically in her/his $L_{1}$. This is the case of the preferable use of indirect speech in written stories. It usually helps the learner to be made aware that the same feature exists in her/his first language.

The $L_{1}$-based strategy of borrowing, rather frequent in the target data, should be allowed in communicative situations between speakers who share the source language of the borrowing (e.g. learners in a monolingual class). They should, however, be reminded that the referred strategy does not help communication when the participants only share the $\mathrm{L}_{2}$. $\ln$ his article about naturalness in student-tostudent interaction, Trickey (1988:128) suggests that long sequences spoken in the $L_{1}$ should be considered as a negative factor but 'odd interpolation in $L_{1}$ should be tolerated'.

The other $L_{1}$-based strategy frequently found in the target data is literal translation. Since it can frequently go wrong, learners should be warned about false cognates and syntactic constructions which resemble the $L_{1}$ but differ completely in meaning.

In summary the major source of difficulty in mastering spoken discourse in a foreign language is the interplay between automaticity and control. On the writing side, pedagogic action is simplified by the fact that declarative knowledge can (and
should) be resorted to with considerable benefit to the final product. Therefore, learners can be asked to reformulate what they write in order to correct lexicogrammatical mistakes or even to make it read like written language. An unplanned speech situation, however, is unique. If a student is asked to improve a relatively spontaneous oral account, the result is often disastrous. With the shift of focus from content to form, the improved version loses in spontaneity and communicative intent and may even sound like written language read aloud.

What would, then, be the solution to the dilemma of spoken language pedagogy? The answer seems to be massive exposure to both oral and written samples of the second language in a variety of registers, accompanied with awareness raising of the different characteristics of each and plenty of opportunities for unplanned production.

The results of this analysis point in the direction of further research involving comparison with features of the $L_{1}$. One possibility would be to ask subjects to tell the same story in Portuguese $\left(L_{1}\right)$ and in English $\left(L_{2}\right)$ in order to check whether parts of the message which are conveyed in the $L_{1}$ story are omitted in the $L_{2}$ version. This sort of analysis could consider the two modes of expression or just one. An interesting joint research would be to have two or more researchers doing the investigation just suggested with different second languages and then compare the results. From the reverse point of view speakers of different first languages could be analysed in their narrative performance in Portuguese ( $\mathrm{L}_{2}$ ). Narrowing down the focus of analysis one could also investigate whether the low degree of occurrence of certain performance features in second language production (e.g. fuzziness and downtoners), is due to insufficient command of the $\mathrm{L}_{2}$ or is transferred from the $L_{1}$.

## APPENDIX

Oral Stories
Target Group

T1
1- (1) I traveled this year to United States, (2) was the first time..(3) I.. (4) I went out of.. (5)of this country, (6) of Brazil, (7) and.. (8)some something very funny.. (9) happened, (10) because I didn't know.. (11) that the English.. (12) I practicized here, (13) in courses and kind of thing, (14) would be the same English there. (interruption by other students arriving) (15) And.. (16) and.. (17) and I.. (18) I got very surprised, (19) because.. (20) they have er:: (21) different.. (22) tendency.. (23) in their.. (24) language.. (25) as.. (26) such as as English of Britain English. (27) It's.. (28) it's.. (29) it's very.. (30) very different.. (31) than American way of of talking.

2a- (32) But the funny is.. (33) because I I was...(34) I I I I could.. (35) I could have.. (36) talk [----]. (37) But the funny was the day, (38) that a Mexican, (39) friend, (40) I met there, (41) and.. (42) he asked me.. (43) a about.. (44) about talk to a.. (45) er.. (46) a phone girl.

3- (47) Do you know? (48) Phone girl.
2b- (49) To:... (50) to call.. (51) a hotel, (52) and [---] (53) the United States, (54) to call.. (55) in this hotel, (56) er.. (57) there was a a Miss.. (58) Gonzalez.. (59) who was.. (60) her friend.

4- (61) So.. (62) was terrible.. (63) because I don't know "castelhano". (64) And I.. (65) and I was very nervous.. (66) of my English.

5- (67) So. (68) When I talked to.. (69) to her.. (70) I used to say.. (71) hasta la vista.. (72) eh.. (73) hablos.. (74) nosotros.. (75) ustedes.. (76) queres.. (77) hablas hablas.. (78) And when I returned and talked to.. (79) to the the phone girl. (80) I
er.. (81) was terrible.. (82) because I was not looking at her. (83) I was in the.. (84) on the phone.

6- (85) And.. (86) and I used to say.. (87) 'eh hasta la vista.. (88) no no (89) eh no (90) OK (91) no (92) excuse me. (93) eh pardon.. (94) er I would like to to talk to to to to Mrs.Mrs. Joaquina. (95) No no no. (96) It's Mrs. Gonzalez. (97) Er.. (98) excuse me. (99) Er.. (100) do you habla (101) no no no (102) Habla habla Gonzalez (103) or hablas Joaquina?' (104) 'Gonzalez'. (105) 'Oh É Gonzalez o nome. (106) No no no. (107) Terrible. (108) Terrible. (109) Eh pardon. (110) Eh.. (111) It's Gonzalez.. (112) the the woman.. (113) I would like to talk to.' (114) 'When did she arrive?' (115) So I returned to the cas to the Mexican girl. (116) 'When did she arrive?' (117) To the Mexican girl, (118) doesn't.. (119) she didn't know.. (120) how to to speak English. (121) And so er (122) how do.. (123) Forgot. (124) 'Eh.. (125) eh.. (126) hablas.. (127) eh.. (128) whe quando.. (129) quando esteve..(130) estieve aqui.. (131) Mrs. Gonzalez?' (132) 'Eh/!? (133) Eh/!? (134)'[---] Mrs. Gonzalez esteve aqui?' (135) Ah!

7- (136) Eh.. (137) So.. (138) in castelhano.. (139) the days are in moon, (140) Jupiter, (141) the the planets. (142) Are the the name of the day. (T.:The days? Yes?) (143) Yes. (144) For example.. (145) in in in English we have Sunday. [---](146) They have the day of sun, (147) the day of earth, (148) the day of every planet. (T.:Yes?) (149) Yes.

8- (150) And the (151) she she talked in castelhano (152) and I didn't know (153) if it was Tuesday or Monday.

9- (154) And was terrible. (155) Because I had to to to speak.. (156) three languages. (157) At the same time. (158) And I used to talk in Portuguese to the phone girl, (159) in English to the castelhano girl, (160) and (laugh) in (161) and in castelhano to me. (162)Myself.

T2
1- (1) You know.. (2) it's a.. (3) an embarrassing.. (4) eh.. (5) situation.. (6) that I spent.. (7) yes.. (8) spent.. (9) last.. (10) last week.

2- (11) l.. (12) I spent all my week.. (13) doing.. (14) a work.. (15) from the.. (16) university. (17) It it was seven.. (18) programs.

3- (19) And l've never been to a lab laboratory. (20) You know. (21) That have computers.. (22) and.. (23) I didn't know how to get the the acce.. assess of the the information. (24) I didn't know it.

4- (25) And the.. (26) this.. (27) work is to:... (28) is to be ready... (29) on Friday. (30) And this was.. (31) last week on on Monday, (32) I don't know.

5- (33) And I went there.. (34) thinking that it was (35) it was too easy.. (36) You know.

6- (37) When I went there on Sunday, (38) on Monday, (39) er (40) I spent there all the week. (41) And[i] I didn't.. (42) I haven't thought any.. (43) no one of them.

7- (44) You know. (45) It was seven. (46) And I I I haven't done.. (47) I haven't done? [-----] (That's OK.)(48) no no one.

8- (49) So.. (50) on on Friday, (51) I I was.. (52) you know. (53) I was desesp desesperate (frightened) (54) No. (55) "Desesperada".

9- (---------) (56) Yes. (57) And[i].. (58) I leave.. (59) I left the laboratory crying a lot.

10- (Why?) (60) I don't know why.
11- (61) I I started to cry.. (62)to cry.. (63) to cry.
12- (64) So I.. (65) When I get in the bus.. (66) the man looked at me (67) 'Oh what are you having?' (68) I said (69) 'Nothing' (70) and I go to Aldeia, (71) crying all the time.

13- (72) When I.. (73) I arrived home (74) Mom (75) my mother said 'What happened?'

14- (77) 'Mother, don't..' (78) I.. (79) you know.

15-(80) I became desesperate (81) because l'd never been (82) to a laboratory.
16-(83) I didn't know how to to to.. (84) to to talk.. (85) with with people there. (86) I didn't know nothing [----]

17- (87) I I only started to cry a lot.
18- (88) And was embarrassing.

T3
1- (1) Eh (2) last year.. (3) when I was.. (4) when I traveled.. (5) eh.. (6) it was my first contact with Americans.

2- (7) And I.. (80) we we are in the airport. (9) And I was talking with er:.. (10) American.

3- (11) I thought it was American.. (12) girl.
4- (13) And I.. (14) I was thinking that erm (15) I was thinking.. (16) I'm the MAXimum. (17) Do you understand?

5- (18) Because the.. (19) the woman was talking (20) and I was understanding EVERYthing.

6- (21) "Al fazia".. (22) And I think.. (23) My God! (24) My English in Britanic is very [laugh] GOOD!

7- (25) And I was becoming "empolgated"..(26) and talk with her.. (27) a lot of things.

8- (28) [laugh] Then she turned to.. (29) her friend, (30) and talk in Portuguese [laugh].

9-(31) I.. (32) I started laughing "né, (33) mas" started talking in Portuguese with her also.

T4
1- (1) I have a funny.. (2) a funny.. (3) thing to told to tell.
2- (4) It was here in Britanic. (5) In nineteen... (6) nine. (7) Nine no. (----)

3- (8) Then, (laugh) it was Gracia... (9) the teacher. (10) You know?
4- (11) Manuela.. (12) was with me. (13) And I.. (14) and I had er er.. (15) friend, (16) called Claudia. (17) That was me and Claudia. (Every time) (18) Every time. (19) Every time. (20) And (----) (21) Manuela, (22) and Adriana.

5- (23) Then, (24) it was music. (25) Music class. (26) And Gracia.. (27) eh.. (28) give give us the the "ficha". (29) You know..? (30) the paper. (31) And I received, (32) and Claudia.

6- (33) When when.. (34) [sh::] when when we.. (35) when we received the this paper, (36) l.. (37) me and Claudia, (38) er.. (39) say say [----] (40) 'Into my life'. (41) "Juntas". (42) Together. (43) You know?

7- (44) And you know er.. (45) "verde e vermelho"? (46) Green and red? (47) That every time, (48) that you speak together, (49) the same, (50) you you touch in in red, (51) no. (52) In green and red. (53) And [-------] (54) to give "sorte". [laugh] (Luck.)

8- (55) Luck. (56) OK. (57) Thank you.
9a- (58) Then...(59) I.. (60) I didn't know that Claudia, (61) knew this. (62) You know? (63) And.. (64) I stay.. (65) eh

10- (66) "Procurando? (67) Como é"? (Looking for)
9b- (68) Looking for.. (69) the green, (70) and the red. (71) And Claudia too, (72) but I didn't know that.. (73) she she knew.

11- (74) Then I started to think.. (75) My God. (76) Britanic has.. (77) three.. (78) and.. (79) draws in the (Pictures) (80) Pictures. (81) "Ne"? (82) And I looked, (83) in the picture. (84) You know?

12- (85) Every.. (86) every.. (87) Manuela, (88) everybody was..(89) pay attention, (90) on the paper. (91) And me and Claudia, (92) pay attention on the green. (93) You know?

13- (94) Then.. (95) every time in in.. (96) silence, (97) when I saw. (98) When I saw, (99) Claudia saw too, (100) the "bolsa", (101) Company, (102) has this\{points to a green label on the bag\}.(103) You know? (Umhum.)

14- (104) And Adriana.. (105) was.. (106) there. (107) With the "bolsa assim". (108)"Aberta".(109) Open.

15- (110) Then.. (111) when I saw the the the green, (112) I I did this. \{hits the bag with her hand\}

16- (113) "Al", (114) everybody [---]] (laugh) (115) "Ai", (116) Claudia, (117) in the same time, (118) "pulou".. (119) jumped, (120) here to to this. (121) To there. (122) To there. (123) He did.. (124) she did this \{gesture\}.

17- (125) And Adriana.. (126) "Uma barata!" [laugh] (laugh)
18- (127) He.. (128) You remember? (129) In the "bolsa".. (130) was open. (131) And every paper "voou" (Flied.) (132) Flied. (133) And Adriana.. (134) My God! (135) "Uma barata"! [-------] [laugh] (laugh)

19- (136) I never smiled [laugh] (137) I never smiled so much in my life, (138) in this day.

20- (139) Was very very funny. (140) Imagine. (141) All.. (142) everybody in silence, (143) then "acontece" happen every.. (144) this. (145) OK. [laugh]

T5
1- (1) My name's C., (2) I'll tell a story about a robbery.
2- (3) I was.. (4) on a Saturday morning, (5) I was walking down to my.. (6) school.. (7) and I.. (8) met.. (9)a little boy.. (10) and he asked me.. (11) if I had money.

3- (12) So and I told him (13) 'No I don't have money'.
4 - (14) And he.. (15) he.. (16) said (17)'Give me.. (18) eh.. (19) all the money that you have'.

5- (20) I told him (21)'No I don't have any money. (22) I don't have money at all.'
6- (23) And he said (24)'So give me the.. (25) your watch'.
7- (26) And I told him (27)'Can't you see (28) that I don't have watch?'
8- (29) And he.. (30) he told me.. (31)'Eh.. (32) OK (33) but this is a piece of glass. (34) Can you see?'

9- (35) And I said (36)'Yes I can see (37) but I don't have any.. (38) any watch.' 10- (39) And so he said... (40) and so I run (41)and he he forgot it. (42) I wasn't robbed.
(R. to T.: They already know that children are told to keep their things in their pockets when they go out.)

11- (43) My watch was in my pocket. (T.: And your money?)
12- (44) My money, (45) yes. (46) Too. (47) But I (T.:You're a liar!) (48) I wouldn't give him my MONEY! (49) Go and work!

13- (50) But I didn't. (51) I said this (52) because I didn't realize (53) it was a robbery. (54)'Cause.. (55) I thought he was just a a little.. (56) boy asking me money. (57) So, (58) naturally I said (59)'No I don't have.

14- (60) And then I.. (61) when he showed me the piece of glass (62) I [-] (63)'On that's a robbery'. (64) But I run [laugh].

15- (65) And.. (66) that's all. (67) OK?

T6
1- (1) I have er::.. (2) very interesting story to.. (3) to tell you.
2- (4) I was at er.. (5) Senai, (6) one time.. (7) er.. (8) making.. (9) a course.. (10) making a course (11) doing a course. (12) Yes. (13) Er.. (14) for the.. (15) the.. (16) the university. (17) And it was my first class.

3- (18) And I.. (19) entered the in the.. (20) in the class, (21) the door was open, (22) there was a man.. (23) er.. (24) sitting.. (25) reading a a (26) a newspaper. (27) With er.. (28) with her feet er.. (29) over another.. (30) another chair. (31) With no shoes. (32) The shoes are on... (33) He took off the shoes, (34) and... (35) I could see only the socks. (36) Over the chair.

4- (37) So.. (38) I.. (39) asked to.. (40) enter, (41) I sat down, (42) and I started to talk.. (43) with my friend.

5- (44) And.. (45) at moment he interrupt me.. (46) interrupted me.. (47) and.. (48) asked me.. (49) The smell er.. (50) use er.. (51) You don't like the sm the smell?

6- (52) l.. (53) I was.. (54) astonished and.. (55) l.. (56) I.. (57) so I say.. (58) I said (59) no no (60) of course not teacher. (61) There is no problem.

7- (62) Two minutes after (63) entered a a a assis.. (64) assis.. (65) assistant.. (66) er er.. (67) a man who keeps the the.. (68) the place clean. (69) And asked for the teacher.. (70) er.. (71) sir (72) the smell of the dedetization is (disturbing you?) [--]

8- (73) I don't understand [laugh] (74) I.. (75) I thought that was the smell of his shoes [laugh].

9- (76) At the first day.. (77) he.. (78) he got a very bad impression for [laugh].

## T7

1- (1) I have a.. (2) I think that's happy and.. (3)and a good story, (4) but for my family.

2- (5) It's a very big family now, (6) but.. (7) for.. (8) six years ago, (9) we were only four children, (10) four children, (11) my father, (12) and my mother.

3- (13) And my mother died. (14) And we were only the four, (15) and my father.

4- (16) And we started to travel, (17) and my father knew a woman. (18) And she was called Jerusa.

5- (19) She had three sons. (20) One.. (21) two were tw twins, (22) and one.. (23) was.. (24) er.. (25) two years older than the twins the twins.

6- (26) And they started to::(27) to have a date.. (28) a::nd.. (29) then they married, (30) and now we are seven children, (31) seven children.. (32) child,.. (33) eh.. (34) a very big family.

7- (35) We had to get a new house, (36) everything had to change in our life. (37) Everything changed. (38) A new mother, (39) a new house, (40) everything was changed.

8- (41) But now we are.. (42) a ve (43) a really family. (44) We're very happy.. (45) we::. (46) treat each other (47) like brothers and sisters, (48) and there are fif.. (49) eh.. (50) girls and only one brother. (51) That is the oldest. (52) There's a lot.

9-(53) I loved. (54) This idea.
10-(55) And now there's four years of marriage (56) and we are very happy.

T8
1- (1) My name's Carol. (2) And I'm going to:: .. 3) talk about a [laugh] funny story story I had.

2- (4) When I was about twelve years old, (5) I was.. (6) an.. (7) a impossible girl.

3- (8) And me and my friend, (9) at the beach, (10) there was a man, (11) that.. (12) he had a.. (13) cre creation. (14) Of chickens. (15) And that..(16) about.. (17) a lot of chickens.. (18) about eh.. (19) fourty.. (20) fourty chickens. (21) And everyday.. (22) she.. (23) [laugh] put the chickens at the street.. (24) and go.. (25) to:: .. (26) walk with them.

4- (27) [laugh] So me and my friends, (28) [laugh] decided to.. (29) pick up.. (30) stones, [laugh] (31) and throw in the chickens. [laugh] (32) Because the man (33) was not with the chickens. (34) He was... (35) I don't know where.. (36) he was.

5- (37) So we picked.. (38) from the... (39) ground.. (40) two.. (41) little.. (42) eh.. (43) stones and started to.. (44) throw in the chickens.

6- (45) So the chickens start to.. [laugh] (46) to run.. [laugh] (47) after us. (48) Eh.. (49) but a lot of chickens.. (50) about fourty.. (51) thir thirty or fourty chickens.. (52) running after us. [laugh]

7- (53) So we had to pull.. (54) eh.. (55) to jump.. (56) into.. (57) a high.. (58) eh.. (59) gate.

8- (60) And I fall.. (61) and..[laugh] (62) and one chicken.. (63) eh.. (64) bite my leg (---) (65) Yes. [laugh]

9-(66) It was very funny. [laugh]

T9
1- (1) My name is.. (2) Ginaldo, (3) and my expe my embarrassing experience was in the.. (4) in my girl-friend's apartment.

2- (5) I was there, (6) with her, (7) and her fathers... (8) her father and her mother. (9) Didn't know that.. (10) we were.. (11) we were.. (12) a couple. (13) Yes, (14) we were a relationship.

3- (15) And we are alone.. (laugh)(---) (16) in her apartment, (17) and.. (18) eh.. (19) with with her two brothers. (20) Younger.

4- (21) They were sleeping. (22) And we were in the.. (23) living.. (24) room.
5- (25) And then the.. (26) the the bell ring. (27) And it was the eh.. (28) and the (-----) (29) Yes. (30) It was the.. (31) the father the fathers..

6- (32) and I.. (33) stayed very nervous.. (34)and I ran.. (35) I didn't know what to do.. (36) and her too.. (37) and I ran to the.. (38) kitchen.. (39) and stayed there (laugh)(40) and when...

7- (41) and she said.. (42) when.. (43) while I open the door.. (44) you wait in the kitchen.

8- (45) When they.. (46) they get into (Did they see you?)
9- (47) No.. (48) yes.. (49) they saw. (laugh)
10-(50) And I stay in the:: .. (51) kitchen's door. (52) And when the when they got into the.. (53) living room.. (54) I opened the.. (55) the kitchen's door.

11- (56) And when they heard the noise,(57) they opened the door again. (laugh) (58) And I was looking at them.. (laugh) (59) and I said 'Oh'..

12-(60) I closed the door.. (61) and she said (62) 'Oh come on! (63) You can open the door. (64) Come on!' (laugh) [----]

13- (65) I stayed very embarrassed. (66) That was terrible.

T10
1- (1) My name's S., (S.: Your name is..) (2) S. (3) and l'll tell a story (4) that embarrassed me too much.

2- (5) In the October second, (6) a girl, (7)called me, (8) on a Friday, (9) saying.. (10) tell me things.. (11) eh that let me very confused.

3- (12) She said (13) that she loved me. (laugh) (14) She said (15) that I.. (16) She said (17) that she loved me, (18) that she was passionate for me, (19) and I got afraid (20) because (-------) (21) I didn't know (22) what to do, (23) and she said (24) that she knew my.. (25) cousin.

4- (26) She was passionate for me, (27) in a long time, (28) and when she knew my cousin, (29) she, (30) she took courage to call me.

5- (31) "AI".. (32) I didn't know (33) what to do.
6- (34) She said (35) that she would call me after. (36) And she called me.. (37) on the night's Friday. (38) Eh.. (39) October ninth. (40) And she.. (41) and I confirmed.

7- (42) Eh.. (43) I was.. (44) trying to: (45) have a date with her. (46) But.. (47) but she didn't want (48) to tell me her name,.. (49) because she was shy.. (50) because she didn't want.

8- (51) And the com (52) and the thing that was combinated, (53) that was.. (54) that we would meet in Rocks, (55) a a disco, (56) at Casa Forte.

9- (57) One eh (58) one day before the.. (59) the disco, (60) that I would meet her (61) in the disco, (62) she:: got sick. (63) She:: got cold. (64) And I can't. (65) eh.. (66) take.. (67) I can't take.. (68) couldn't meet with her.

10- (69) And.. (70) and I sent.. (71) a paper.. (72) to her, (73) through my.. (74) cousin.

11- (75) Two two days eh.. (76) two days after (77) she got the letter.. (78) eh.. (79) she had.. (80) eh.. (81) sh she be.. (82) she had begin (83) eh her dating, (84) with her old boyfriend. (85) And.. (86) I can't date her.

12- (87) And and I.. (88) in the Friday (89) I I I waited her.. (90) her phone call, (91) but she didn't call me.

13- (92) And after.. (93) eh when I.. (94) She said (95) that she would send me a letter.

14- (96) And when I got the letter, (97) she tell (98) she told all. (99) That she was more passionate for me, (100) that er.. (101) that she.. (102) doesn't.. (103) she she told me (104) that she:: .. (105) she doesn't. (106) eh.. (107) the people don't choice.. (108) don't choose the person who love,

15- (109) and and today.. (110) and today I discovered (111) who was she. (112) And I.. (113) that that let me very embarrassed.

## T11

1- (1) This story happened last year. (2) When I went.. (3) I came back to my house.. (4) and I didn't have any key to:: (5) open the door.

2- (6) My.. (7) And I I know my.. (8) brother was there was there.
3- (9) And I.. (10) knocked the door, (11) I rang the bell, (12) my boy-friend (13) eh rang the interphone, (14) we made a a strong noise (15) to call him, (16) but it was impossible. (17) He didn't wake up (18) he didnt wake up.

4- (19) And we took some materials, (20) hammer, (21) irons, (22) to.. (23) broke.. (24) the door "né?" (25) And we.. (26) broke the door "né" (27) The door was very... (28) eh.. (empty?) (29) hmm? (---) (30) No. (31) The door broke. (32) Every.. (33) the door.

5- (34) And when I.. (35) I arrived "ne", (36) and I.. (37) When I was open, (38) his door, (39) the bedroom, (40) when I was open, (41) he said.. (42) don't make any noise.[laugh] (43) I want to sleep.

T12
1- (1) I remember.. (2) a history.

2- (3) Eh.. (4) I was in a.. (5) eh:: Madalena..(6) square.. (7) eh:: because I I wanted.. (8) buy.. (9) eh food.. (10) to my fishes. (11) I had fishes.

3- (12) And.. (13) I was looking.. (14) all all fishes. (15) Beautiful fishes. (16) And.. (17) there.. (18) there was a.. (19) eh:: a.. (20) beautiful fish. (21) Only one. (22) Very beautiful. (23) A::nd.. (24) that is.. (25) eh.. (26) very expensive. (27) This fish. (28) And I was.. (29) only looking.

4a- (30) So a.. (31) a man.. (32) a boy. (33) Maybe.. (34) eighteen years old..
5- (35) And this history happened.. (36) erm.. (37) about six or seven years ago.

4b- (38) And this this boy.. (39) eh.. (40) begin to:: .. (41) talk with me.
6- (42) 'Look this fish. (43) Is very beautiful'. (44) 'Oh yes.' (45) 'Eh.. (46) there is.. (47) eh.. (48) one month.. (49) I want.. (50) eh.. (51) I was.. (52) wanted buy.. (53) this fish. (54) But I.. (55) I.. (56) don't have enough money.. (57) to.. (58) to buy this fish.'

7- (59) And... (60) eh.. (61) we:: .. (62) made a conversation, (63) very very long conversation, (64) and he:: .. (65) eh.. (66) "pediu".. (67) asked.. (68) asked me.. (69) eh.. (70) money.

8- (71) But I don't know this. (72) But he's a.. (73) he look like a good person.. (74) OK? (75) Eh.. (76) different er a rob.

9- (77) And I look.. (78) eh.. (79) he asked me about.. (80) today.. (81) eh.. (82) thirteen.. (83) thousand. (84) Cruzeiros.

10- (85) And I.. (86) I had look to him and.. (87) 'Cause I must buy this fish, (88) I love this fish',

11- (89) and I look.. (90) I look to him, (91) and.. (92) OK. (93) I decide.. (94) I dec.. (95) decide give the money.

12-(96) But I don't know him, (97) OK? (98) I don't know eh.. (99) when.. (100) no. (101) Where he live, (102) I don't know anything about him. (R.:Did he buy the fish?)

13- (103) Yes I.. (104) I gave my money.. (105) to him. (R.:But did you see him buy the fish?) (106) Yes yes. (107) He buy the fish and.. (108) eh hold my hand
and.. (shook) (109) shook my hand.. (110) 'Thank you very much, (111) thank you very much,' (112) many times. (113) 'Thank you very much. (114) One day I will give.. (115) One day I will give you.. (116) the money back. (117) OK?' (118) 'OK.'

14-(119) I.. (120) I don't believe.
15- (121) So.. (122) two or three years ago.. (123) I was in a club, (124) in a party, (125) a::nd.. (126) I don't know anybody. (127) I was alone.

16- (128) And I sit in a table, (129) to look.. (130) the the party.
17- (131) So.. (132) a man.. (133) now he he has a.. (134) a bear.. (T.: A beard.) (135) a beard, (136) and he was.. (137) eh.. (138) more fat, (139) and. (140) he:: he looked to me, (141) and I looked to him, (142) and.. (143) continued to look the the party.

18- (144) And he.. (145) he asked me (146) 'Do you want a drink of beer?'
19- (147) And I look.. (148) 'No no no. (149) Thank you'.
20- (150) And.. (151) 'No. (152) Come on. (153) Let's drink some beer'.
21- (154) 'No no, (155) thank you.(T.: I'm sorry. I missed this. You were in a party?)

22- (156) Yes. (OK.) (157) Two or three years later. (Yes)
23- (158) And.. (159) but I want buy.. (160) I want give you beers. (161) I want to drink with you.

24- (162) And I looked.. (163) and he looked to my eyes. (164) Inside my eyes. (165) And I think (166) he is a "homossexual", (167) a::nd.. (168) he:: .. (169) asked me.. (170) many times..

25- (171) "eu" (172) 'OK. (173) Let's..' (174) 'Hey! (175) waiter. (176) Give me beers.'

26- (177) Hmm. One beer, (178) two beers, (179) three beers, (180) four, (181) five, (182) six, (183) I don't know.

27- (184) And I.. (185) 'OK er.. (186) I'm go away.. (187) because I don't have eh.. (enough money) (188) enough enough money to.. (189) l.. (190) I don't have money. (191) OK? [------]

28- (192) And 'No no. (193) I I will..(pay) (194) pay.. (195) every.. (196) every beers.. (197) all of the beers'.

29- (198) And.. (199) he asked me.. (200) 'Do you don't remember me?'
30- (201) 'No no. (202) What's your name?'
31- (203) And he tell me.. (204) and.. (205) eh.. (206) 'because er.. (207) two or three years ago, (208) I was.. (209) eh.. (210) in Madalena.. (211) square, (212) and you.. (213) send me money.. (214) lend me money.. (215) to buy a fish'.

32- (216) So I remembered (217) and I don't believe but.. (218) he.. (219) the beard.. (T.: You couldn't recognize him in the beard) (220) Yes. (221) In the beard.

33- (222) OK. (223) He gave me the money..

T13
1- (1) Erm.. (2) erm... (S.: Have you ever had an accident?) (3) Yes. (4) I have a LOT of accidents. (R.: A lot of accidents?!)(5) Yes I have a lot of accidents.

2- (6) Er.. (7) one of them.. (8) I was.. (9) I was er.. (10) in a on the street. (11) It's a bike. (12) And it was raining a lot.

3-(13) I was er.. (14) what! (15) I was ten years.. (16) ten years old.. (17) or.. (18) eleven.. (19) something like that and I was.. (20) running a lot.

4- (21) And the.. (22) When I was.. (23) getting on getting in a street.. (24) a new street. (25) I stayed in front of a kombi. (------)

5- (26) Yes. (27) That's right.
6- (28) And I fall down and I stayed er.. (29) what? (T..Unconscious?) (30) unconscious for.. (31) for one hour.. (32) something like that.

7- (33) I broke my arm, (34) and..
8a- (35) Oh my God! (36) It was terrible because.. (37) it was er.. (38) there was just TWO DAYS for the weekend, (39) and I was ALMOST going to Pitimbu.

9-(40) Pitimbu is the beach that I.. (41) took my vacation.
8b- (42) And[i].. (43) it was terrible. (44) In the start of my vacation, (45) II had (46) I had had an accident. (Was there anybody there to help you?)

10-(47) Yes , (48) in the kombi. [----]
11- (49) Another day, (50) another accident,(laugh) [laugh] (51) me and my.. (52) me and another.. (53) and my another cousin, (54) we were.. (55) we were playing with.. (56) guns, (57) and he.. (58) he shoot me.

12- (59) Yes I have a lot (S.: He shot you?) (60) Yes. (61) He shot me. (S.: Or you shot him?) (62) No. (63) He shot me. (64) I was the [-----] (laugh)

13- (65) I have yet .. (66) a lot of er...(T.: Scars?) (67) Not scars but.. (68) little.. (69) little spheres. (----) (70) Yeah.

14- (71) My father.. (72) in that time, (73) my father er.. (74) hunting.. (75) 'how how can I say that?' (T: he was a hunter?) (76) Yes. (77) He was a hunter. (78) He was hunting, (79) and er.. (80) he had er:: (81) a gun with.. (82) there is a.. (83) a special a special gun for.. (84) for birds. (85) There are a lot of spheres. (86) Spheres of metal inside the cart er.. (87) it's hard to say.

15-(88) And er.. (89) and there are fourty-five [---] (90) There are fourty-five spheres of metal (91) inside me now. (92) Exactly now. (93) Yes, (94) there is. (T.: You mean little balls of powder?)

16-(95) Hmhm. (96) Of powder. (S.: You can explode any moment?)
17- (97) No. (98) I'm sure. (laugh) (S.: Is that all?)
18- (99) Yes. (100) I suppose. (101) Of course. (102) Otherwise [---] (103) It's enough.

T14
1- (1) I was in an airplane.. (2) from.. (3) São Paulo to Argentina. (4) So.. (5) in the plane.. (6) there was... (7) Almost everybody was.. (8) Argentina (R.: Argentinian) (9) Argentinian.

2- (10) So I was.. (11) I:: .. (12) was going to the:: bathroom.. (13) and there was a.. (14) "fila" (R.:queue) (15) a queue.

3- (16) So.. (17) I.. (18) | passed.. (19) stepped in the foot of a man.

4- (20) So the man looked at me and I said "gracias". (21) It was the only thing that I know, (22) in [------].

5- (23) So then he looked at me with an angry.. (24) with an angry face, (25) and then I was not understanding.. (26) what was angry.

6- (27) So l.. (28) I came back for.. (29) for my seat.. (30) without understanding.

7- (31) And after.. (32)। started to think about it.
8- (33) After I discovered, (34) I started to laugh. (35) A lot. (36) I was alone in the seat. (37) I started to laugh.

T15
1- (1) I was with my family.. (2) in a.. (3) airplane, (4) we.. (5) we were.. (6) ok coming back. (7) From United States.

2- (8) We went.. (9) with..(10) GDN..(11) company.
3- (12) And[i].. (13) when we arrived at São Paulo, (14) because.. (15) we came from.. (16) United States, (17) and we will.. (18) eh "escalar"!? (T.: Stop.) (19)"Como?" (Stop) (20) in.. (21) São Paulo. (22) So.. (23) we.. (24) The:: (25)"eita danou-se". (26)"Aeromoca". (T.: Flight attendant.) (27) flight attendant. (28) Said that we arrived in Brazil.. (29) everybody.. (30) from here.. (31)"né".. (32) began to:: (33) "jogar travesseiro ". (34) Everybody.

4- (35) Because we were in a problem. (36) I don't know if you saw the problem.. (37) from the GDN.. (38) company. (......)

5- (39) And when we arrived here.. (40) in Brazil.. (41) everybody.. (42) "com a maior zona". (laughs) (43) How can I say? (T.: Was happy!)

6- (44) And the flight attendant.. (45) eh.. (46)"anunciou" (------) (47) said in the:: (T.: Microphone.) (48) microphone to-.. (49) we stop.. (50) the things that we are doing. (51) We were doing.

T16
1- (1) Last week [-----] (2) last week, (3) I and my fiance, (4) went to visit one friend. (5) He was operated..

2- (6) Then when we arrived, (7) my.. (8) fiance knocked the door, (9) and the.. (10) this friend[i] (11)[8].

3-(12) Then my fiance (13)'Oh You are very THIN, (15) you are very WHITE.' (16) And the man looked to him stayed [-----] (17) very...(T: Scared?)

4- (18) Then my fiance looked to the.. (19) scar, (20) and[i] he passing very BAD. (21) He:: start to stay white and [laugh] very.. (22) bad.

5- (23) Then I looked to my fiance (24)'OH MY GOD!' (25) I.. (26) stayed.. (T: Nervous?) (27) nervous.

6- (28) And the man looked to him (29) and[i] said (30)'What are happening?' (31) And[i].. (32) he didn't answer. (33) And[i].. (34) my fiance \{gesture\} (T:Fainted?) (35) Fainted. [laugh]

7- (36) And was a bad situation [laugh] to me.
8- (37) After he.. (38) returned to.. (39) to normal, [laugh] (40) and we:: went to:: (41) our our home. (42) And don't visit the man.

T17
1- (1) My name's Georgeton (2) and (3) two years ago, (4) I was held up.
2- (4) I I left (5) my work, (6) at six-thirty.. (7) in the evening, (8) and then I went to er:: (9) a public telephone, (8) called my family, (9) and afterwards (10) I was walking to the bus stop (11) and two guys (12) came and (13) beated me very strong.

3-(14) I spent three days in a hospital, (15) and two weeks without coming to the university.

4- (16) Then I got very frustrated and er (17) afraid of er black guys. (18) Because both were black.

T18
1- (1) When I was (2) eh (3) when I was ten, (4) er (5) I finished the:: (6) the class (7) in (8) December.

2- (9) So my:: (10) my vacation was in Cabedelo. (11) In Paraíba.
3- (12) So I'm (13) I'm went there (14) with my cousin. (15) Called Renata. (16) And we stayed at Renata's.. (17) eh (18) no. (19) Renata's no. ... (20) Renata's father's house. (T.: Yes.) (21) We (22) we stayed Renata's father's house.

4- (23) So we passed the::re (24) abo::ut (25) twenty year.. (26) "Ou." (27) Twenty year, (28) no. (29) Twenty days. (30) Twenty days.

5- (31) And the:: (32) the:: (33) the house is very near the beach (34) and everyday (35) we go (36) we went to the beach (37) and joy.. (38) we:: (39) we didn't.. (T: Played?)

6- (40) We played all things.
7- (41) So (42) one day on (43) this vacation (44) we go to the the beach without (45) eh his father (46) eh her father (47) and her.. (mother-in-law) (48) mother-in-law? (49) Mother-in law. (50) Anyone (51) eh (52) didn't didn't know (53) what we are doing. (54) We're doing without[i]... (----) ... (55) So we:: (56) went to the beach (57) without permission, (58) OK? (59) And nobody know (60) that we are in the beach.

8- (61) We go about three (62) three o'clock (63) p.m. (64) And when we are in the (65) in the beach (66) we began began to:: (67) to play.

9- (68) And come (69) came er:: (70) a man (71) that is a soldier. (72) A soldier. (73) And began to:: (74) to play with us.

10- (75) So (76) er (77) the man started (78) to hold[i].. (79) hold us (80) and throw (81) and start to:: (82) backwards. (83) And the (84) we began (85) to do it (86) it (87) many many times.

11- (88) So (89) the last time (90) that I I do that (91) I broke my (92) my leg. (93) My leg, (94)no. (95) My arm. (96) And[i] my arm began to (T: Swollen.) (97) swallow and the (98) this soldier took me (99) in this hold (100) in his hold (101) in his arm (102) and (103) eh (104) let me (105) to the hospital.

12- (106) We went to the first hospital (107) don't.. (T: No acceptance.) (108) No accept (109) because it's a public (110) hospital.

13- (111) I'm (112) we went to the second (113) and too, (114) don't acc accept us.

14- (115) And we had to go to:: (116) João Pessoa, (117) not in Cabedelo. (118) To João Pessoa, (119) to:: accept us.

15- (120) And I [miming] (T: I had a plaster cast put on my arm. Plaster cast) (121) And the.. (122) after.. (123) one day after (124) I had to operate my (125) my arm. (126) And I operate them (127) three times.

16- (128) I stay with the:: (129) plaster (130) in my arm (131) four months (132) and I (133) do.. (T: Physiotherapy.) (134) physiotherapy one year.

17-(135) Just.

T19
1- (1) Er (2) it was in my life a great er (3) history (4) about er (5) eighteen years ago. (6) When I was young.. (7) yet.

2- (8) The group er (9) a group of er (T.: You still are) (10) Yes you're right. (11) And er (12) a group of er (13) Gospel preachers (14) got to my home (15) and they preached er (16) the good news to our family.

3- (17) And the.. (18) I.. (19) was very surPRISed. (20) With the (21) their methods, (22) right? (23) About the good news. (24) Eh.. (25) where eh.. (26) they spoke about er (27) the Lord God (28) when.. (29) gave er (30) his son Jesus Christ (31) to save o our sins.

4a- (32) And on that day
5-(33) it's a very great experience in my life
4b-(34) I accepted Jesus as my Saviour (35) a::nd this is wonderful (36) for me (37) until now and forever.

6- (38) OK. (39) That's all.

T20
1- (1) One night (2) eh (3) my mother and I (4) were watching television. (5) A::nd (6) it was a (7) horror movie. (8) With ghosts.. (9) I don't know.

2- (10) A::nd.. (11) my mother, (12) as usual, (13) was sleeping. (14) And I told her, (15)'er eh (16) I will turn off the television (17) because you are sleeping.

3- (18) And she said to me: (19)'No, (20) I I'm not sleeping. (21) I'm not sleeping.'

4- (22)'OK. (23) I.. (24) go to my bedroom. (25) When I come back, (26) if you are sleeping, (27) eh still, (28) I turn off the television.'

5- (29) Eh (30) then I go to my bedroom, (31) when I came back, (32) she was sleeping.

6- (33) And I (34) I was wearing er:: (T:Night gown.) (35) night "camisola". (T: Night gown.) (36) Ah! (37) Night gown. (38) And I stand.. (39) I stand by (40) in front of the television (41) and look at her (42) like this. [miming] (43) And (44) she (45) she awake (46) and scream.

7- (47) I think (48) she thought (49) that I was a ghost. (50) And she screamed very much [ah ah ah]. (51) And I jumped over her (52) because I was scared too.

T21
1- (1) Last week I (2) I went to the.. (3) laboratory (4) to make some.. (5) exams (6) And.. (7) in the way I passed (8) behind the Cemiterio of Santo Amaro.

2- (9) When I was in front of the gate, (10) I looked at (11) cemetery (12) and I saw a man (13) who is coming to me, (14) with no pants, (15) nothing [laugh](--------)

3- (16) Yes. (17) And I.. (18) began to run.. (19) to run away from him.
4- (20) And I spent three days (21) having nightmares with this man. (22) Three days. (23) Three nights.

T22
1- (1) Well, (2) when I was thirteen years old, (3) no [---](4) er (5) twelve. (6) Twelve years old, (7) [laugh] I was in.. (8) Fortaleza, (9) Ceará, (10)[laugh] and I am.. (11) I was.. (12) with my.. (13) boyfriend.

2- (14) But my.. (15) my father.. (16) didn't know.. (17) that I was a boyfriend.
3- (18) That I... (19) Then I.. (20) I was kissing.. [laugh] (21) and and he..(22) he came, (23) and and see (24) and saw.. (25) all (S.: Everything) (26) He saw everything (27) that I'm doing. (28) I'm did. (29) I'm did. (30) That I did.

4- (31) Then eh.. (32) he he s (33) "como e"? [---] (34) Then he.. (35) he talked to me, (36) to:: .. (37) to go away.

5-(38) (S: Were you at home?) Yes. (What happened to the boy? What did he do?) (39) What did he do? (40) He talked to to the boy, (41) and he never [laughter] (R: He never came again?) (42) He never came again. [laugh]

T23
1- (1) Eh (2) last semestre, (3) I (4) was [laugh] mm (5) show showing a (6) a work (7) in the class [laugh] (8) to eh (9) English 8A, (10) do you understand?

2- (11) And I (12) I [laugh] (13) I was very nervous, (14) and (15) and[i] (16) I was.. (17) in front of my.. (18) my friends. (---) (19) And I (20) I'm[i] (21) how can I say (22)"enrolada"? [laugh] (in trouble) (23) I was VERy in trouble.

3- (24) And and l.. (25) I read.. (26) and speak for.. (27) my friends. (28) And[i].. (29) my paper.. (30) it's flying. (31) And I I[---] (32) Sorry. (33) And I (34) I read (35) and speak (36) and flying again..[laugh] (37) and my friends eh (R:laughing?) (38) Laughing very much.

4- (39)And I'm very .. (40)l'm very.. (S: embarrassed?) (41) Yes. (42) Embarrassed (43) and[i] (44) but[i] (45) | (R: continued?) (46) Continued (47) and and[i].. (it was OK?)

5-(48) I don't think it were OK but...

1- (1) I went to a party (2) er a birthday party (3) and I met.. (4) a friend, (5) that I didn't see, (6) a long time ago, (7) and I TALKed a lot with him, (8) everybody was talking (9)'[tsh tsh]. (10) Oh look that! (11) Look that!'

2- (12) I didn't (13) perceive that.. (14) and.. (15) er.. (6) a friend, (17) a girl. (18) er was all the time looking.. (19) me.. (20) and with a angry face, (21) I didn't know why! [laugh] (22) I was just talking.. [laugh] (23) with him...

3- (24) a::nd (25) and when I go.. (26) when I.. (27) went to.. (28) to my home, (29) my my sister said.. (30) 'she is angry with you. (31) You took.. (32) her.. (33) almost..(34) boyfriend'.

4- (35) And.. (36) I didn't perceive it.. (37) isn't funny? (38) 'Cause er (39) er (40) she was talking with us.. (41) a::nd all the time, (42) walking to me, (43) with a angry face, (44) and I didn't know why. [laugh] (45) I was just talking with a friend, (46) that I didn't see, (47) a long time ago.

T25
1- (1) Er.. (2) I remember once.. (3) when I was (4) about.. (5) seventeen years old, (6) and I (7) I used to go to.. (8) my.. (9) grandmother.. (10) house, (11) and stay stay there.. (12) er.. (13) how can I say (14)"o dia todo?" (S.: All day.) (15) All day.

2- (16) And once I was.. (17) playing with a.. (18) chicken son, (19) a small (19) a small chicken. (chick) (20) Chick. (21) OK. (22) I was playing with the chicken, (23) a::nd.. (24) I made (25) I made it as my (26) as (27) it was my my children, (28) my own children, [laugh] (29) so I I hit him, (30) hit it a lot, (31) OK, [laugh] (-----) (32) I hit it a lot, (33) until he died. [laugh] (-----)

3- (34) When it.. (35) when the chick died, (36) I put.. (37) I put the chick between er:: (38) wall (39) and a.. (40) something as er (41) a tank? (42) OK?

4- (43) And the day (44) after, (45) my grandmother (46) went to.. (47) to back of the house (48) and see the chick [laugh] (49) there, (50) so (51) he he call (52)
she called me, (53) and said (54)'Oh Vanessa! (55) Look.. (56) at the chick. (57) He's.. (58) it's died.'

5- (59)'Oh little chick!', [laugh] (60) I said to her. (61)'Oh little chick! (62) Please grandmother, (63) let me..' (64) how can I say (65)"enterrá-lo?" (S.: Bury). (66)'Let me bury it.' [laugh]

6-(67) It's enough.

T26
1- (1) The the story was about (2) a embarrassing story.
2- (3) I wa::s (4) in the bus (5) and[i] (6) the bus was very crowded.
3- (7) Then a.. (8) there was er (9) a boy (10) that I thought (11) he was (12) a friend of mine. (13) The (14) the boy was very.. (15) similar, (16) and[i] (17) when $\mathrm{I}:$ : (18) I asked.. (19) I call (20) call him (21) and (22)'João!'

4- (23)'And[i] (24) he look at (25) he look at for me, (26) and[i] (27)she he [laugh] (28) he look at with er (29) a strange.. (30) er face, (31) then I (32)'Oh my God! (33) I thought you were (34) a friend of mine!'

5- (35) And he look at for me, (36)'Oh no! (37) My name is not João.'
6- (38)'OK. (39) Sorry. (40) Because you you are very (41) eh (42) similar (43) my [--] a friend of mine.' (44) Oh. (45) No problem. [laugh]

7- (46) And the bus was crowded (47) and everybody look at me. [laugh] (48) I [---] very embarrassing. (---) (49) Yes.

## Control Group

## C1

1- (1) My name's Izelma, (2) and er (3) I will tell you (4) an embarrassing situation (5) when I was going to.. (6) by bus to (7) to Salvador, (8) Bahia, (9) and er (10) when the bus stopped at the er (11) what they call (12)"ponto de apoio" of..
(13) er (14) Itapemirim company, (15) when it[i].. (16) when the bus stopped there, (17) it was er (18) raining a lot, (19) it was (20) I think (21) midnight, (22) and I:: (23) get off the bus, (24) and went to the:: .. (25) snack bar.

2- (26) And there was a big.. (27) er (28) how can I say that? (R: pool?) (29) Not pool but.. (30) the sidewalk was full of water (31) and I (32) I didn't want (33) to pass near a man (34) that was sitting (35) in the shadow, (36) so I preferred to go (37) through the water, (38) and in the middle of it (39) I fall down frrrrr (40) in the (41) in the water.. (42) in the .. (43) at this [------].

3- (44) People ran to.. (45) take me up (46) and I said (47)'Oh no. (48) I don't need. (49) I'm hard to falling.. (50) to falling and'..

4- (51) OK.

C 2
1- (1) My name's J., (2) well the only.. (3) personal experience, (4) that I can think of (5) is not something funny, (6) it happened a couple of years ago.

2- (7) (Probably tragic.) Yeah. (8) Sort of.
3- (9) You know (10) I had a.. (11) motorcycle accident,(12) without knowing how to ride a bi a motorcycle.

4- (13) And er.. (14) yeah..
5- (15) But I was very fun.. (16) er I was very.. (17) lucky..
6- (18) that time er I was.. (19) in my house.. (20) with er.. (21) my cousin and my brother.

7- (22) So we were supposed to go downtown.
8- (23) I live at at Estreito. (24) Right. (25) In the continent. 9- (26) It was a Saturday night, (27) around eleven, (28) eleven-thirty, (29) we were supposed to go downtown, (30) to go to.. (31) a night-club.. (32) er have some good time (33) a::nd er:: (34) well we we were supposed to go by car.

10- (35) The problem was that I.. (36) while I we were in our house.. (37) in my house you know?

11- (38) My cousin was supposed to go to his house, (39) to get to get the car, (40) and go downtown. (41) But er (42) he was with his motorcycle. (43) So I had I had to go with him (44) as a passenger. (45) OK?

12- (46) And in.. (47) in a space I would say er.. (48) not one kilometer.. (49) everything happened, (50) (----) from my house up to::

13- (51) I don't know if everybody knows Estreito, (52) more or less here (53) no? (54) No? (55) OK. (56) Only you. (57) Yes. (58) Yeah.

14- (59) And in the meantime (60) you know? [(61) It was.. (62) we left.. (63) our house around.. (64) eleven.] (65) I think everything might happen.. (66) elevenfive something. (67) In five minutes. (68) Everything happened.

15- (69) We were supposed to go to his house, (70) pick up the car (71) and go downtown.

16- (72) And I was I was I was not wearing any protection. (73) Any helmet. (74) Because I was the passenger. (75) So didn't have any. (76) And he had his own.

17- (77) And er (78) we we were crossing a certain street, (79) it was.. (80) there was not traffic at all. (81) It was eleven. (82) But.. (83) and a car crossed our way and hit (84) er (85) the back part of the motorcycle (86) exactly where I was. (87) And made it spin like this (88) and I was THROWN to the sidewalk. (89) About.. (90) ten er.. (91) ten meters (92) around ten meters.

18- (93) I just had er.. (94) a broken leg here. (95) But I didn't have any any injury. (96) Thank God. (97) Any any injury in the arms, (98) and er in the back, (99) or in the head, (100) but he.. (101) although he was wearing a a helmet (102) but the helmet (103) I don't know what might have happened. (104) I just know that he.. (105) lost the helmet before.. (106) during the the crash. (107) OK?

19- (108) And he hit his head, (109) on the.. (110) on the asphalt, (111) on the street, (112) he had a serious brain (113) er damage, (114) injury, (115) he was taken to the hospital, (116) I I thought he was about to die (117) but.. (118) fortunately (119) later on he.. (120) recovered and..

20- (121) I said er (122) it was not so serious fracture, (123) but er (124) I would say.. (125) three (126) I just took about three or six (127) three or four days in at the hospital.

21- (128) And the funny thing about it (129) when I tell people about it (130) they say (131) 'Are you still riding motorcycles?' (laugh)

22-[---] (132) I never did. (133) Yeah.
23- (How's your cousin?) (134) OK. (135) He's he's all right now (136) er (137) but er (138) he's taking er (139) a medicine, (140) very strong medicine. (141) Called Gard (Gardenal!)

24- (142) He has some er 'sequelas' (143) and he had er (144) broken teeth (-----)

C3
1- (1) My name's Célia, (2) and l'd like to tell you:: ..(3) a kind of (4) bad experience (5) that happened to me yesterday.[laugh]

2- (6) My boy-friend and I were coming from a restaurant, (7) a::nd er (8) we were on a.. (9) we thought it was a main.. (10) erm.. (11) street (12) or avenue whatever, (13) [laugh] and er (14) and then we were at a.. (15) we were going slowly, (16) but er.. (17) we didn't observe that there wa::s (18) a a truck coming.

3- (19) A::nd we thought our.. (20) we had the way, (21) but we didn't. [laugh]
4- (22) So this car (23) this truck, (24) hit us, (25) in the the front part of the car, (26) we were we were (27) it was a surprise, (28) and we were scared for a moment, (29) but then.. (30) Paulo went out of the car, (31) and he was all right, (32)he didn't get hurt, (33) but erm (34) his car, (35) was pretty:: (36) bad (37) badly damaged.

5- (38) And so he took a look at the car, [laugh] (39) and the other car too, (40) but er (41) ours wa::s (42) worse.

6- (43) And erm (44) and so it was AWful (45) because you know (46) it's interesting (47) how people GAther.

7a- (48) Suddenly there there was noBODy! (49) At the street. (50) NoBODy!

8- (51) It was eleven-thirty, (52) I guess.
7b- (53) SUDdenly (54) I don't know where (54) ALL those men came from. (56) You know [laugh] (57) and everybody looking at you.

9- (58) It was awful. (59) Very awful.
10- (60) And then.. (61) we had to leave the car, (62) at a friend's house, (63) and then (64) get a ride, (65) and then (66) get a taxi, (67) bu::t (68) we were thankful nobody got hurt. (69) But erm (70) we we::re (71) we thought (72) we didn't need this.

## C4

1- (1) All right. (2) OK so er (R.: Your name?) (3) A. (4) A. (5) So C. and I (6) we are room-mates. (7) And we live with another girl (8) who's called Solange, (9) and er (10) one of these days, (11) we were er (12) just trying to have some fun, (13) and we decided to roleplay something (14) very very funny.

2- (15) And er [laugh] (16) so er (17) Celia Celia and I (18) we know how it worked, (19) but Solange the the third girl, (20) who lives with us, (21) she didn't know how it worked. (22) So for her it would be very funny. (23) But (24) what happened, (25) ended up being very funny for me (26) I think [laugh] (---) 3- (27) Erm (28) we had to to be er (29) to get inside of one, (30) only one shirt, (31) yeah (32) me and Celia, (33) yeah, (34) and er roleplay er (35) a small man, (36) and to (37) say something very funny, (38) and then erm.. (39) I was laughing so much (40) you know [laugh] (41) that I thought I thought like peeing.

4- (42) And I said (43) 'Oh I have to pee! (44) And she wouldn't get out of that shirt, (45) and we were together (46) you know. (47) And I pee-ed my pants.

5- (48) And we were (49) you know (50) just together in that shirt [laugh] (laugh) (51) and it is so funny. (52) Terrible..

6- (53) yeah [--] (54) sorry. (R.: What about the other, the third one? She was just..)

7- (55) She was dying, (56) yeah! (She must be rolling on the floor.) (57) Yeah!

8-(58) Well, (59) that's all I have to tell.

C5
1- (1) Well my name's Débora. (2) OK. (3) And I::'m.. (4) The experience I'm going to tell i::s (5) when I went to England (6) when er (7) I used to live there (8) some years ago.

2- (9) When I went there, (10) my ex-husband was already there (11) waiting for me.

3- (12) And I couldn't speak any English then. (13) No words.
4- (14) A::nd (15) so l:: had some papers, (16) (----) my passport, (17) all the documents, (18) but I was very scared (19) because I didn't know (20) what would happen (21) when I got there. (22) At the immigration. (23) Because I I wouldn't be able to communicate (24) with the people there (25) because I couldn't speak any English.

5- (26) So eh (27) during the flight (28) I tried to to TALK (29) to to somebody (30) inside the plane (31) to see if I could find somebody to help me out.

6- (32) And there was this Jewish man (33) who is actually a British man. (34) But he:: (35) comes to South America regularly (36) because he deals in in diamonds. (37) So he buys diamonds here.

7- (38) And he speaks Spanish. (39) So I I could talk with him.
8- (40) And I asked him if he could help me. (41) But he was very weird.
9- (42) It was my first contact with a British person. (43) It was very weird.
10- (44) And he said OK, (45) that he would try to help me (46) when we got there.

11- (47) And all of a sudden, (48) during the flight, (49) he took erm (50) some kind of er (51) shawl, (52) from his bag, (53) and a kind of hat, (54) and he he improvised (55) a kind of altar (56) you know (57) just in front of him. (58) And he started praying.

12- (59) Because (60) actually (61) it was Friday (62) and it seems to be sort of er (63) holy day for them (64) and he had to pray (65) at a certain time.

13- (66) And so he prayed (67) and that shocked me already. (68) Because I couldn't understand a word (69) he was saying (70) and he was doing all these gestures and things.

14- (71) And when we:: (72) finally got there (73) after twelve hour (74) a fourteen:: hours flight, (75) I was very tired (76) very nervous (77) then I asked him if he could help me (78) and he said (79) 'Well I don't know (80) if I can help you because (81) I have to hurry (82) because I have to be home (83) at four o'clock before the sun sets.

15- (84) And it was December (85) and the sun sets (86) very early (87) during the winter.

16-(88) And he said that he had to be very early at home (89) because eh (90) in his religion (91) you cannot be:: outside on a Friday evening. (92) You have to be at home in order to pray (93) or whatever you have to do.

17- (94) So he just ran away [laugh] (95) and he left me there (96) in the middle of nowhere (97) and I didn't know what.. (98) he was my only hope. (99) I didn't know what am I going to do now!

18- (100) And so I went (101) with the rest of the the herd (102) the rest of the herd, (103) and we had to go through this very (104) erm humiliating queue (105) because you know (-----) (106) you have been in England. (107) Eh Europeans, (108) and Americans (109) and Australians (110) they have a special queue for them (111) which is very quick (112) and they they don't have to answer many questions etc, (113) but Latin Americans (114) and Africans, (115) all Third World people, (116) they have to queue up for ages, (117) and they have to answer (118) loads of questions.

19- (119) And I got scared (120) and scared (121) and scared.
20- (122) And and eventually I couldn't speak with the woman. (123) Cause when I got there (124) I was the last one (125) and I couldn't say a word.

21-(126) And was very embarrassing.

22- (127) A::nd they had to call my husband. (128) Because he could speak some English. (129) Already. (130) Because he had been there for.. (131) some months.

23- (132) A::nd (133) he came a::nd helped me out.
24- (134) And in the end, (135) she:: discovered (136) I we discovered. (137) I had a letter from the the British eh:: (138) consulate in Rio, (139) explaining why I was going to England, (140) to join my husband etc.

25- (141) And if I had shown this letter the very beginning, (142) everything would have been OK. (143) But my my lack of knowledge, (144) about the language (145) was so.. (146) great, (147) that I couldn't eve::n (148) you know? (149) And I was so nervous (150) that I couldn't show them the the letter.

26- (151) And in the end, (152) it took me hours to get out out of the immigration.

27- (153) And eventually everything was OK. (154) She gave me three years eh 'visto'.

28- (155) But this was very embarrassing. (156) Very.. (157) sort of eh nervous experience.

29- (158) Afterwards I laughed. (159) A lot. (160) About it.
30-(161) OK.

C6
1a- (1) Well I I can.. (2) it's not really (3) something that (4) I can remember.. (R.: Your name?)

2- (5) OK. (6) Maria de Lourdes. (7) I was.. (8) I was born in Portugal.]
1b- (9) And then er (10) this is a story (11) I've been told many times (12) and then (13) it's something that I think (14) it's really.. (15) for me it is funny.

3- (16) Er my father my father came er (17) before us. (18) Before my mother and my sister and I .

4- (19) And er:: (20) it happened that (21) when she was pregnant, (22) when I was to be born, (23) he was here already.

5- (24) And then (25) I I met my father (26) when I wa::s (27) three.
6- (28) We spent three hours in Port (29) three three years in Portugal and (30) my father was already here.

7- (31) So er:: (32) my mother used to show me pictures. (33) This is your father. (34) This is your father. [----] (35) OK!

8- (36) When we came to (37) when we arrived in Rio, (38) and we were still $0:: n$ (39) on the ship, (40) there was a problem and the ship couldn't .. (41) er my father was so anxious to see us (42) that he:: (43) he took a boat (44) to meet us. (laugh)

9- (45) Then they.. [(46) Imagine the scene.] (47) He was.. (48) my sister he already knew knew. (49) But he was to KNOW me. (50) He was about to know his (51) his daughter.

10- (52) So he came to:: (53) to hug me (54) and kiss me, (55) and I reSISTed. (56) I didn't want it.

11- (57) And then my my mother said (58) eh 'It's your FAther. (59) KISS him!'
12- (60) And then I said (61)'NO! (62) That's not my FAther!'
13- (63) And then er (64) he was very:: (65) surprised, (66) because you know that (67) Portuguese are KNOWN (68) for his their preference (69) for 'mulata'. (70) A::nd er:: (71) so there was a a a kind of a very confusing situation, (71) because my father was thinking (72)'Well (73) who's her father then (74) if not me? (75) What has she been doing?'

14- (76) And (77) so the the thing wa::s (78) er embarrassing.
15- (79) And then my $f$ my mother said (80)'No. (81) It's your FAther!'
16-(82) Then I said (83)'No. (84) My father is made of paper.' (85) [----] relief.
17-(86) That's the idea of a father (87) I had. (R.: umhum)
(laughs) [-----]. That's the idea of a father I had. (hmhm)

C7
1- (1) My name's M, (2) and er (3) I wouldn't say (4) it was an embarrassing situation, (5) but I had a very sad situation, (6) three years ago, (7) it was Easter time, (8) actually it was (9) Easter Sunday, (10) and I was coming back (11) from Maceio, (12) I had spent a week there, (13) and when I came back home (14) about midnight, (15) I:: (16) found that my house.. (17) had been (18) robbed.

2-(19) I mean (20) somebody had got (21) inside the house, (22) had took the TV set, (23) a::nd er (24) not money, (25) but a few objects.

3- (26) A::nd er (27) at the moment of the robbery (28) my father was at home, (29) but he didn't see anything (30) and he couldn't hear (31) any strange noise, (32) he was sleeping.

4- (33) What I think (34) was quite nice. (35)'Cause when he woke up (36) everything was already done (37) but.. (38) er.. (39) they did no harm to him, (40) so I think [----] (41) but I think (42) it's (43) horrible (44) when you get inside your house (45) and you see (46) that some strange people (47) have been there... (Right. Was it only you and your father?)

5- (48) At that time (49) it was my father, (50) my sister and me.
6- (51) And er (52) they got inside (53) only inside MY room, (54) I don't know why, (55) he didn't take anything (56) from my sister's bedroom (57) or from my father's bedroom (58) but just from mine. (59) Probably 'cause (60) it's the first one.

C8
1- (1) I'm going to tell you (2) about an embarrassing ..(3) situation.
2- (4) Let's see if I can.. (5) remember.
3- (6) I.. (7) was coming back (8) from the beach, (9) and er (10) there was.. (11) a man who was.. (12) walking just (13) er (14) behind me.

4- (15) And I hadn't noticed (16) that he was looking at me (17) or anything like that, (18) but [-----] (19) he (20) went (21) after me, (22) until very near my house, (23) er (24) I think (25) two streets before.. (26) mine, (27) and he took a car, (28) at
this point, (29) and he went straight.. (30) on this.. (31) along this street. (32) And he passed (33) my street. (34) OK?

5- (35) When I (36) arrived (37) in front of my (38) house, (39) he came back (40) and he stopped (41) in front of the house, (42) OK? (43) And he called me.

6 - (44) He (45) er (46) asked (47) asked me (48) if I could help him (49) to find (50) er (51) another house (52) and he asked (53) he told me (54) the number of a house (55) and he asked me (56) if I knew (57) where it was.

7- (58) So (59) when I got near (60) to the car, (61) he:: (62) took a gun, (63) and he told me (64) not to run and (65) not to shout (66) and er (67) and he asked me (68) to give him er.. (69) a bracelet (70) that I $h(71)$ I had.

8- (72) Well, (73) I looked at my arm, (74) and didn't have any bracelet.
9 - (75) I began (76) to run away, (77) and to shout (78) and he:: (79) escaped.
( S : You had no bracelet?)
10- (80) No. (81) I think (82) he wanted me (83) to enter his car (84) or something like this. [---] (S: Were you in front of your house already?)

11- (85) Yes. (86) Just in front of my house,(87) yes, (88) the door was open, (89) so I just (90) entered the house, (91) you know.

12- (92) It was horrible.

C9
1- (1) This story's about (2) this story's about (3) erm (4) F.'s cousin. (5) She's a very funny person. (6) A::nd her looks (7) is very funny too. (8)She's very tall. (F.: She used to be. Right? Because now she's a protestant.(This was uttered at the same time as (8).))

2- (9) Well, (10) she used to be.
3- (11) Anyway. (P.: Who's this, N.?) (12) F.'s cousin. (13) She's very tall, (14)(-----) She's very tall, (15) right? (16) And at the time (17) she used to go from Olinda to (18) er FOPE in:: (Camaragibe) (19)Camaragibe. (20) Right? (21) So it's a long way.

4- (22) She had to wake up (23) very early in the morning. (24) And it was a long way in the bus. (25) Can you imagine it?

5- (26) So she (27) er (28) started (29) She she was in the bus (30) and she fell asleep. (31) Right?

6-(32) And after (33) a long time, (34) a long long time, (35) when she woke up, (36) she had her her head (37) on someone's shoulder, (38) and this person (39) this short guy (40) sitting next to her (41) had his (42) No. (43) He had (44) not not her. (45)He had he had his head (46)on her shoulder, (47)and she had her head on his head. (Other participants contribute: "her head on his head". They say this at the same time as the teller.)

7- (48) And then she woke up (49) and she said (50)'Hey sir'.
(51) Yes. (52)'Hey sir! (53) You're sleeping on my.. shoulder. (54) You know (55) and everybody on the bus start started laughing. (56) And it was really.. hilarious. (That's it?)

8- (57) That's it.

C10
1- (1) We had a competition. (2) In my school. (3) Between classes. (4) A::nd er (5) we were going to swim.

2- (6) So (7) er (8) I I had a cold. (9) So I couldn't swim.
3- (10) Then I asked, (11) a friend of mine, (12) if she could swim (13) for me.
4- (14) And she said (15)'Oh that's OK. (16) In Brasilia, (17) when I lived in Brasilia, (18)I did everything'.

5- (19) She (20) ail the time she did (21)in Brasilia, (22) because we didn't know.

6- (23) So she said, (24) I swim very well. (25) So, (26) it's going to be fine. (27) A::nd we trust her. (28) So (29)she was supposed to swim [laughing].

7- (30) But (31) when she jumped (32) into the water, (33) she was swimming (34) er (35) under under water? (T.: Yeah.) (36) OK. (37) And everybody was swimming (38) and she was swimming under water [laughing]

8- (39)[-----] (40)'What's happened to Ligia? (41) She's crazy!'
9- (42) And she was swimming [laughing] (43) and in the middle of the swimming pool (44) she came. (45) And she started swimming (46)"cachorrinho"? (laugh)

10- (47) OK. (48) Everybody was laughing (laughs).
11- (49) So she was the last one.
12-(50) And we asked her (51)'What's happened Ligia?'
13- (52) And she said (53)'Oh it's so BEAUtiful under water! (laughs)
14-(54) I thought (55) I was in the (56) How do you say "infinito"? (T.:----) (57) Yes.

15- (58)She said (59)'I thought (60)I was in the (61)infinitive'. 16- (62) And we were kidding her (laugh)


17- (63) She didn't know (64) how to swim!

C11
1- (1) Er (2) it happened last year (3) when I was traveling with Denise (4) and (5) er (6) I had left her behind (7) in Oxford (8) and I was going to Leeds (9) I was going to start my course in Leeds.

2-(10) So she was very [----]
3- (11) When I arrived in Leeds (12) I thought (13) 'Well, (14) there won't be any problems. (15) I have got the map (16) so (17) it will be OK'.(iaugh)

4- (18) And I have two.. (19) heavy bags. (20) Right?
5- (21) And everybody told me (22)'When you get to Leeds, (23) take the bus number twenty-two'.

6-(24)'OK.'

7- (25) Right. (26) 'Can I (27)Could you please help me? (28) Where is the bus number 22?'

8- (29)'OK. (30) Go straight ahead, (31) turn right, (32) turn left, (33) it's over there (34)[-----]

9- (35)When I arrived at the:: (36) bus station, (37) you know, (38)'There isn't any bus 22 here. (39) You must go to tha::t (40) travel information up there'.

10- (41) And I went there.
11- (42) They said (43)'No, (44) sorry. (44) Can't help you. (45) Go to that travel agency (46) and they'll help you.'

12- (47)'All right.'
13- (48)'Where's bus number 22?'
14-(49)'Ah it's over there, (50) you go straight ahead, (51) down (52) and turn right (53) and right (54)right.'

15- (55) And I (56) It was almost (57) it had been almost one hour (58) I was walking, (59) trying to find out the (60) the bus. (61)(----laugh) (62) The 22. (laugh) (63) Going up and down, (64) up and down. (65) And I couldn't find it.

16- (66) And I was so so nervous, (67) and started to cry, (68) and cry, (69) and cry

17-(70) | was alone [----] (71) | couldn't do anything.
18- (72) It was almost almost $60^{\circ}$ clock (73) $70^{\prime}$ clock, (74) and I had to find the address. (75)'Cause I had no place to stay.

19- (76) Finally (77) when I asked a British woman, (78) she said (79)'Oh, sorry! (80) It's terrible when these things happen. (81) I can't help you. (82) I don't know.'

20- (83) But there was a foreigner. (84) I think he was from.. (85) fro::m from Mexico. (86) I don't know.

21- (87) And 'OK. (88) I can help you. (89) Straight ahead, (90) straight ahead, (91) straight ahead, (92) over there, (93) on the right, (94) on the left, (95) you'll find bus number 22.' (T.: mmmm)

22- (96)'Thank you very much! (97) Thank you very much!'

23-(98) Then I went, (99) and there it was. (T.: mmmm) (100)[------] take it. [-------]

24- (101) And I said (102) I will never forget him. (103) In my life. (104) Never. (105) Never.

C12
1- (1) We er.. (2) we were at home, (3) I mean (4) me and my family, (5) OK?
2- (6) My mother (7) and and my my brothers and sisters (8) were in the bedroom (9) and I wa::s (10) in the:: (11) in the sitting-room in the living-room watching television.

3- (12) it was about eleven o'clock at night.
4- (13) A::nd (14) I heard a noise. (15) Someone knocking at the door.
5- (16) Because (17) at at the right (18) at the left side of of the door in my house, (19) er (20) there was er (21) I don't know how (22) to say that. (23) Something made made of of glass. (24) I mean (25) if someone passed (26) behind the door, (27) I could see. (28) Right? (29) Because (30) there was er.. (31) glass. (32) Something made of glass.

6a- (33) So I saw (34) someone passing. (35) And I looked and.. (36) you know (37) I became very frightened, (38) and I and I.. (39) called (40) and I told my mother: (41)'There is someone.'

7-(42) I was fifteen years old.
6b- (43) And I told her (44)'There is someone behind the door'.
8- (45) And she said (46)'And WHAT is this person doing? (47) Behind the door? (48) Go on. (49) You are you are the MAN (50) of the family. (laughs) (51) Go and see.

9- (52) And I (53) put my ear.. (54) to try to listen something. (55) But silence.
10-(56) And then (57) some of (58) the person which was (59) er (60) behind it, (61) knocked \{he knocks on the desk\} (62) and said (63) er (64)'Open it.'

11- (65) And I said (66)'Who's who's out there?'

12- (67) And the person said (68)'Open it. (69) You son of a bitch.
13- (70) And I said (71)'No. (72)|'m not going to open it.' (laughs)
14- (73) And I said er (74) And he said (75)'Open or I will er [----] (T.: Knock it down? Break through?) (76) Knock it down. (77) Break. (78) Break down. (79) Break down.'

15- (80) And I sai::d (81)'You're going to break it down. (82) Because l'm not going to open it. (83) What do you think?'

16- (84) And he said (85)'I'm going to count, (86) and you are going to open it'. (laughing)

17- (87) Then someone else said. (88) And now there were two. (89) Two men (90) behind the door in my house.

18- (91) And they started kicking (92) and you know (93) er (94) how can I say this? \{gesture\} (95) Kicking (96) Hitting it with (T.: Jump? Kicking?) [----------] (T.: Kicking..hard.) (97) Very very (98) In a very strong way.

19-(99) It was almost breaking .. (100) the door. (101) It was almost...
20- (102) And we:: (103) I was desperate.
21- (104) A::nd er (105) we raned all the house (laughing)
22- (106) And I I told my mother (107)'Er loud (108) I'll put the television louder the the (109) and call the police'.

23- (110) And my mother said (111)'No. (112) Turn (113) Put the television er (T.: Down.) (114) down, (115) and (116) call it'.

24- (117) I said (118)'No. (119) They are going to listen us (120) calling to the police'.

25- (121) A::nd er (122) I said (123) And she said (124)'No it's better if the television is out (125) is.. (126) low is low, (127) because if they listen (128) they listen to us (129) calling the police, (130) they're not going to:: (131) they're goin'away. (132) They're going to to (T.: Run away?) (133) to run away.

26- (134) And (135) we were discussing about that, (136) all that, (137) and said to my sisters (138)'Go to the to the.. (139) hide.. (140) yourselves under the
beds', (141) and.. (142) my brother (143)I said to my brother (144)'Pick up something. (145) Let's stay here (146) because if they enter we.. \{ hits the desk\}

27- (147) And we.. (148) they kept on.. (149) kicking, (150) and making a lot of noise, (151) and you know (152) saying swear words (153) all the time (154) and we were.. (155) I was almost going to jump (156) out of the window (157) and then when I (158) when I stop and (159) we were almost fainting, (160) then I said (161)'I give up. (162) Mother (163) call the police because I'm (164) I'm going to faint'. (165) Everybody was going to faint (laugh).

28- (166) And the the the [---] man said (167)'Ha ha ha'.
29- (168) And I (169) when I heard (170) I was (171) It was also one of the (172) the worst (173) things I.. (174) It was my stepfather, (T.: Oh! I see!) (175) playing a trick at us (laughing). $\qquad$
30-(176) I was almost [-----]
31- (177) We almost killed him.
32- (178) So it was one of the (179)I think it was the the (180) It was not a very frightening experience. (181) It was the worst.. (182) experience I had (183) I had in my life. (laughs) (T.: Did you get rough?) [-----]

C13
1- (1)Right. (2)I have lots of funny stories (3) but I can't think of any funny stories (laughing) (4) at the moment. (5) So l'll just (6) er (7) tell something (8) that happened to me about.. (9) two or three days ago. (10) Here.

2- (11) Now I think it's funny, (12) but at the time (13) I was really upset. (P.: That student?) (14) Yeah.

3a- (15) I had this new student (16) I had
4- (17)I think I told you. (P.:Yes, you told me.) (P.:The one with a secret?) (18)Yeah.

3b- (19)। had this new student (20) coming in my classroom, (21) it's a classroom with about.. (22) 6 or 7 young girls. (23) And one young boy. (24) About 1415 years old.

5- (25) And.. (26) here comes in this guy.(27) He's about thirty, (28) and he comes in (29) and very nicely, (30) politely, (31)! asked him (32)'Hello! (33) Come in! (34) Welcome! (35) What's your name?'

6- (36) And he said (37)'Dugs'. (38) And I couldn't understand very well.
7- (39)'I'm sorry. (40) Could you repeat please?' (laughing)
8-(41)'Dugs.'(laughs.) (42)And the girls (43)understood him. (44) Right? (45)And she said (46)'É Douglas tia'. (laughs.)

9- (47)I said (48)'Oh OK. (49) Right. (50) I said [-----\}(51) Tell me about YOU Douglas. (52) You know. (53) Are you a student in Britanic? (54) Did you change [----1 ?

10a- (55) And he said very low (56) like his English was er
11- (57) He mixed English with Portuguese English. (P.:---------)
10b- (58) He said (59)'Secret. (60)Secret. (61)"Não posso revelar agora". (imitating English accent)

12- (62) I said (63)'Oh! (64)OK'.
13- (65) And so the other girls said (66)"Que fora!" (laughing) (67) Right?
14- (68) And so.. (69) OK. (70)... (71) more or less ignored him,
15- (P.:-----) (72) Yeah. (73) Yeah.
16- (74) And so the class continued on (75) you know? (76) Normally.
17- (77) And at the end of the lesson (78)! told everyone to leave, (79) and I invited him (80) to stay with me, (81) so, (82) you know, (83) maybe (84)! thought (85) he just doesn't want to say (86) anything in front of the others (87) but to me he will.

18- (88) So, (89) I asked him (90)'Well Douglas. (91) Tell me about you'. (92) You know. (P.:Did you ask in English again?)

19-(93)No. (94)in Portuguese.

20- (95)A::nd he said (96)'The same thing I told' (97)In Portuguese. (98)'The same thing I told you before.'

21- (99)And I said (100)'You mean you don't want to reveal anything? (laugh)
22- (101)He said (102)'Yes'. (103)'OK.' [------] (laughing) (P.:And she left the room furious)

## C14

1a- (1) It's not really a story. (2)t's just (3)It's about when my daughter Julia,
2- (4)she's thirteen now.
1b- (5) When she was about.. (6)four or five.
3- (7)। think she was about 4 (8)because she couldn't read. (9)Erm (10)numbers very well. (11)! think she could only.. (12)I don't remember.

4- (13)Anyway. (14)She was 4 or 5 or 6 (15)whatever.
5- (16)And she wanted to call (17)a friend of hers on the phone. (18)And she asked me the number (19)you kow. (20)Of this friend.

6- (21)So I told her. (22)lt was something like (23)two two one, (24)er (25)sixteen eleven. (26)Or something.

7- (27)So she went (28)she got a little piece of paper, (29)she went to the phone, (30)and started dialing.

8-(31)And I was in my bedroom.
9- (32)All of a sudden (33)here she comes. (34)CRYing you know. (35)With the little piece of paper.

10-(36)I think you remember the STOry Rejane. (Yeah.)
11a- (37)'Mom! (38) can't call' \{crying voice\}
12- (38)What's the name. (39)Debbora I think.
11b- (40)'I can't call Débora. I can't call Débora.' \{crying voice\}
13- (41)! said (42)'Why not?'

14- (43)Because the dial on on the on the telephone (44)doesn't go (45)doesn't go on (46)doesn't go on after nine! (47)It stops at nine. (48)And her telephone number (49)has eleven or something. (50)Right? (laughs)

15- (51)Cause she read (52)Obviously (53)obviously it wasn't sixteen eleven (54)because she wouldn't have found eleven either.

16- (55)Must be something like (56)I don't know. (P.:Let's say ----) (57)But I know that she kept (58)eleven in her mind (59)and she couldn't dial. (60)She couldn't find eleven on the dial.

## C15

1- (1) it's a very funny story. (2)Well, (3)it was a very funny story (4)when it happened a LONG time ago.

2- (5)I was going to the university, (6)a::nd I.. (7)I had taken a ride.. (8)from my house to the middle of the way.

3- (9)But I was going to the bus stop (10)as a matter of fact. (11)To take this Cidade Universitária bus. $\square$
4- (12)When I was crossing the the avenue, (13)It was Conde da Boa Vista Avenue, (14)I saw a friend of mine (15)in a bus. (16)In a troley bus. (17)Right? (18)And then I started waving to him.

5- (19)A::nd I ran, (20)I tried to cross the [-----] (21)So I ran across the street. (22)And when I got to the curb, (23)I tripped. (24)And I fell into the the (25)into the sidewalk. (26)Right? (27)With all my books and notebooks (28)and pens and pencils and whatever, (29)and there had been RAINing! (30)Right?

6- (31)And I started LAUGHing at myself. (32)Mainly because the bus LEFT. (33)Right? (34)So I missed the bus, (P.: I'm very glad -------)(laugh) (35)I couldn't avoid laughing at all.

7a- (36)So I took the the the next (P.: What was people's reaction?)
8- (37)। don't know. (38)I didn't pay attention to anybody. (39)l just started laughing at me. (40)Right?

7b- (41)A::nd (42)and I took the other bus, (43)the next bus, (44)right?
9- (45)And I was.. (46)LAUGHing in the bus. (47)As if I were a crazy person. (48)Right?

10- (49)Then I.. (50)everybody was looking at me, (51)and I was.. (52)trying to control my LAUGH. (53)Right? (Two participants start an exchange about an episode which happened to one of them.)

11- (54)OK. (55)Anyway. (56)When I when I got to the to the bus stop, (57)there was this eNOR::mous line. (58)Right? (59)And then there I found Sergio. (60)Right?

12- (61)Then I said (62)Sergio (63)wait a minute. \{imitates the sound of laughing\} (64) I burst out laughing,(65)and he was looking at me,(66)staring at me, 64)Come on! (65)What's wrong? (66)What's going on? (67)Tell me. (68)And I couldn't avoid laughing. (69)Right?

13- (70)And then (71)when I finally, (72)relaxed (73)a little bit, (74)I told him.
14-(75)He said (76)'But come on. (77)This is a nonsense. (R.: Did you get wet when you fell down?)

15- (78)No. (79)Thank God. (80)Thank God. (81)I didn't.

## WRITTEN STORIES

## Target Group

T1

1) This year I went to United States as a tourist.
2) It was the first time/ that I went to an English country, / I mean, a country/ which have English as its language. 3) So, I was always looking for talkative people/ who I could improve my English with.
3) This passage is interesting. 5) A Mexican girl,/ who I met there/ wanted me/ to ask a telephonist/ to talk to a hotel/ where was waiting a woman/ called Mrs Gonzalez.
4) It was funny/ because I don't know/ how to speak Spanish,/ so I mixed Portuguese, Spanish and English in that talking.
5) I used to talk to the telephonist in Portuguese,/ talk to the Mexican girl in English/ while I was trying/ to think in Spanish. 8) I got very embarrassed.

## T2

1) I had to do some work for the university,/ and I had to go to the laboratory (computers),/I didn't have no idea/ how to face the machines,/ and in the end of the week l've done only one program;/2) It were seven. 3) So I get in the bus completely desperated,/ crying a lot,/ and, a man asked me/ what it was happening,/ and I said/ that it was nothing. 4) I was felling very bad, and very stupid.

T3

1) In July, last year, I were travelling in United States, at Washingtown's airport,/ and I started to talk with a woman. 2) It was my first contact with American people. 3) Than by the time the woman was talking to me,/I was understanding everything/ and I started/to think/ that I was really good in english,/ that I had already brushed it up,/ and then... the woman turned to another woman beside her/ and talked in portuguese,/ and we all started laughing.

T4

1) I was in Britanic in 1990,/ studding with Gracia,/ and I had a friend/ that was sitting next to me.
2) It was a song class/ and we received a paper with a music INTO MY LIFE.
3) There is a game/ that called "green and red"/ that you have to touch in this collors. 4) And I was looking for this/ but I didn't know/ that Cláudia, my friend,
knews too. 5) And I remember/ that Britanic had a picture on the "parede",/ and Claudinha looked green on Adriana's bag, next to her.
4) When everybody was pen attencion/ I 'turn on'/ to touch in the picture/ and Claudinha jumped on the bag.
5) It was very funny/ 'cause Adriana thought/ that it was a "barata",/ and she shout very much.
6) Nobody understand this. 9) Claudinha and me keeped this secret till the other semester in Oxford A.

## T5

1)On a Saturday morning I was going to school/ when a little boy asked me/ to give him money/ and I told him "I don't have any money"/ and he said:/ "give me all your money!",/ then I told/ that I really didn't have any money,/ so he told me/ to give him my watch/ and I asked him/ if he couldn't see/ that I haven't got any watch,/ because of my answer he said to me/ "Yes, and this is just a piece of glass"/ and I told him:/ "Yes, I can see this is a piece of glass,/ but I dont have any watch!",/ and so I began to run/ till I reached my school. 2) I think/ the reason of my "cold argument" was/ because I didn't realized it was a robbery,/ and I just realized it/ when he show me the piece of glass/ and then I was terrified.

T6

1) I was at SENAI one time,/ to have a class of Metrology, by the university diciplins.
2) I entered in the class,/ there was a man, probably my teacher. 3) He was sat,/ reading a newspaper, with the shoes off and with his feet over another chair. 4) I could see his socks. 5) I asked:/ "May I?"/ he said OK. 6) I sat down/ and started/ talking with a friend. 7) Sundenly, the teacher asked:/ "What about the smell?"./ 8) I looked to my friend. 9) He was astonished too. 10) I said 11) "No problem. Make
yourself at home."12) he turned/ and started to read again. 13) After that, a servent entered in the room/ and asked: "Is the smell of DDT strong?"

## THE END

P.S. Think about my face!

## T7

1) For six years ago we were a family. Me, mom, papa, and three brothers 2)(one was a boy/ and the others were girls). 3) But mom died/ and we started/ to travel. 4) My father met a woman/ called Jerusa/ who had three daughters 5)(two of them were twins). 6) They started/ to have a relationship/ and then they got married (7)(Jerusa was widle, too). 8) The marriage was very beautiful,/ all the soons were "damas-de-honra". 9) Then, after that day, our life changed completely:/ 10) we had to move for another house, a bigger one. 11) And we had some problems on the start,/ but now we are a real family/ and we are very happy! 12) | love my BIG family!

T8

1) When I was about ten years old, / I was a very impossible girl.
2) One day me and a friend of my/called Monica/ were at São José da Coroa Grande beach. 3) Ther was an old man/ who had a creation of chickens (hens)/ it was about forty chickens,/ and everyday he puted his chickens/ to walk on the street,/ but he was always looking after them. 4) But at this day his chickens were alone, without him. 5) So, me and my friend decide/ to trow stones on the chickens/ because the old man was not with them. 6) Then when we started to trow the stones,/ the chickens started/ to run after us. 7) We were very afraid,/ but it was funny,/ Forty chickens running after us. 8) We had to jump a very high gate of one house/ to scape. 9) I falled on the grass/ and one chicken bited my leg. 10) It was hurting so much/ but we scaped.

T9

1) I was in my girlfriend's apartment/ and her parents didn't know about our relationship. 2) All them were outside home/ and only her little brother and sister were sleeping in the bedroom. 3) When we were in the livingroom/ the bell rang/ it was her parents. 4) I was very astonished and very nervous,/ we didn't know/ what to do/ and then she adviced me/ to go to the kitchen/ and wait/ they get in/ and only leave the apartment/ when the livingroom's door were completed closed/ and when the door closed/ I opened the kitchen's door. 5) Then her mother opened the other door,/ that was by the side of mine/ and we stayed face to face,/ at this moment I didn't know/ what to do/ and how to act. 6) So her mother said/ OK Ginaldo you can go out/ if you want. 7) And then I left the apartment/ and went home. 8)This was one of the most embarresed situation/live ever been.

T10

1) Something/ that I tell/ that lets me very embarassed/ is this story. 2)In October 2nd I was at home/ doing nothing/ and somebody called me/telling things/ that let me very surprised,/ she said/ that she loved me/ and she was passioned for me a long time ago,/ I didn't know what to do,/ she said me/ that she knew my cousing./3)l asked her/ when she would call me again/ and she said/ that she would tell me about my cousing. 4) Next Friday, October 9th she calls me again/ and says things/ that I stayed very surprised,/ she told me/ that we would meet at a disco/ called Rock's. 5) One day before, she gets sick/ and I can't meet her/ so I sent her a paper/ telling many things too. 6) She didn't answer me,/ two days after she got the paper, she starts again with her old boyfriend/ (For what I knew a very blond fool person),/ and she sent me a letter through my cousing,/ and she tells me everything.
2) Today I discovered/who's her/ because she told me/ that she studies piano/ and only person/ who studies piano at 1st $\mathbb{A}$ only could be her. 8) I acted like nothing have happened.
3) This story happened last year./ When I came back to my house. 2) I wanted/ to open the door/ but I didn't have any key. 3) My brother was there,/ he was slepping. 4) I knocked the door,/ rang the bell,/ rang the interfone,/ but he didn't wake up. 5) I decided to break the door/ and I took some materials (hammer, screwdriver). 6) After 20 minutes I could open it.
4) When I was oppening his bedroom's door/ he said to me:/ "Don't make any noise, / I want to sleep."

T12

1) About six years ago I was walking on the Mercado da Madalena,/ looking some fixes. 2) Ther was an very beaultfull and especial fixe there. 3) So a fat boy came closer/ and began/ to talk about fixes. 4) He told me/ he was wanting/buy that beautfull fixe/ and ask me some money. 5) I didn't know anything about that guy/ but I disided/ hend him all my money.
6)Two or three years late I was in a club, alone/ and I was sat on the table/ when a fat guy came close/ and invited me/ to drink with him. 7) After we start/ to drink/ and talk about many thinks. 8) So he tell me/ he was I guy/ who I had lend money a long time ago,/ when he want/ buy the beautfull fixe. 9) And so he pay all the beers.

T13
Accidents

1) Some years ago, I was twelve years ago, / I was going down to a hill, very fast, in a bike,/ when I turn on the first street/ that there was after the hill/ I crashed on a van,/ fell down/ and stayed almost one hour unconscious,/ I broke my right arm.

Other accident: 2) I was playing with my cousins in my grandparent's home,/ with guns, who didn't know the guns, one of them was ready to shoot,/ well it was
too late,/ when we knew it, / it was shooted,/ and went to an hospital. 3) Thank a goodness I'm here.

T14

1) I was in an aeroplane from São Paulo to Argentina. 2) And almost everybody was argentinian. 3) One time in the flight I went to the bathroom,/ and/ when I arrived near it,/ there was a kwill (fila),/ and a stayed behind a man,/ so I stepped on his foot, not propously (of course). 4) And I didn't know/ how to speak anything. 5) So I said Gracias (the only thing/ that I knew), / and he looked towards me with an ugly face,/ and didn't know/ why was him so angry. 6) Then I came back to my seat,/ and started/ to think about/ what happened. 7) After I discovered/ why the man was so angry,/ and I started to laught.

T15

## Happy End

1)Well, evrything happened/ when I were with my family and a group/ that went with us to the same travel. 2) We were in an airplane. 3) We were coming back from U.S.A. 4) Everybody loved this travel/ but happened in the end of the travel, things,/ that everybody stayed afraid. 5) We travelled with G.D.N. company/ and/ when we were in Orlando's Airport,/ we knew/ that the flight from Brazil was canceled/ because the own of the company didn't pay our flight of the back.
6) We stayed in Orlando more two days. 7) Were days very bad/ because many people didn't have more money/ to come back or to pay more one passenger.
8) But, after we can come back. 9) Some of people took a airplane at morning and another in the afternoon. 10) Me and my family came in the afternoon's flight. 11) The travel was calm/ and/ when the girl/ that works in the plane/ said/that we had arrived in Brasil,/ everybody began/ to play with almofadas,/ because we were happyl and because we were with miss of our country.
12) I loved this travel/ but I don't change my country with any country.

T16

1) Yesterday, I and my fiance went to visit our friend.
2) The man was operated/ and we had very much complications. 3) When we arrived there,/ my fiancé said to the man:/ Oh! you're very thin,/ you're white like a paper! 4) The man didn't answer. 5) After my sweet-heart looked to the scarl and started to feel bad, and white/ and I took him. 6) It was very costrain to me.

## T17

1) Two years ago, I was held up. 2) I was working/ and left job at 6:30. 3) After that I went to a public telephone/ and called my family. 4) On my way to bus stop two black guys held me up/ and beated strong. 5) I spent three days in a hospital and two weeks/ without coming to college. 6) I got frustrated about black guys. 7) That's all.

T18

1) When I was ten/ in my vacations I won a trip to Cabedelo in Paraiba. 2) So I went with my cousin Renata,/ because her father had a house beach there. 3) When we arrived in this city/ we went to Renata's father's house/ and began to play at the beach. 4) In the day before we returned to Recife/ we went to the beach with the Renata's father's permission. 5) About three o'clock p.m. we were playing/ when arrived a soldier/ and began playing with us. 6) He hold us through the back wards/ and we felt into the water. 7) I did it many times/ until that I broke my left arm.
2) Immediately this soldier left to Public Hospital/ and for three times it did accept us. 9) We had to go to João Pessoa. 10) I had to operate my arm for three times,/ I passed four months with plaster/ and did therapy for one year.
3) This a short and great history in my life. 2) When I was very young, about 18 years ago, a group of Gospel preachers got home/ and preached the Good News, the word of God, to my family and to me. 3) I was surprised/ when I heard the message about the love of God, giving us His Only Son, Jesus Christ/ to save us from our sins,/ and forgive us/ if we obey his word. 4) It was wonderful. 5) I accept Jesus as my Saviour. 6) It was the very great moment of my life from that moment until now and for ever,/ if I stand firm until the end.

T20

1) One day my mother and I were watching television/ and it was a horror movie full of ghosts. 2) I said to her/ that I will turn off the television/ because she was sleeping (as usual)/ and l'd go to my bedroom,/ but she said:/ "No,no! I am watching the film,/ I'm not sleeping..."
2) I was already very angry,/ because almost everyday it was the same thing. 4) So I look at her/ and I said:/"Mom, I go to my bedroom/ and if you're still sleeping/ when I come back,/ l'll turn off the television;/ did you hear me?" 5) And she said: OK OK."
3) Then, when I came back,/ she was still sleeping/ and I stand by in front of the television/ looking at her/ and I was dressing my night-dress. 7) So she looked at $\mathrm{me} /$ and scream too much, I stayed afraid / and jumped over her abruptly.

T21

1) Last week I was going to the laboratory/ to make some exams. 2) In the way I pass in front of one of the gates of the Santo Amaro's Cemetary. 3) When I was in front of the gate/ I looked inter the cemetary/ and saw a man/ coming in my direction. 4) The man was totally naked/ and I stayed frightened/ and began to run away. 5) After this episode I stayed three days/ having nightmares with this man.
2) When I was twelve years old/ and I was in Fortaleza with my boyfriend,/ but my father didn't know/ that I had one,/ then I was in front of my cousin's house/ and my father came! 2) He saw everything (3)(I was kissing my boyfriend)! 4) He stayed very angry/ and he spook to me/ go home,/ then he putted my boyfriend/ to run away!! 5) It was horrible/ because my boyfriend never came again! 6) It was really embarrassed!

T23
The show

1) Last semester I was studying here (UFPE) English 8 A and when I was showing a work in the class for my friends, very nervous, very confused/ and I read/ and my paper flew,/ and I read/ and my paper flew again. 2) My friends smiling/ I was much more nervous,/ but I finished my show. 3) I didn't thought my work so good/ but I made. 4) It's all.

T24

1) Last Saturday I went to a birthday party,/ and I met an old friend, a boy/ that I didn't see a long time ago. 2) So I was talking a lot with him/ and the other people was talking/ "hum, look that" or "great Stefânia", (3) anyway, another girl was looking very angry with me/ and I didn't see that. 4) After the party, my sister said/ "did you see her?/ She was very angry with you."/ "you was talking a lot with him."
2) Well, I didn't know/ that he was her "almost boyfriend"! 6) I don't know/ what will she do/ next time I see them!

T25

1) When I was about 8 years old/ I used to go to my grandmother's house and stayed there all day long. 2) So once I was playing with a young chicken/ and I made it as my own children. 3) So I began/ to hit it a lot/ until it die. 4) After it died/I put it between a wall and a tank. 5) Then, on the day after my grandmother went to the back of the house/ and noticed the chicken died there. 6) So she called me/ and said:/
-- Vanessa look at the chicken/ it is dead.
2) Then I said to her:/
-- Oh! grandma, please let me bury it.
3) She never knew/ that I had killed the chicken.

T26

1) Once I was in the bus downtown/ and suddenly I thought/ I had met a friend of mine/ called John. 2) Then I called the boy/ like I had known him for a long time. 3) When he looked at me/ he did a ugly face/ and I could noted/ that he wasn't my friend. 4) Then I apologized him/ and he said/ it wasn't problem. 5) I became very shamed/because the bus was very crowded/but I got off it some minutes after.

## Control Group

## C1

1) When I was going by bus to Salvador - Bahia,/ the bus stopped in Aracaju in a place/ they call Ponto de Apoio for Itapemirim Company. 2) It was midnight/ and it was raining a lot,/ because of this there was lots of water in the sidewalk. As there was a guy in the shadow/ I prefered/ walk through the water/ then pass near him. 4) When I was in the middle of the pool (water)/ I felt down. 5) People run for helping me/ and I said to them:/ "Don't worry! I'm hard for falling!"

C2

1) I had a pretty serious accident back in 1985. 2) I was in my house at the neighborhood of Estreito here in Fpolis with my cousin Marcos. 3)Marcos invited $\mathrm{me} /$ to go downtown in his car. 4) Since he went with his motorcycle to my house,/ we were supposed to go to his house first/ to get his car/ and go downtown. 5)His house was very near my house,/ so I went with him in his motorbike/ when everything happened. 6) In the middle of the ride, a car crossed our way/ and hit the motorbike right at the back/ where I was. 7) With the impact of the crash, I was thrown to the sidewalk/ and had only my left leg broken. 8) My cousin on the other hand, had a serious head injury/ even wearing a helmet. 9) We were both taken to the hospital,/ where I might have stayed for only 4 days/ while my cousin remained in very critical condition for ten days. 10)Strange as it may seem, / I was not wearing my helmet,/ I didn't know/ how to ride a motorbike,/ and everything happened withing a space of three minutes from my house to his.

## C3

1) Dear Mom! It was good/ talking to you on the phone last weekend, 2) I miss you a lot. However,/ as you're always saying,/ /'ll be home soon!
2) Paulo \& I are doing fine/ but yesterday we had a little problem. 4) Don't worry about/ what I'm going to tell you/ because we're both doing fine. 5) Well, we went out for dinner,/ which was delicious,/ but on the way back we had a car accident. 6) Luckly we we were driving very slowly/ otherwise Paulo would have got hurt. 7) As I was saying,/ we were going to cross a street/ \& he thought/ he had the way/ so he just gave two light signals/ \& went on. 8) You can imagine our shock/ when we saw a truck, one like the one/ dad used to have,/ coming towards us. 9) I just remember/ hearing the crash after a short sound of Paulo/ stepping on the brake. 10) After checking/ to see lif I was all right,/ he went out of the car/ to see/ if the other driver was injured/ \& also to see the damages on both cars. 11) He asked
me/ to stay in the car,/ 12) (well, he needn't do that/ for I couldn't move./ Not because I was injured/ but bec. I was in shock). 13) The first thing/ I thought/ was/ that I wished/ it was a dream,/ the second was/ that I was thankful/ we were all right. 14) The truck hit the front part of our car pretty badly/ but thank God it got only a broken lamp/ 15) (you know/ how parts of these trucks are expensive). 16) We set up everything/ before the police arrived 17) (poor Paul is going to pay for the damages in both cars).
3) There was a nice man,/ who saw the whole accident,/ who helped us/ find a place/ to leave our car overnight./ So we came home by taxi. 19) Mom, I felt so sorry for Paul. 20) I offered/ to help him with some money/ but he won't accept it. 21) He's the "macho" type,/ you know.
4) Anyway, we are fine. 23) I'll tell you more details/ when I get home.

Love you mom,
Célia

## C4

Dear Jacques,

1) I've got to tell you something very funny/ that happened 2 or 3 weeks ago. 2) Célia, Solange and I were trying to have some fun together/ (as we always do /when we get fed up with studying, reading, writing papers, and so on.),/ so we (Celia \& I) decided/to roleplay something/to present to Solange.
2) It worked like this:/ we had to get in the same shirt (Célia \& I), / and say some funny things --/ 4) Celia would have her head out of the shirt/ while I would be wearing the sleeves/ and hiding my head behind her back. 5) The whole situation became so funny/ that I couldn't stop/ laughing. 6) So I felt like/ peeing/ and I told Celia/ to get out,/ but she just couldn't. 7) You can imagine/ what happened,/ can't you? 8) I ended up/ peeing on my pants/ while trying/ to get rid of that shirt (and of Celia of course!). 9) Isn't it terrible? 10) We still have lots of fun/ whenever we talk about the fact.

Love,

Ana.
C5

1) My name is Déboral and the story [l'm going to tell] happened/ when I went to England for the first time, about eleven years ago. 2) My ex-husband was already there/ taking his PhD,/ and I was going to join him.
2) I had all the necessary documents with me,/ but as I couldn't speak any English then,/ and as that was my first experience abroad,/ I was very nervous. 4) I didn't know/ how I was going to manage/ to communicate with the official at the immigration office/ when I got to London.
3) So, during the flight from Rio to London I tried/ to find someone in the plane/ who could help me out at Heathrow Airport. 6) I met this Jewish guy/ who dealt in diamonds/ and who used to come to South America frequently. 7) He could speak Spanish,/ so I asked him/ if he could help me at the airport. 8) He said/ he would try. 9) He was the first British person/ I had ever met,/ and my first impression wasn't very good/because in the middle of the flight he covered his head with a kind of shawl,/ improvised a kind of altar in front of him/ and started/ praying in some strange language. 10) I found all that very weird,/ but I still hoped/ to get some help from him once in London.
4) When we landed, however,/ he told me/ he wouldn't be able to help me out/ because he had to rush home. 12) It was a December afternoon, very cold and gray,/ and it seemed/ that according to his religion he had to be home on Fridays before sunset (13)it was a Friday, of course). 14) So he just left me/ standing there, with all my bags and scared to death.
5) I had no choice/ but to join the long and slow queue of Third World people at the immigration office. 16) It was very annoying/ to see/ how quickly Europeans, Americans, Australians, in short, First World citizens went through the immigration procedures. 17) I was the last one in my queue,/ and the worst happened:/ I couldn't communicate with the official. 18) My ex-husband had to be called ((19) he was waiting for me)/ and eventually everything was sorted out. 20) The funny thing is/ that all the time I had with me a letter from the British Consulate in Rio/
explaining/ what I was going to do in England,/ but I was so confused/ that I didn't show it to the official at first. 21) If I had done that, I would have been released immediately.

C6
The day I met my father

1) I'm going to tell a story/ I've been told several times in my life,/ and I happen to like.
2) I was born in Portugal/ and when I did/ my father had already come to Brazil. 3) I was living there for three years, with my mother and sister,/ when we finally came/ to join him.
3) My mother used to show me pictures of my father/ whenever he sent them. 5) Finally the day came/ when he and I would meet, in person! 6) The ship arrived in Rio,/ everybody was anxious, except for me,/ I think. 7)(I don't remember any way...) 8)Well, my father was so anxious indeed/that he couldn't wait/ till the ship came to harbor,/ he got himself I small boat and a special license/ to meet us on board.
4) My mother and sister were really excited,/ they knew him, after all./ And I was suddenly supposed to kiss a person,/ whom in my early days I had never met,/ although I knew/ he was my father. 10) When he came/ and turned to me/ expecting a warm hug and kiss/ he felt some resistance and a kind of suspicious mind,/I think. 11) My mother insisted,/ urging me to action. 12) "Come on,/ kiss your father!" 13)"That's not my father",/ I said. 14) This fell like a bomb. 15) My father and mother looked worried,/ and they both had good reasons/ to feel so. 16) Then I added, for their relief/ .- "My father is made of paper"...

C7

1) It was Easter time, 1989,/ and I had just come back from a week holiday in Maceió. 2) I had gone to Maceio with my sister/ as my father preferred/to stay in Recife. 3) As soon as I opened the front door,/ I noticed/ that the TV set wasn't / where it used to be,/ in fact it wasn't anywhere in the house/ as someone had entered the house the day before/ and along with the TV had taken my jeweleries.
2) Fortunately nothing bad had happened to my father,/ actually he hadn't ever heard any strange noise. Lucky him!
3) Well, the TV has been replaced, but not the jewelleries.
4) Anyway, we have almost "forget" it. 7) I just remember it/ when people ask $\mathrm{me} /$ to talk about bad experiences. 8) Why do they do it?

C8

1) It was midday/ and I was coming back from the beach. 2) I noticed/ that there was a man/ walking behind me,/ but at the moment I didn't realize/ that he had any interest in me.
2) At a certain point I saw/ when he took a car/ and went straight away along the street. 4) I kept going home/ and/ when I reached my house/ I saw his car/ coming towards me. 5) The he stopped the car in front of my house/ and called me/ to ask for some information. 6) When I got near the car,/ he pointed a gun at me/ and told me not to run away/ or to shout,/ which I did indeed. 7) Luckly he didn't shoot me,/ he run away.

C9

1) Felipe's cousin [called Ceça] [who is very tall and a funny person] used to study in Fope (Camaragibe)/ and live in Olinda. 2) So one day she was going to school/ which was a long way/ and fell asleep/ as she had to get up very early. 3) When she woke up/ there was a very short man/ sitting next to her. 4) He had his
head on his shoulder/ and she had her head on his head,/ so she tapped on his shoulder/ and said:/ "Sir, you've been sleeping on my shoulder".
2) Everybody in the bus burst in laughter.

C10
1985

1) It was 1985 / and we had a competition in my school between classes. 2) I couldn't participate/ because I had a cold./ So I asked one of the girls/ who lived in Brasilia/ to swim in my place. 3) She said/ that it would be OK/ because [when she lived in Brasília] she used to do many things such as: ballet, swimming./ So we trusted her.
2) When it was her time/ to swim,/ she jumped in the swimming pool/ and started/ to swim under water,/ everybody started/ to laugh/ and the people from my class kept/ asking: What's going on with Lígia? 5) When she was in the middle of the swimming/ she came out/ and started/ to swim doggy paddle/ while the other participants were finishing.
3) Finally [when she finished] she said/ that [when she jumped into water] it was so beautiful/ and she felt in the infinity.

## C11

Poor girl

1) I was traveling to Europe for the first time. 2) I was given a scholarship by the British Council. 3) Luckily I was not going alone;/ one of my closest friends had also got a scholarship/ and both of us had never been abroad. 4) Everything was OKJ until we had to separate from each other. 5) She stayed in Oxford/ and I went to Leeds, the city/ where I was supposed to start my course. 6) I was really excited and afraid/ of things not happen/ as I had planned. 7) The moment I arrived/ I tried/ to find bus no. $22-8$ ) l'll never forget it! 9) After asking ten or more people,/ going up
and down,/ carring two heavy bags/ I began/ crying/ and wondering/ what I was going to do. 10) Finally I was given the right answer by a foreigner/ and (following the right direction)| could get to the university on time/ to register. 11) That's the most desperate/ l've ever been.

C12
The door

1) One night, some years ago I was at home with my family. 2) I was watching TV/ while my sisters and my mother were in the bedroom. 3) It was about 11:00 p.m. 4) As it was a Saturday night/ all our neighbors or most of them were out./ So we were the only family in our floor. 5) Everything was fine/ until I saw someone/ passing/ and stopping behind the entrance door of our apartment. 6) I waited for some noise, the bell, or something/ but nothing happened. 7) I called my mother/ and we went to the door/ and asked/ who the person behind it was. 8) Suddenly the person begun/kicking,/ and shouting swear words at us. 9) We thought/ of calling the police,/ we were very nervous, desperate/ to be more exact. 10) The man threatened us,/ he told/ he would enter the house,/ break into it/ if we did not open the door. 11) Of course we did not. 12) A few minutes passed/and I don't need/ to say/ how we were feeling. 13) Then when we were almost fainting/ the person revealled his name. 14) It was my stupid stepfather/ playing a silly trick at us. 15) I think he's sick or something like that.

C13

1) I'm going to tell you a story about/ what happened to me the other day. 2) At the time I didn't think/ it was very funny,/ but now I do.
2) I had a new student/ who came into my classrooom this week. 4) Tere are about 6-7 young girls and a young boy./ And in comes this guy who's
around/about 30 years old. 5) I tried/ to be very nice and polite/ asking him/ "Hello, what's your name?/ Are you a student from Britanic?" 5) He said/ his name was Douglas,/ but I couldn't understand him. 6) He had to repeat it two or three more times/ and still I couldn't understand it,/ until one of the girls said it clearly, Douglas.
3) And then he said in an English or Portu-English/ "Secret, não posso revelar agora!" 8) So I said O.K./ and continued my class/ more or less ignoring him. 9) At the end I told everyone/ to leave/ and I invited him/ to stay,/ so maybe I could get more details. 10) Maybe he didn't want/ to reveal anything in front of the others/ and he would tell me. 11) So again I asked him some questions in a friendly way/ and he told me/ it was/ like he had told before. 12) So I said,/ you mean/ only when you want to reveal it to me and he said Yes. 13) I left the classroom/ and went downstairs absolutely angry/ saying/ I didn't want him in my class anymore, etc...

## C14

1) First I told them the story about Julia,/ when she was 5 years old/ and she wanted/ to call her friend Deborah on the phone. 2) Her friend's number was something like 221-0311.3) So I gave her the slip of paper with the number on it/ and she went to the phone. 4) I stayed in my room/ and in a few minutes she came in/ crying/ and saying/ she couldn't call her friend/ because there wasn't a number "11" on the dial...

## C15

1) I remember this day/ when I was going to the university. 2) I had taken a ride/ which left me in the middle of the way to the bus stop. 3) (The bus stop used to be down town at that time.)
2) Well when I got out of the car on my way to the bus stop/ and I was crossing the street/ to take the bus downtown/ I saw a friend of mine on a bus going downtown./ So I ran across the street/ and I tripped on the curb/ and fell onto the
pavement. 5) Well, the bus left and there I was with all my books pens and notebooks on the ground. 6) It had been raining/ and I almmost got wet/ as I fell very close to a small pond on the sidewalk. 7) I burst out/ laughing/ and I couldn't avoid that. 8) I took another bus/ And I was laughing all the drive long. 9) (I thought/ people were taking me for a crazy person.) 10) When I finally got to the bus station/I met my friend/ standing on a big line,/ still waiting for the bus. 11) I was still laughing and laughing at myself/ and he kept/staring at me/ without understanding the situation. 12) When I finally managed/ to stop/ laughing/ and told him the story/ he found it very silly.
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