Dictogloss: Is It An Effective Language Learning Task?

Toshiyo Nabei

University of Pennsylvania
Graduate School of Education

SLA studies on interaction support the hypothesis that negotiation is a useful context for language learning. Based on the assumption that learners' awareness of language form facilitates their language learning, Kowal and Swain (1994) claimed that dictogloss was an effective language learning task since the task provide a context for negotiation. This paper examines learners' interaction in the interactional stage of dictogloss to see how it might facilitate L2 learning.The learners' interaction suggests that the four procedural stages of the task are all important for language learning.

Studies on the nature of communicative interaction in the field of SLA have compiled empirical evidence which support the belief that language is best learned and taught through interaction (Pica, Kanagy, & Falodun 1993: 10). Researchers who share this perspective of language learning process seem to agree on the importance of negotiation as the context for language learning. Negotiation is defined as an activity in which interlocutors work linguistically to resolve the communication difficulty identified by one of the interlocutors (Pica 1992: 200). This process involves various interactional modifications which help to overcome communication difficulties (Pica 1994: 497; Varonis & Gass 1985: 151). Indeed, some empirical studies on negotiation have shown powerful support for the claim that negotiation is helpful in order to make meaning comprehensible for the L2 learners (Pica, Young, & Doughty 1987: 753; Pica, Holliday, Lewis, & Morgenthaler 1989: 84). Negotiation, thus, is believed to be useful context for language learning.

Furthermore, some researchers who questioned the process of internalization of linguistic data began to consider the value of linguistic production by learners. Swain (1985: 249) claimed that learners' stretching to produce comprehensible output would be important for the internalization of linguistic forms and the acquisition of the target language. Swain and her colleagues believe that language learners need to be pushed into syntactic processing (Swain 1985: 249; Kowal & Swain 1994). In order to internalize target syntax, students need to be aware of the relationship between meaning, form, and function that are closely intertwined (Kowal & Swain 1994).

These researchers thought that such linguistic awareness would facilitate L2 learners' language learning.

While the negotiation process which was composed of linguistic input, output, and feedback, was considered to be helpful for effective language learning, various researchers sought ideal techniques to provide learners with such context (Pica, Holliday, Lewis, & Morgenthaler 1989; Pica, Kanagy, & Falodun 1993: 10). One answer that they found was use of language learning tasks. In general, language learning tasks are characterized as goal-oriented classroom activities in which language learners exchange information and communicate for the purpose of a meaningful outcome (Nunan 1989: 10-11; Pica, Kanagy, & Falodun 1993: 11-12). Under this definition, various classroom activities such as the information gap, jigsaw, problem-solving, and even interviews were interpreted as communication tasks (Brown 1994: 179; Mackey 1994: 67-68).

Pica claims that empirical linguistic data from jig-saw tasks is full of evidence supporting the fact that negotiation is indeed taking place in discourse between L2 learners and their interlocutors (1994: 508). Studies by Pica and her colleagues showed various structural modifications such as segmentation, relocation, and repetition made by the task participants (Pica, Holliday, Lewis, & Morgenthaler 1989: 72; Pica, Lincoln-Porter, Paninos, & Linnell 1995: 22-28). This linguistic evidence supported the assumption that well-designed language learning tasks can provide learners with comprehensible input, output, and feedback which are necessary elements for a language learning environment.

Swain and her colleague were interested in learners' internalization of linguistic knowledge and found that dictogloss was an effective task for making students aware of language form and function (Kowal & Swain 1994). They used dictogloss in their research in the French immersion content-based instruction classroom to see whether this task would push the students into syntactic processing (Kowal & Swain 1994). While their report of their students making extended linguistic output was insightful, actual effectiveness of the dictogloss from the perspective of negotiation was not known well. This study, thus, focused on the interactions between language learners during the dictogloss task.

The dictogloss task

There is a four-stage procedure to use dictogloss in a classroom: preparation, dictation, reconstruction, and analysis with correction (Wajnryb 1990: 7-9). In the first stage, students are prepared for the passage that they will be hearing through discussions of the topic and vocabulary. Then the teacher dictates the passage to the students. Students listen to the passage read to them at natural speed. They are encouraged to take notes of important words for reconstruction but not whole sentences. After the dictation stage, the students are arranged in pairs or small groups. They pool their notes

and produce their own written version of the text which should be grammatically accurate. During this stage, the teacher does not provide any language input. In the final stage, students' products are analyzed and corrected by the whole class.

The dictogloss is designed to draw the learners' attention to language form (Wajnryb 1990: 5-6). Wajnryb (1990: 19) claimed that the dictogloss promotes negotiation of meaning as well as negotiation of form. The interaction process in a small group during the task give students opportunities to talk about grammar in order to complete the task (Wajnryb 1990, Kowal & Swain 1994). The dictogloss is described as a contemporary approach to learning grammar; that is "language forms, structures, and patterns are treated from the perspective of their particular contextual meaning" in the task (Wajnryb 1990: 13). Thus, when the learners talk about grammar during the reconstruction stage, they talk about the predetermined context of that grammar point as well. Kowal and Swain (1994) valued this grammar-orientation feature of the task. They consider the collaborative reconstruction stage beneficial because the learners engage in metalinguistic discussion.

However, the dictogloss is not the same as a jig-saw task. The dictogloss is a task in which students needed to communicate about grammar, while in the jig-saw, students communicate in a content area of interest to them, but not about grammar per se (Pica 1995: 388). Although the interaction stage of the dictogloss was assumed to be an effective language learning environment (Kowal & Swain 1994), it was not clear whether negotiation which happened during the dictogloss interaction stage had the characteristics similar to the ones found in the jig-saw, whose discussion content was not grammar. Because of the grammar-orientation of the dictogloss, the nature of the negotiation in the task might be different from the negotiation in the jig-saw.

This study, thus, focuses on the learners' interactions within the reconstruction stage of the dictogloss task. The questions which guided the research are:

1. Does the dictogloss as a whole promote learner discussions of meaning, of form, or of both?

2. In what way(s) is the learner-learner negotiation, namely the nature of input, output, and feedback, in the dictogloss reconstruction stage, similar to or different from negotiation in jig-saw tasks?

Methodology

Subjects:

The subjects in this study were four adult ESL students who volunteered for this study. Two are Polish speakers and the other two are speakers of Chinese languages. They are female students studying in an inten-

sive English program in a university in Philadelphia. They were enrolled in classes of higher intermediate proficiency level. Their average length of stay in the United States was about one year at the time of the study.

Procedure:

In order to investigate learners' interaction patterns in the interaction phase of the dictogloss task, this study was carried out in an experimental environment. The students worked on the dictogloss task twice outside of their regular classes. On the first meeting, the students were given a training session in which the procedure of the task was explained. Then the students worked on the task. They were paired according to their first language, which made the Polish-speaker pair and the Chinese language speaker pair. The second meeting was held four days after the initial meeting. Assuming that the subjects had completely understood how to do the task, there was no briefing of the procedure at this time. The students were put into mixed language pairs, which created two Polish-Chinese dyads.

The procedure of the task activities followed the instructions given by Wajnryb (1990: 7-9) as much as possible. First, a native speaker instructor led a whole-group discussion about the topic of the story that the students were going to listen to. She then confirmed that the students understood some important vocabulary which would be helpful for them to understand the forthcoming dictation. The instructor explained the definition of the words and phrases and sometime wrote them on the board. The board was erased when the actual tape-listening started so that the listening part of the task would be reasonably challenging.

After this preparation, the students listened to a taped story text read to them at natural speed. The text was read three times with pauses between sentences. There were longer pauses between the readings. While they listened to the tape, the students wrote down words and phrases that they heard on the paper. After the third hearing, the students were put into pairs and asked to reconstruct the text. Each pair spent about 20 to 30 minutes on this activity. The students' activities during the reconstruction stage were audio- and video-taped.

During the reconstruction of the text, the pair could look at each other's notes. At the completion of the task, each pair had to write a reconstructed passage; thus, one of learners in each pair functioned as a scribe. It was emphasized that the passages they produce should not be an exact replica of the original passage but that their products should contain the same information as the original text, and that they should be grammatically accurate. The final stage of the task suggested by Wajnryb (1990: 9), analysis and correction in the whole class, was deleted because of the time constraints. The analysis and correction was left to the students by giving them the copies of the original text and their reconstructed texts.

Materials:

The story text was adapted from the intermediate-activity chapter in *Grammar Dictation* by Wajnryb (1990: 60-61). The focal structure was the past tense of verbs (See Appendix for the complete texts). The text was approximately 100 to 150 words in length.

Data Analysis

All of the data from the three groups were transcribed. The Polish-Polish pair discussed the task in Polish in order to complete the task. Since the researcher does not understand their language, the whole data from this group was unfortunately disregarded from the consideration. The total length of discourse was approximately one and a half hours. For the purposes of coding the data, the categories, Critical Language-Related Episodes (CLREs) were adapted from Swain and Lapkin (1995: 378) and Kowal and Swain (1994). The CLRE was defined as an episode in which language was the focus of the discussion. A CLRE begins with the identification of a grammatical point to be discussed or a sentence or phrase which needed to be reconstructed and finishes once the discussion is completed. It is possible for one episode to be embedded within another. For instance, there were two CLREs when a student corrected her partner's vocabulary in the larger discourse in which they negotiated a verb tense. Not every utterance was considered as CLRE, either. Their discussions were not coded as CLRE unless they identified linguistic problems. As a result, 66% of the total utterance was treated as CLRE.

According to Kowal and Swain (1994), there are three major categories of CLRE: Meaning-based Episodes, Grammatical Episodes, and Orthographic Episodes. These categories were data-driven from the study by Kowal and Swain (1994). The meaning-based episodes are those to which the students' attentions are directed on the semantic components of the language, such as understanding the content of the story. The grammatical episodes must relate to both explicit and implicit discussion on morphosyntactic issues, and the orthographic episodes are those relating to writing styles.

The data was coded by the researcher twice with a one-month interval. Where there were discrepancies between the two coding, those episodes were excluded from consideration. The intra-rater reliability was .82. Furthermore, the language-related episodes were subcategorized. Some of the sub-categories were adapted from Kowal and Swain (1994) and others were dependent on this particular data set.

There are 12 sub-categories. The categories are listed below along with examples[1]:

1. The utterances written in Italics are texts which the students remembered from the listening or attempted to reconstruct. Underlined utterances are the key features for the categories.

1. Meaning-based Episodes

a) Confirming the meaning of the original text

D *The doctor managed to save his life.* Did he die?

C No

D Yes. He

C I think to save his life. Managed to save his life It didn't say he died or not.

D I don't know he died or not saved his life may be not die.

b) Considering lexical choices

D There's a word I . . . didn't catch. say, they sent

C Raced . . . /rei t/ to hospital, I think.

D /rei t/ rushed... *rushed*

c) Vocabulary correction

D *check the phone*

C No No *He was chatting on the phone.* He was talk talking.

d) Reconstruction of the sentence using their own words

B *quick thinking.* something else?

C Yeah. *to save his* uh

B *to save his brother's life*

C no I don't think his life. It's a . . . make something is very quick to reheal to heal.

2. Grammatical Episodes

a) Verb tense

C Mmm why don't we use the . . . *he was looking for?* *He was looking for.* What do you think? In that time time in that time he was . . . doing something. He was looking for another job to do

D odd jobs to do

b) Preposition

C *It is last day of school term of this term* or *this term* or *school term*

D *This term of school*

C *This term of school.* Yeah.

c) Derivation

B When he heart his brother

C scream . . . screaming of his brother

B his brother screamed

C you can say the screaming of her brother his brother

B the same. O.K.

d) Verb + preposition

D *round . . . around . . .* which one should we use?

C *turned round turned it to*

D I think I use *himself* here

C *turned it round himself, turned it to himself* we don't need to use the

exact same word.

e) Conjunction

C *due to* without *due to* Not *due to Because* is better.

D It's same meaning

C It's same meaning no. Sometimes it doesn't same meaning.

f) Pronoun

D Yes, I don't have to use *himself* here again.

C *Turned it to* himself. *Turned it to* himself. Right?

D Yeah, I know. I write down to himself again.

C Uh, *turned it to* uh, *turned it to*

D ###

C Because ...

D *turn...* is it *turn*?

C *Turn round... Turn back... Turn to... turned to*

D O.K. *turned it to himself*, it's self.

3. Orthographic Episodes

a) Spelling

B hurt? H-E-A-R- hurt? no hurt

C H

B H-U-R-T

b) Punctuation

C There is no period I think

B That's a that's a no no sentence

Results and Discussion

In total, 43 CLREs were identified. The results from the analysis of the group work are shown in Table 1. About the half of the episodes, 21 out of 43, were grammar-related episodes, and 15 out of 43 were meaning-based episodes.

The grammar-related episodes had the most variations. There were six different subcategories including the grammar point on which the original passage focused (.i.e. verb tense). While the main grammar point received attention (9 times out of 21), there were five other grammatical categories focused on by the students.

Among meaning-based episodes, the ones in which learners confirmed the meaning of the original passage were observed most frequently. They were followed by episodes for lexical search. There were also six episodes in which students discussed spelling.

Research question 1. Does the dictogloss as a whole promote learner discussions of meaning, of form, or of both?

The description of CLREs indicates that the task facilitates discussions of both meaning and form. As described in Table 1, 35% of the CLREs were

Table 1
Description of Critical Language Related Episodes (Group). n=43

Meaning-based Episodes		Grammatical Episodes		Orthographic Episodes	
Confirming the meaning of the original text. 6		Verb (Tense) 9		Spelling 6	
Lexical search 5		Preposition 4		Punctuation 1	
Vocabulary correction 2		Derivation 3			
Reconstruction with own words . 2		Verb + Preposition..2			
		Conjunctions 2			
		Pronoun 1			
TOTALS					
35%	15	49%	21	16%	7

meaning-based discussions. However, there were meaning-based discussions, but which were not necessarily language-related. For instance, the following dialogue is an example of students' negotiation in which they focused on meaning without identifying language problems.

Example 1:

D When . . . When he at this time . . . Timmy wandered in
C You should say his father to pick up the phone first. Then the Timmy
D oh yes.

In Example 1, the students focused on the sequence of events and negotiated meaning that is Timmy's "father picked up the phone" before "Timmy wandered in." However, the students did not identify any linguistic and structural problems relating to the sequence of the events. Thus, this example and other similar episodes to this were not included in the CLRE. Example 1 is an evidence that there were more occasions in which students focused and negotiated meaning. Therefore, the dictogloss as a whole seems to promote discussion of meaning.

As Kowal and Swain (1994) discuss in their study, the dictogloss indeed elicits discussion on form. The students engaged in discussions in which they needed to talk more or less explicitly about how English worked. In the study, the students focused on the grammar point for which the original texts were designed; 9 out of 21 occasions (42%) of grammar-oriented discussion was about the tense of verbs, and there were five other

grammatical points discussed in the sessions (12 episodes, 28% of all episodes). The students seemed to predictably focus on these features which were not the major focus of the original texts because they became aware of the gap between what they wanted to say or write and what they could actually say or write. Some of their discussions even reveal their metalinguistic cognition of their thinking processes as in Episode 1:

Episode 1:

225 C *Timmy . . . was wandering.* Right?
226 D *Timmy*
227 C Do you use progressive?
228 D Progressive
229 C Uh, I think we should use passive. Was wandering.
230 D Do you wander wander in? Simple past tense?
231 C Here is the simple past.

Although the linguistic terms they used in Episode 1 are not correct, their awareness of the gap in terms of their understanding of certain areas of syntax is observable.

In Episode 2, the students attempted to use the stem of a verb they managed to hear.

Episode 2:

80 A *when he heard . . . screaming*
81 or *he screamed*?
82 D *When he heard . . . his brother screaming*?
83 A Yeah
84 D *screamed* or *ing*?
85 A *ing*? yes *ing*

In line 80 and 81, Student A suggested two possible forms of the verb, **scream**. Her identification of problem was acknowledged by her partner in lines 82 and 84. Finally, Student A makes a decision that the verb should be "screaming" in the context. Although the students did not use sophisticated grammatical terms or metalinguistic explanations, they were aware of the morphology of the verb, and chose the right form.

Research question 2. In what way(s) is the learner-learner negotiation, namely the nature of input, output, and feedback, in the dictogloss interaction stage similar to or different from negotiation in the jig-saw task?

The negotiation during the reconstruction stage of the dictogloss did not seem to be similar to the one in a jig-saw puzzle. The role of input in this task actually appeared to be different; their access to original passage is limited. At the beginning, the students are given the original text aurally

without any negotiation opportunities. Once they are engaged in reconstruction, they do not have further opportunities to hear the original text. When the students are given an opportunity to negotiate and produce comprehensible input and output in regard to the content, they do not have access to the complete original passage, which is either on tape or in the hand of instructor. Thus, they have to depend on the limited input data, which are the notes, their memory, and their partner.

This circumstance limited the development of the negotiation. For example, in Episode 3 students' discussion the preposition was abandoned.

Episode 3:

141	C	*Stayed at home with. . .*
142		Uh...
143	D	What do you say? *with cold*? what did you hear?
144	C	*stayed home* that's it. we don't. if we don't understand

In Episode 3, students C and D became aware that they did not understand the message of the original text, "Timmy stayed home with cold." When they came to the point when they actually needed to make a decision and write down the passage, they chose to abandon the phrase. Since the dictogloss procedure does not require students to dictate the exact words and phrases from the original text, they could excuse themselves and abandon the uncertain phrase. While the students negotiated the meaning, their discussion on form was limited because they did not have sufficient input data or further access to the original text.

On the other hand, when one of the partners had a clear understanding of the original message, their discourse developed into negotiation. Episode 4 is a Meaning-based Episode, in which Student D repeats the original message with modifications and helps Student C understand the content.

Episode 4:

76	C	But last sentence, I didn't
77	D	Uh, *it's simply an accident. One of those things.*
78		*One chance in ten million.*
79	C	What does it?
80		One chance to win? the one million? Why?
81	D	It's an accident.
82	C	It's accident to win.
83	D	Not win.
84	C	To lose I think. But I heard...is win...the ten million
85	D	I think nothing win or lose.
86	C	Uh, ... is ... what?

87 D just said this kind of accident is one chance in ten million
88 C O.K.....O.K.
89 (C/D laugh)
90 C It's one chance. oh, ONE chance.
91 I think is WIN the chance to.
92 D no win no
93 C So I wonder why
94 D I . . . I thought it's *chance* but I'm not sure.
95 C It's *one chance out of ten million.*
96 C uh-ha

Unlike the purely meaning-based episodes such as in Example, Student C identified her problem: "one chance to win" (line 80).

Indeed, the initial comprehension of the original text by the students appears to have a significant impact on their interaction. The differences between the students abandoning the identified linguistic problem or continuing the negotiation depended on the degree of their understanding of the first input of the original text. The students seemed to realize that they could not reconstruct the story or talk about grammar without understanding the content of the original message. Student C's comment in Episode 3 (line 144), for example, indicates that they could not help abandoning the phrase "with cold" because they could not completely comprehend the original sentence.

Furthermore, there were also 6 CLREs in which students attempted to confirm the meaning of the original text. This is 40% of the Meaning-Based Episodes and 14% of all the CLREs. There was a pattern of strategies observed through the interaction. The students approached a challenging text with semantic processing first and then with syntactic processing. Episode 5 and 6 are from the interaction between student C and D. Episode 5 occurred when the task proceeded for about two minutes, and Episode 6 happened twenty minutes after they worked on the task.

Episode 5:

39 D And *he . . . he*
40 C *he . . .* uh. *When the telephone ring,* an . . .*telephone is*
41 *ringing, and he*
42 D *he take. he...*
43 no. *He take out he old gun to clean when telephone ring.*
44 C Yeah. *He stop to to he stop to . . .* uh *he stop to clean old gun*
45 *when the telephone ring*
46 D Yeah.

Episode 6:

197 C Uh, ah, yes. *When the telephone is ring.*
198 Here should be the past tense. Here is should be the pre-, uh

199 what do you say? *He was taking his old gun out*
200 *when the telephone rang*. Right?
201 Here is the *ing* and here uh, is
202 D uh, I know he didn't use the progressing tense
203 C Progressing tense...yeah, I agree to use...
204 D yeah
205 C ...but I think in the later sentence, use the progressing.
206 The first use the past tense. You reverse...
Reverse this.

Earlier in their reconstruction process, students C and D confirmed the sequence of events (Episode 5); later they were ready to engage in an extended "talk about grammar" (Episode 6).

In regard to feedback, this study indicates that there seems to be a need for students to receive some feedback on their product in order to learn. As we have seen earlier, the students redefined their focus on grammar rather arbitrarily. They were not always correct in solving the difficulties they identified. There were some occasions when the students abandoned the issue because of their limited comprehension of the original text and/or linguistic knowledge. Moreover, they did not identify all problems and mistakes. These phenomena were observed in Kowal and Swain's (1994) studies as well.

The "identification of problems" will theoretically raise students' awareness; the time when they noticed their problems would be a desirable chance to learn the particular linguistic feature they identified as a problem. Because of the design of the study, the subjects in the current study did not receive explicit feedback on their reconstructed text or on their hypotheses of how the language works.

For example, Student C was preoccupied with progressive forms throughout the tasks. Indeed, 8 of 9 CLREs regarding verb tense had her involvement. Her attention to the verb-form especially progressive forms seems very high. However, she could not explain why she should or should not use the forms in the questioned sentences during the tasks. Neither could her partner explain the use of progressive forms. The problems were often solved by either Student C or her partner's compromise rather than by their mutual understanding. Their learning for "filling the gap", thus, will depend on the inductive reflection of their experience of language use and the meaning of the message.

Corrective feedback, in fact, seems to be essential for the successful use of the dictogloss task. This fact is actually discussed by Wajnryb (1990: 11). She treats analysis and correction of the reconstructed text as a final stage of the task; the correction stage is as valuable as the interaction stage in her view (Wajnryb 1990: 8-9). Kowal and Swain (1994b) also mention the need for feedback. They note that all mistakes in the students' final texts were given feedback either in the follow-up whole-group discussion or the teachers' correction on their work.

In addition to feedback, proper preparation for better comprehension of the text is also desirable. In Kowal and Swain's (1994) study, the students were exposed to the theme and content of *L'environnement* in the content classroom before they worked on a dictogloss task with a text of this theme. The students had held discussions around the theme, read passage as well as completed comprehension activities and extended written activities prior to the task (Kowal & Swain 1994: 10). The topical warm-up discussion and vocabulary preview before the task probably need to be thorough, especially for lower level students, so that they are receptive enough to the listening stage.

Conclusions

Apparently, the interaction stage in the dictogloss differs from the jig-saw whose content is not grammar. The dictogloss task requires students to engage in more language-form related processes than the jig-saw does. While interaction in the jig-saw requires only meaning-based communication, in the dictogloss both meaning-based and grammar-based communication is expected. Pica and her colleagues evaluated the communication tasks according to the nature of negotiation within the task. They valued the tasks which provide language learners with the context filled with meaningful communication opportunities (Pica, Holliday, Lewis, & Morgenthaler 1989: 83-84; Pica, Kanagy & Falodun 1993: 29-31). The jig-saw indeed provides students with the constant opportunities to be exposed to input, feedback, and output. Although they are implicit and embedded in the discourse, modifications made in discourse during the task are rich resources for language learning.

Students engaged in the dictogloss seem to be exposed to different amount of input, output, and feedback according to the different stages of the task. While the task as a whole promotes learners' discussions of both meaning and form, the limited access to the input and feedback in the reconstruction stage seems to affect the students' production. This stage in the dictogloss is useful and valuable to make the task communicative and to provide students with opportunities to hypothesize how grammar works. However, without proper preparation for assisting their comprehension of the original text, the outcome of students' interaction and negotiation may be restricted. Moreover, students still need adequate feedback from the instructor on their production since they are not always accurate in their grammatical knowledge. The result of this study suggested that the dictogloss completes as a context of language learning when the entire stages are proceeded.

References

Doughty, C., & Pica, T. (1986). "Information gap" tasks: Do they facilitate second language acquisition? *TESOL Quarterly, 20,* 305-325.

Gass, S. M., & Varonis, E. M. (1985). Task variation and nonnative/nonnative negotiation of meaning. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 149-161). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Kowal, M., & Swain, M. (1994). Using collaborative language production tasks to promote students' language awareness. *Language Awareness, 3,* 73-93.

Mackey, A. (1994). Targeting morpho-syntax in children's ESL: An empirical study of the use of interactive goal-based tasks. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, 10* (1), 67-89.

Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Pica, T. (1992). The textural outcomes of native speaker-non-native speaker negotiation: What do they reveal about second language learning? In C. Kramsch & S. McConnell-Ginet (Eds.), *Text and context: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on language study* (pp. 198-237). Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.

Pica, T. (1994). Review article Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second-language learning conditions, processes, and outcomes? *Language Learning, 44,* 493-527.

Pica, T. (1995). Teaching language and teaching language learners: Expanding roles and expectations of language teachers in communicative, content- based classrooms. *Georgetown University Round Table on Language and Linguistics* (pp. 378-397). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Pica, T., Holliday, L., Lewis, N., & Morgenthaler, L. (1989). Comprehensible output as an outcome of linguistic demands on the learner. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 11,* 63-90.

Pica, T., Kanagy, R., & Falodun, J. (1993). Choosing and using communication tasks in language teaching and research. In S. Gass & G. Crookes (Eds.), *Tasks and second language learning* (pp. 9-34). London: Multilingual Matters.

Pica, T., Young, R., & Doughty, C. (1987). The impact of interaction on comprehension. *TESOL Quarterly, 21,* 737-758.

Pica, T., Lincoln-Porter, F., Paninos, D., & Linnell, J. (1995). What can second language learners learn from each other? Only their researcher knows for sure. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, 11* (1), 1-36.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.). *Input in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 235-253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Swain, M. (1994). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlholfer (Eds.), *Principles and practice in the study of language* (pp. 125-144). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1995). Problems in output and the cognitive processes they generated: A step towards second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 16,* 371-391.

Wajnryb, R. (1990). *Grammar dictation.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Toshiyo Nabei, a native of Japan, has a M.S. Ed. in TESOL from the University of Pennsylvania. Her current research interest is SLA, especially the role of interaction in the learning process.

Appendix

Dictogloss Task Text

ONE IN TEN MILLION

On the last day of the school term, eleven-year-old Timmy stayed home with a cold. It was a rain day and his mother thought he'd better not go to school. His father, who was out of work, stayed at home too and looked for odd jobs to do. He was getting out his old gun to clean when the telephone rang. While his father was chatting on the phone, Timmy wandered in, picked up the gun, turned it around, pulled the trigger and shot himself. He was sent to the hospital; doctors managed to save his life. * The police did not charge anyone with any crime: it was simply an accident, one of those things, one chance in ten million. (Wajnryb 1990: 60) *This sentence was changed.)

YOUNG HERO

A nine-year-old boy dashed through flames to pull his younger brother to safety. The little boy had been playing with a cigarette lighter while sitting on his bike. The older boy said he was standing in the kitchen when he heard his brother screaming and ran to help him. He dragged the toddler to the bathroom and turned on the water to put out the fire. Doctors praised the young hero for his quick thinking and said the boy's burns would heal with time. (Wajnryb 1990: 61)