Pre-service Teachers' Reflections on a Repeated Dictogloss Activity

Stan PEDERSON

Abstract

This paper explores the reflections of pre-service teachers at the end of a series of dictogloss activities. Final assignments revealed that students were able to identify linguistic gaps and speak of them in formal linguistic terms. They identified their own language processing problems as of two broad sorts: those caused by an inability to pick up weakly stressed forms and those related to applying limited attentional resources to real-time listening. Students also showed an awareness of their own strategies for constructing meaning. However, despite identifying their own problems, showing awareness of their own processes for meaning construction and having the opportunity to apply feedback immediately to the next dictogloss, most students did not believe themselves to have improved in their abilities to fill the gaps they had identified. The activity was generally felt to be difficult. Perhaps due to this experience, students were able to come up with a variety of ways to adapt the activity to be more suitable to the context and level of junior high school. These student reflections formed the basis for recommendations for improving future dictogloss activities and for planning future research.

Key words : focus on form, output, dictogloss, teacher training

1. Introduction

This classroom research describes student impressions of one activity, the dictogloss, taken up as part of a communication class for future teachers of English. Dictogloss content was based on the course theme: classroom management and discipline. It was implemented, in part, to provide some form focus in a course primarily based on content and stressing fluency. The activities were designed to build on each other-the previous dictogloss was reviewed immediately before starting the next-providing an opportunity for retrial immediately following feedback. The literature review, which follows, will introduce the background to this and other aspects of the design rationale.

This will be followed by a treatment of goals and procedure followed by instruments and data collection and an extended treatment of the results. I will conclude by outlining improvements for future activities and directions for future research based on student reactions to this round of instruction.

2. Literature review

˙Dictogloss is a pair activity in which two students collaborate to construct a written text closely approximating that read aloud by the teacher. The technique has a number of variations but according to Jacobs & Small (2003) consistently follows this basic procedure:

1) The class engages in some discussion on the topic of the upcoming text. . . .
2) The teacher reads the text aloud once at normal speed as students listen but do not write. . . .
3) The teacher reads the text again at normal speed and students take notes. Students are not trying to write down

every word spoken; they could not even if they tried, because the teacher is reading at normal speed.

4) Students work in groups of 2-4 to reconstruct the text in full sentences. . . . The reconstruction seeks to retain the meaning and form of the original text but is not a word for word copy of the text read by the teacher.

5) Students, with the teacher's help, identify similarities and differences in terms of meaning and form between their text reconstruction and the original. (pp. 1-2)

The distinction between dictation and dictogloss is described as: "students reconstruct the text on their own after the teacher has read it aloud to them just twice at normal speed (steps 2 and 3) rather than the teacher reading slowly and repeatedly" (p. 3) However, the number of repetitions and speed at which the text is read is largely a distinction of degree. It might be argued that in dictation the student picks most everything up through listening whereas in dictogloss, a dearth of information forces the student to reconstruct the text. However, listening is itself a process of construction in which the listener applies pre-existing schema of phonemes, words, syntax and discourse to the "blooming, buzzing confusion" of signals coming in. In dictation, the opportunity to hear the text repeatedly and slowly allows the listener to apply these constructive resources at the local phoneme and word level even when grammatical and discourse schema are not up to the job. The dictation continues until it exhausts these resources. In dictogloss, the paucity of recorded information forces the listener to activate every available schematic resource to fill in the gaps. Both dictation and dictogloss involve construction on the part of the learner, but the more extensive gaps of dictogloss shifts the balance in the direction of top down processing.

The procedure of reading twice at natural speed, as prescribed above, is of course arbitrary. Any combination of factors that leaves enough missing to challenge learners higher order processing will suffice. As Sun (2008) states: "there must also be *incomprehensible input* — some extra bits of linguistic forms that cause a mental jolt in processing. (p. 6)

However, dictogloss also differs from dictation in a more fundamental qualitative way; It involves learner collaboration. In dictogloss, students combine their knowledge and work to teach each other. In other words it engages sociocultural learning. Borer (2007) explains:

For Vygotsky (1978) and other socioculturalists, language emerges as *social speech* to regulate interaction with people. It gives way to egocentric speech for the self, and becomes *inner speech* as cognitive functions are transferred from the environment to the individual. Learners move from an external dependence on an immediate stimulus (object-regulation) or a helper (other-regulation) toward self-regulation, a process of internalization whereby the concept can be recalled and applied in new contexts. (p. 275)

From the perspective of sociocultural learning theory dictogloss takes advantage of both social-regulation, in the person of the student partner (and later on the teacher), and object-regulation in the form of the externalized text.

Doughty (cited in Sun, 2008) claims that collaboration-negotiation serves to highlight input in three ways:

First, it is made more comprehensible, which is a pre-requisite of IL development. Second, problematic forms that impede comprehension are highlighted and forced to be processed to achieve successful communication. Third, through negotiation, learners receive both positive and negative feedback that are juxtaposed immediately to the problematic form, and the close proximity facilitates hypothesis testing and revision. (p. 5)

Dictogloss is also recommended by the output theory of Swain (2001). She and her colleagues, investigating why Canadian French immersion students failed to attain native-like proficiency, observed: first, that grammar was being taught as stand-alone material, not integrated with content teaching, and second, that students were unable to produce native-like morphology, syntax and discourse although they were able to comprehend them. They determined that the rich comprehensible input of these content-based courses was not enough for full language development.

They also observed that students had few opportunities to produce language in these relatively large teacher-centered classes. Further investigation led Swain to recommend the integration of content with grammar instruction and

to emphasize the importance of student output with a focus on accuracy. She explains that with output "learners need to move from the semantic, open-ended, strategic processing prevalent in comprehension to the complete grammatical processing needed for accurate production." (p. 48) Output works to enhance accuracy by giving students an opportunity to 'notice' differences between their own linguistic products and correct models. It may promote hypothesis testing of learner-generated ideas about language systems and can also lead to thinking about language using metatalk about form. Swain confirmed the action of these three functions in dictogloss activities:

> We tried using dictogloss tasks in grade seven and eight immersion classes (Kowal and Swain, 1994; 1997), and have found that they have elicited the sort of student talk we hoped they would elicit: talk about the language of the text they were reconstructing, that is, metatalk. We observed students noticing things they did not know or could not say to their own satisfaction, and we observed these same students formulating hypotheses and testing them out using the tools at their disposal: themselves; each other; their dictionaries; their 'verb' book; their teacher; their L1. (p. 52)

Williams (1999) investigated the incidence of Language Related Episodes (LREs) instances in which learners engage in metatalk, and found that highly-structured tasks like correcting homework and working in the textbook, tasks in which learners use relatively little of their own language, generated the highest frequency of LREs thus confirming Swain's assertions about the highly-structured dictogloss promoting metatalk.

Expanding on research about LREs, Gutierrez (2008) studied interactions during collaborative L2 writing tasks and found that metalinguistic activity is not always explicit. She compared the explicit metalinguisitic comments on spelling, punctuation, lexis, morphology, meaning, discourse and text organization to those comments relying on implicit evaluations. The interactions based on implicit rules included: repetitions, acceptances, rejections, questionings and reformulations either without justification or without specifically metalinguistic justification. These were found to be plentiful. Of all interactions involving metalinguistic activity, explicit statements were only slightly more frequent at 40.7% compared to 36.6% of the implicit type.

The prominence of implicit communication about form might be linked to ability, with explicit LREs increasing in frequency as proficiency level goes up (Williams 1999). This might be attributed to processing constraints as those with higher proficiency might have automatized lower-level processes allowing them to allot attention to higher-level processes of explicit metalinguistic thinking. Bolstering this view, Harley (1998) trying to explain the good results of the first 2 weeks and the poorer results of the last three weeks of a study on input enhancement, observed that the first two weeks involved mostly known vocabulary and a familiar topic while the last three weeks involved a lot of new vocabulary. The new vocabulary meant that students were "preoccupied with remembering the new words for objects featured in the activities and thus were not able to devote full attention to the formal aspects that were the intended focus of the activities." (p. 169) In other words it is crucial that focus on form activities not overburden students with lower level vocabulary problems or hobble them with an unfamiliar topic restricting their use of top-down processing.

Finally, reconstructing a text from limited resources can also be viewed from the perspective of mistake correction. Johnson (1996) outlines a program for mistake correction based on the literature on skills training. It consists of four elements:

1) The need or desire to eliminate the mistake.
2) A model of the form being used correctly in real operating circumstances.
3) Knowledge that a mistake has been made.
4) The opportunity to practice again under the same circumstances. (p. 123)

The dictogloss meets the criteria for steps 1, 2 and 3 in its procedure. Step 4, the opportunity to practice again in the same circumstances, however, is missing in the dictogloss procedure which typically ends with the students comparing their product with the original. Furthermore, Johnson writes that it is important that retrial occurs soon after feedback.

He also points out that the "most useful feedback comes from those areas of mismatch which students are themselves able to identify, because those areas will accord with the stage of their skill (or interlanguage development)" (p. 127) Dictogloss satisfies this condition in that each pair will create a profile of their own gaps at each stage of the activity and finish by considering their own persistent gaps and errors as revealed by the model text.

3. Participants and setting

Participants were second year English majors in the Faculty of Education at a high level university in Japan. They attend most classes together and regularly collaborate with each other. The dictogloss was incorporated as a part of regular classroom activities in a communication class. The class was built around an educational theme: classroom management and discipline. Students participated in listening activities around a film, engaged in repeated pair discussions and wrote opinions based on a questionnaire exploring beliefs about classroom management. The dictogloss activity used texts based on the same themes.

4. Goals of the dictogloss activity and research questions

As this is classroom research, the goals of the activity and the aims of the research are closely correlated, although the research questions are somewhat more detailed and precise. The pedagogical goals were to:

1) Become aware of gaps in linguistic knowledge.
2) Heighten awareness of language processing and meaning construction.
3) Communicate explicitly about language.
4) Apply this experience to a possible teaching situation.

Goals 1-3 are typical of dictogloss activities but goal 4 is specific to these students and their chosen career in education.
These goals were the basis for the following research questions:

RQ1: What errors or gaps did students identify?
RQ2: To what extent did students identify their errors in metalingistic terms?
RQ3: How did students account for their errors?
RQ4: What strategies were students aware of using to complete the task?
RQ5: To what extent were students aware of reducing the errors they identified?
RQ6: How did students propose to adapt this technique for use in another teaching situation?

5. Method

The classroom procedure was as follows:

1) The teacher reads the passage at less than natural speed but quickly enough to preserve prosodic features. Students are instructed to listen for global meaning. They may not take notes until the teacher has finished reading.
2) The teacher reads the text again with the students taking notes freely throughout.
3) Partners compare notes and construct an initial text.
4) Steps 2 and 3 are repeated twice and the final product emailed immediately to the professor. This prevents any

alteration of the text after viewing the correct answer.

5) Students are shown the original and compare this with their own version. No further processing takes place at this point.

6) At the next class, their product from last class is returned and they are asked to compare it with the original, being careful to identify the types and patterns of mistakes as preparation for today's activity. This is an unconventional procedure. It is imposed so that noticing and accounting for the errors has an immediate purpose and application and, in line with Johnson (1996) cited above, students have a chance to apply feedback immediately.

7) A new dictogloss is performed as in steps 1-5.

8) At the end of the course all dictogloss assignments were returned to students. They were asked to think in detail about their own language processing, why they made errors, where they improved, how they worked with their partner and how they might apply such activities in their own teaching. This provides another level of reflection.

As mentioned above, the dictogloss was based on the classroom management themes in focus at the time. The example below is typical in length and content:

Keeping order in the classroom is not always easy. Children will always present problems for the teacher to solve. Some of these problems are with self-control. Other problems may stem from a lack of social sense: in other words, some students may lack knowledge of how to behave in a social group. The dutiful teacher must consider each of these factors when making a plan for maintaining discipline in their classroom. (72 words)

6. Data collection and instruments

Data for analysis consisted solely of the final written assignments. Students were asked to collaborate with their dictgloss partners. They were advised to discuss things at length and reach agreement wherever possible. However, in light of student concerns about what to do if they still disagreed, it was decided that all students would hand in their own papers, even if identical. Students were asked to consider the following:

1) What mistakes did you make? Was there a pattern? What was the reason for these mistakes? Before each dictogloss (except the first) you reviewed the previous one with your partner. Did this make a difference in the next dictogloss? Did you make the same sorts of mistakes again? Did the kind of mistakes change?

2) How did you work with your partner? Describe the process and what each of you contributed. Talk about what happened when a word was unknown and how you polished the final draft.

3) How could this activity be used in a junior high school English class? In what ways could it be helpful to students? Do you see any problems with using this activity? How could these problems be solved?

7. Results

7.1 Summarizing the data

In the end, all students submitted papers identical to those of their partner(s). In some cases absences meant that a student was paired with a new partner for a session. In these cases all partners met and collaborated on a single paper. In all, 10 different papers were submitted from a pool of 23 students. This included one group of three and one group of four.

I read the papers and organized the data according to the questions students had been asked. Sticky notes were used to code each unique response. Where a similar response appeared in another paper, the paper's number was added to the sticky note as another instance. The initial categories were: recommendations for junior high school, improvements in performance, problems/difficulties and ways of working together. Finally, this summarized data was used as an index

for exploring each specific research question.

7.2 Research questions 1, 2 and 3

The first three research questions are closely related and tended to be interwoven in student papers. They were:

RQ1: What errors or gaps did students identify?
RQ2 To what extent did students identify their errors in metalingistic terms?
RQ3: How did students account for their errors?

Students tended to speak of their errors in metalinguisitic terms, using formal grammatical expressions. While they mentioned a large number of specific difficulties, these were grouped together under two broad causes; missing weakly stressed elements and inability to focus attention on more than one element.

Problems attributed to difficulty in picking up weakly stressed elements included: the 3rd person "s" on verbs, "s" on plural nouns, short conjunctions, articles and function words (mostly prepositions). In addition, there were two mentions of the relative pronoun and two of missing out auxiliary verbs. Most students accounted for these difficulties in formal terms specifically citing: weak stress, elision, assimilation and difficulty in picking up schwa. For example:

It was difficult for us to catch conjunctions and relative pronouns. We made the same sort of mistakes again. In particular, the conjunction "and" and the relative pronoun "that" were hard to catch. We misheard the conjunction "and" as the preposition "in", and we took "that" for the article "the." We thought of the reason for the mistakes. We found the reason for the mistakes. Conjunctions, relative pronouns and prepositions are pronounced weakly. We Japanese do not catch such words very well because we are hardly taught such ways of pronunciation. (Paper 2)

Note the explicit grammatical terms used and the way difficulties are linked to a common cause. On the other hand, one paper, citing some of the same difficulties, attributed them to a different cause:

We could not catch a lot of the "the," "a," "an," /l/ and /r/ sounds, "s" and "es" in plural forms, and "ed" in past forms and prepositions. We concentrated too much on content words so we could not catch the ending of words and function words. (Paper 10)

In this case an expanded list of mistakes is classed together under the broader cause of attention or, processing limitations. Other papers mentioned limited attention as a source of difficulties but linked this cause to different results. These included missing: entire words, the last half of sentences, the middle of sentences, entire sentences and, in one case, missing the global meaning. This problem was explicitly stated in half of the submissions. Here is the most elaborated account:

During the dictogloss, we often missed whole sentences. There were many reasons. The biggest cause was that our writing speed was slow. Because of this, we could not catch up with the listening speed. Thus, we could not take enough notes. What is worse, we always failed to remember the content. As a result, we could not make a whole sentence from the words we could get. If we knew the content, we might be able to predict what kind of words would appear next. But we did not remember the content well, so we wrote down only the words we could catch exactly. Indeed, when we do dictation tasks, we need to depend not only on our hearing ability but also on our predictions. (Paper 5)

This paper shows awareness of processing limits and beyond this an understanding of background schema operating to make predictions, to construct meaning.

Overall, regarding the first three research questions, we can say that students experienced problems deriving from

weakly stressed elements and from processing limits. These two factors were the main reasons cited for the list of student difficulties. It can also be said that difficulties were identified using explicit linguistic terms.

7.3 Research question 4

Next, we turn to the question of how students faced these difficulties.

RQ4: What strategies were students aware of using to complete the task?

Strategies for taking on the task can be grouped in two broad categories: the first involving collaboration with their partner and the second regarding how they approached unknown stretches or bits of language.

In working with a partner, pairs used a variety of collaborative strategies. These always included those required by the procedure, sharing what each had noted and negotiating to fill in gaps and polish the final product. But beyond these required strategies, pairs also noted more specific tactics: dividing up blanks missing in their combined text, listening for alternate sentences and assigning the beginning of a sentence to one partner and the end to the other partner. In addition, one pair mentioned a more specialized division of labor:

> My partner is good at grammar. And although I cannot often pick up the sentence, I can catch individual words. Therefore, I caught the words, and my partner constructed them into sentences. (Paper 9)

Students also used a variety of strategies to fill in unknown stretches of language. One strategy, applied to a partially completed word, was using a dictionary or spell check function to come up with candidates. Other students used their own knowledge of words to come up with possibilities:

> In the case where we heard something, which we did not know or understand, we wrote it as we heard it. Then we created words using our imaginations, or we thought that we misheard the words for words we already knew so we wrote the words which had sounds that were close to them. (Paper 4)

Here is a more detailed explanation of this approach but one resulting in an unsuccessful guess:

> When unknown words appeared in the sentences, we were confused and took the words for known words. For example, we misunderstood "disruptive" as "this active" because we did not know the word "disruptive" (Paper 3)

This shows implicit awareness of using known schema to impose meaning onto the linguistic data. Here is another example of going wrong in a guessing strategy, but this time the explanation implies an underlying theory of activation thresholds:

> When our professor said "disapproving," we could catch the sound of /dis/, /p/, /ving/. Therefore, we chose the word "disimproving." That is because "improve" is more familiar to us than "approve." (Paper 1)

Another top-down strategy was to adjust the unknown element to conform to the overall context or meaning:

> When we couldn't catch some words, we talked and guessed from the context and the sound. Then we decided the most appropriate words or sentences which accommodated the context. (Paper 7)

And more specifically:

> We didn't know the word "intrinsic." We could catch only the "in" sound, but we found the word by using the

"spell check" in our electronic dictionary and checked the meaning of it. Then, if we thought that its meaning suited the sentence, we wrote it down, and completed it. Finally, we read the sentences we could catch and made sure of the meaning. (Paper 9)

Checking against grammar rules was also a common strategy. Specifically mentioned in these grammar checks were: plural versus singular, past tense "ed," 3rd person "s" part of speech and punctuation. Here is an example of the process:

> For example, we didn't know a word in the fourth dictogloss. The word was "cultivation." On the first try, we couldn't catch the word clearly and conjectured the spelling of the word. On the second try, we could not catch the sound clearly again, so we conjectured the word's meaning from the flow of the sentences. On this try, we thought the word was "cultivate." Finally, we checked the word from a grammar point of view, and we found the word "cultivation." (Paper 5)

In summary, students used collaborative strategies to exchange information, to divide up tasks and to negotiate a final text. In addition, they used a variety of linguistic strategies to choose appropriate words or to construct sentences. These strategies included: checking against grammar rules, aligning meaning within a larger semantic frame, and selecting candidate words from one's own stock of words or from those generated by reference to a dictionary or spell check function.

7.4 Research question 5

We now turn to the question of improvement. In this procedure, reviewing the previous dictogloss before undertaking a new one gave the students an opportunity to put their insights and ideas into action immediately. While the study utilized this innovation, it was not isolated as a variable. We are, therefore, restricted to looking at student perceptions of improvement resulting from the procedure as a whole.

RQ5: To what extent were students aware of reducing the errors they identified ?

Overall, most problems continued to persist. A number of papers cited continued difficulty in picking up weakly stressed sounds, short words and blended sounds: "It was difficult for us to catch conjunctions and relative pronouns. We made the same sorts of mistakes again. In particular, the conjunction "and" and the relative pronoun "that" were hard to catch." (Paper 2) This is echoed in Paper 9.

Errors attributable to processing also continued with little improvement. Paper 5 said they continued to miss out whole sentences. The pair who earlier said they "fell into a panic" when they could not pick something up said "The tendency continued all the time, we made the same mistakes and the kind of mistakes did not change" (Paper 10) Papers 7 and 9 made similar assessments.

Another paper showed awareness of reducing mistakes in one area only to see other sorts of mistakes take their place: "We tend to fail to hear the differences of nouns and adjectives since we awoke to function words too much." Paper 4 and paper 6 made similar observations.

Some pairs did claim improvement over the series of activities: "Mistakes in articles and inflected endings decreased little by little, In addition, omission of the articles has almost disappeared" (Paper 5) Unfortunately, they failed to mention exactly how they were able to reduce these errors. Paper 1 is more forthcoming in attributing improvement to grammar checks:

> We could reduce the mistake where we miss the "s" appearing at the end of the 'general' verb, dictation by dictation. This is because we started to check the grammar of the sentences we caught more carefully from the second dictation. At the final dictation, we didn't make any of the mistakes that I wrote about above at all. On the other hand, we could not reduce the mistake of "s" which appears at the end of the plural noun. (Paper 1)

Finally, papers 8 and 3 failed to make any mention of changes over time suggesting no perceived improvements. We can conclude that aside from the 2 papers quoted above, students did not note any improvements over the series of activities. Those who did feel they had made progress found the improvements linked to checking grammar points.

7.6 Research question 6

We now move on to the question of how students applied their own experience as students to a junior high school teaching situation.

Research question 6: How did students propose to adapt this technique for use in another teaching situation?

First of all, there was consensus that the procedure, as performed in our lessons, was too difficult for junior high school. Students suggested making the activity simpler in the following ways:

1) Limit to partial text such as blanks (Papers 1, 5, 6, 7, 8) or selected sentences. (Paper 8).
2) Make things easier to pick up by repeating more often, (Papers 5, 6, 8) speaking more slowly, (Papers 2, 4, 5, 7) or by limiting the length of sentences. (Paper 7)
3) Limit content to previously taught material and known words. (Papers 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10)
4) Orient students well to global meaning beforehand. (Papers 4, 6)
5) Limit scope to a selected grammar point. (Papers 1, 7)

Students were not explicit in justifying their suggestions beyond recommending them as ways to make the exercise easier. Nonetheless, a degree of informed pedagogical thinking is implicated. The suggestions in numbers 1 and 2 face the problems of processing constraints by giving students less to listen for or by altering the input to make it easier to pick up. Suggestion 3 faces the problem of unknown words by eliminating them, thus assuring that students have the resources to solve every word identification problem they face. Suggestion 4 relies on creating a clear context within which the students can make informed predictions and guesses. And finally, suggestion 5 limits the grammar scope of the exercise, which could help students be more focused in their grammatical checks. These five suggestions are, more or less, context free and apply to any circumstance in which you want to make the exercise easier.

Other pedagogical considerations were more specific to the junior high school setting:

6) Assure that students do the listening notes alone rather than depending on their partner. (Paper 3)
7) Use a CD to assure correct and clear pronunciation in the case of an NNS English teacher. (Paper 9)
8) Change pairs now and then to solve the problem of two troubled students being paired together. (Paper 2)

The final three suggestions show some awareness of problems that may well present themselves in the real world junior high school. However, they lack the richness and the broad endorsement of the first five suggestions, perhaps, because they are less closely linked to their own personal experience of dictogloss.

8. Conclusions and directions for further research

Students were able to identify their own difficulties and engaged in explicit conversation about grammar, morphology, phonology and lexis. They also showed awareness of their behavior during listening and their own strategies for making corrections and revisions. In addition, they were able to transfer knowledge of their own experience to the situation of teaching. This is shown in their extensive list of suggestions for simplifying the activity. The activity functioned well in these respects.

On the other hand, the lack of perceived improvement was widespread (8 of 10 papers) pointing up a serious

problem. A number of possible solutions present themselves. In fact, student suggestions for simplifying the dictogloss for junior high school can be taken as indirect feedback on the activity as experienced. Accordingly, the activity might be made easier by slowing it down, increasing the number of repetitions, or by reducing it to blanks or missing sentences.

However, the difficulty with these innovations is that they may allow students to complete too much from the bottom up. That is, it may reduce the opportunities for students to engage in negotiation and construction based on higher-order processes involving meaning and form.

More promising are suggestions to limit the activity to known words or previously studied material, or giving a more thorough orientation to global meaning. This could provide students with the resources to make greater use of higher-order processes. Similarly, one could take up the suggestion of concentrating on a specific grammar form. For example, one could use the first dictogloss to raise awareness of difficulties. The second dictogloss could be preceded with instruction in a key area of concern. This would not preclude negotiation on other areas of grammar but would provide students with the resources to negotiate targeted grammar points with more certainty and confidence.

Finally, this additional grammar instruction could provide a benchmark against which students and teachers could measure progress. It would then be possible, with the inclusion of a control group, to determine the effects of the feedback/immediate retrial procedure or other variables.

References

Borer, L. (2007). Depth of processing in private and social speech: Its role in the retention of word knowledge by adult EAP learners. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 64(2) D 273-300.

Gutierrez, X. (2008). What does metalinguistic activity in learners' interaction during a collaborative L2 writing task look like? *The Modern Language Journal*, 92 519-37.

Harley, B. (1998). The role of focus-on-form tasks on promoting child L2 acquisition. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.) *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 156-74). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jacobs, G., Small, J. (2003). Combining dictogloss and cooperative learning to promote language learning. *The Reading Matrix*, 3(1) 1-15. Retrieved on July 3, 2009 from http://www.readingmatrix.com/archives/archives_vol3_no1.html

Johnson, K. (1996). *Language teaching and skill learning*. Blackwell: Oxford, U. K.

Sun, Y. (2008). Input processing in second language acquisition: A discussion of four input processing models. *Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics* 8(1) 1-10.

Swain, M. (2001). Integrating language and content teaching through collaborative tasks. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 58(1) 44-62.

Williams, J. (1999). Learner generated attention to form. *Language Learning*, 49(4) D 583-625.