

Face-work, writing and interaction in the FL classroom

(Trabalho de face, escrita e interação
na aula de língua estrangeira)

Adail Sebastião RODRIGUES JÚNIOR
Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais

ABSTRACT: This essay proposes some suggestions of how to develop written texts in Foreign Language (FL) classrooms. Based on 'face', 'interaction' and 'politeness' theories, the proposals underlined here follow the theoretical perspective of Interactional Sociolinguistics. In addition, the points discussed in this essay are suitably applied to undergraduate students who seek to continue their studies on future research. This theoretic article is divided into three interconnected parts that I consider useful to FL writing activities. The first part deals with some aspects of FL classroom interaction and of how discourse is built during some tasks achieved between teachers and learners. The second part points out the connection between interaction and writing, comparing the writing process to a social practice, in which writer(s) and reader(s) meet each other and interact through the text. Finally, this essay shows the relevance in computer-mediated interaction in FL Teaching/Learning as a way of improving textual production abilities.

WRITING AND INTERACTION

RESUMO: *Este ensaio propõe algumas sugestões de como desenvolver textos escritos em sala de aula de língua estrangeira (LE). Baseando-se nas teorias sobre ‘face’, ‘interação’ e ‘polidez’, as propostas aqui ventiladas seguem a perspectiva teórica da Sociolinguística Interacional, aplicada às necessidades de estudantes universitários que visam a dar prosseguimento a seus estudos em pesquisas futuras. Para tanto, este artigo teórico se apresenta em três partes, não obstante interligadas, que considero importantes para atividades de escrita em LE. A primeira trata de alguns aspectos acerca da interação em sala de aula de LE e de como o discurso se forma no decorrer das tarefas elaboradas e/ou desenvolvidas entre professores e alunos. A segunda parte faz uma conexão entre interação e escrita, comparando o processo de produção textual a uma prática social na qual escritor(es) e leitor(es) se encontram e interagem através do texto. Por fim, este ensaio mostra a relevância das práticas interacionais em Ensino/Aprendizagem de LE mediadas por computador, como uma forma de aprimorar as habilidades em produção de texto.*

KEYWORDS: *face, writing, interaction, discourse.*

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: *face, escrita, interação, discurso.*

INTRODUCTION¹

Writing in a Foreign Language (henceforth, FL) has been usually considered a complex issue since learners find it hard to be pursued. Recent research in this field has demonstrated that the focus of attention is on *how* students endeavor to fulfill the writing process, in which they employ a three-fold task, i.e., different but interconnected steps of forming a written text – prewriting (reading, comprehension, interpretation, note-taking, summarizing, and listing possible ideas), writing (the construction of the text until reaching an appropriate version), and revision (corrections and addition to the text as a whole).

However important and useful this three-fold task, there are other factors that influence the process of writing which lie heavily on the learner's subjectivity and socio-cultural framework. Rather than asking students to promptly strike up the writing activity, FL teachers are invited to ask learners "who do you write to?", for *writing is also a tool for efficient communication*. Once teachers touch this aspect they give rise to an interaction between writer-reader and then the FL writing classroom is no longer viewed as an 'enclosure space'. On the contrary, the FL writing class becomes itself a more extending context that allows students to have a grandest view of the whole process. Within this interchange, learners are supposed to widen their own limits to meet the reader's expectations, needs, and comprehension, by writing a text accordingly, and not just writing a text to be solely corrected by the teacher.

¹ I am deeply indebted to Prof. Vera Lúcia Menezes de Oliveira e Paiva for revising the first and last versions of this paper. I am also grateful to Prof. Célia Magalhães for her useful suggestions.

WRITING AND INTERACTION

Therefore, this *theoretical* article attempts to show the importance of a sociolinguistic approach as a support to the interaction between writers and reader in a FL writing class. In so doing, this article draws its attention to *Face-Work* theory developed by Erving Goffman (1967, p. 5-45), from which Interaction and Politeness² theories have gained support. Albeit Sociolinguistics is not a theoretic field usually used as a methodological issue in FL research, it is indeed a branch of Linguistics used to clarify and interpret what a FL classroom entails, from common studies in social relationship to specialized human communication features³. In addition, this article elicits some interaction studies to analyze FL classroom discourse and hence understand the inextricably connection between language and society *in and through* classroom dynamics.

It is noteworthy to say that the theoretical points discussed here remain central to undergraduate students who intend to lengthen their studies in future research. For this reason, academic writing is likely to be emphasized in order for the students to meet their discourse community's targets, and to prepare them to produce well-turned and specific types of texts, according to their academy's purposes⁴. In view of this, learners start getting along with the appropriate scientific genres, mainly if they are to develop their skills in the English Language code⁵. However, this

² Despite some critics, politeness theory is still considered a useful tool for analyzing face-to-face interaction, regarding the way people employ strategies in maintaining and expressing their personal and subjective performance (face-saving strategies) during social encounters (Cf. Coupland & Jaworski, 1999, p.295-7).

³ Cf. Coupland & Jaworski, 1997.

⁴ Cf. Swales, 1990, p. 21-82.

⁵ This study considers English as a Foreign Language.

ADAIL RODRIGUES JÚNIOR

study does not take into account *genre analysis* as a focus of its interest, even though succinct comments in this area may appear in what follows.

The first part of this article deals with some interaction techniques applied to FL classes, which is viewed as a support to any writing task. The second part tackles how politeness and face needs are appropriate tools in order for the student to shape (or imagine) the text's reader. After that, some concerns of computer-mediated communication are analyzed as a means of improving student's writing abilities. Finally, the conclusion binds the assumptions treated here as a basis for wider research in the future, since only theoretical standpoints are underlined in this study.

FL CLASSROOM INTERACTION

One of the preoccupations in a FL classroom is how interaction among participants takes place. According to Brown (1994), "interaction is the collaborative exchange of thoughts, feelings, or ideas between two or more people resulting in a reciprocal effect on each other" (p. 159). Based upon this mechanism, learners are expected to co-construct knowledge and teachers are invited to co-support this construction offering ways to establish a healthy classroom environment. In view of this, a FL class is supposed to enable *collaborative* participation, no matter how fluent the students are in the target language. Moreover, learners are expected to negotiate information, that is, interpret the amount of input they receive and analogously respond to this information through their dialogue performance.

WRITING AND INTERACTION

Considerable research has been focusing attention on how interaction underpins classroom dynamics. One theory in this field is *output*, in which Swain (1995) points out that “collaborative dialogue, [that is], a joint construction of language, (...) allows performance to outstrip competence: it’s where language use and language learning can co-occur” (p.3). It thus claims that not only input, or the language a learner receives, is sufficient to learn a FL, but output, or the language a learner produces, is undoubtedly crucial for the apprenticeship aspect as well.

Under the light of output theory, when the interaction between students and teacher occurs, through which they share participatory and common-goal activities, the participants are invited to present their “selves” during the dialogue negotiation, in order for a positive classroom atmosphere to go on. At this moment, each participant shows her/his *face*, then becoming transparent and submitted to the classroom conversation requirements. Accordingly, the classroom itself is viewed as a *micro-context* that allows students to elaborate their thoughts and switch them to dialogue⁶. Therein lies a wide activity which learners absorb information and produce results throughout an exchange in which the teacher offers appropriate feedback and encourages her/his students to continue on building their own language skills as far as they use the target language to communicate⁷.

In this micro-context, students depict their social characteristics according to the *macro-context* or social background they are from, hence forming, so to speak, a bridge between both. In this way, learning a FL means not

⁶ Cf. Richards & Lockhart, 1994.

⁷ Cf. Widdowson, 1992.

only to produce well-turned sentences in order to communicate, but mainly to express the socio-historical and cultural aspects that are related to the language use as well. Furthermore, “talk is socially organized, not merely in terms of who speaks to whom in what language, but as a little system of mutually ratified and ritually governed face-to-face action, a social encounter” (Goffman, 1972, p. 65). Therefore, language is, on the one hand, the representation of our social roots and, on the other hand, the tool through which our thoughts, intentions, and goals become clearly overt to people. This aspect is one of the main cruxes when teachers attempt to provoke any dialogue during the FL classroom interaction, for teachers need to see language as a typical mechanism that represents social life. Likewise, students have to realize that language is part of their social features that makes them a mirror-image of their own social background reality.

Moreover, when teachers take into account how language is socially constructed and used they identify the students’ needs as language users. Thus, it is rather important to encourage peer work between learners, under the teacher’s guidance, in order to lessen their expectations and increase their certainty in employing their own apprenticeship by setting forth their own *communicative competence*, i.e., the ability to know when, how, and to whom utterances can be expressed⁸. Successful and well-conducted classrooms are places where language and social relations are likely to be produced, exchanged, decoded, and transformed, in which language use and language learning are bridged accordingly, within a clear

⁸ Cf. Gumperz, 1997.

WRITING AND INTERACTION

interplay⁹. Furthermore, during dyad-work students and teacher mutually comprehend that culture and language are bound together by *discourse*, whereas sentences or utterances are merely superficial representations¹⁰.

FACE-WORK IN WRITING

Interaction phenomenon is clearly seen when people are engaged in any kind of talk or conversation¹¹. Within this conversational structure, speaker's *face* or "the image of self delineated in terms of approved social attributes" (Goffman, 1967, p. 5) is achieved. During this social encounter participants get into a congenial talk – when sharing the same social rules – or into a difficult one – when any of the conversational rules is broken. When speakers are inserted in any kind of talk the rules of cooperation¹² must be followed to assure an overt and secure interplay. Moreover, speakers' performance takes into account the *social frame* they are inserted, i.e., the situated context or 'floor' build up according to the social organization in

⁹ Cf. Brown, 1994; Cazden, 1986; Shieh & Donato, 1996; Swain, 1995; Villamil & Guerrero, 1996.

¹⁰ Cf. Agar, 1997, p. 466; Ochs, Schegloff & Thompson, 1996; Tsui, 1995, p. 21.

¹¹ Cf. Cazden, 1986; Levinson, 1983, p. 284-370; Maybin, 1996, p. 5-27; McCarthy, 1999, p. 118-46; Yule, 1998, p. 59-82.

¹² Cooperation is settled by a *cooperative principle*, that is to say, when interlocutors are promptly and socially inclined to contribute towards others during a conversational encounter. Moreover, each participant is expected to be informative in accordance with the conversational requests, to be true, relevant, and perspicuous, seeking an friendly and clear face-to-face interaction (see Grice, 1975; Santos, 1997).

which people draw attention to the subjective involvement between each other¹³.

Face postulate sheds light on *politeness* theory, which is considered as a ‘universal’ issue in language usage. Politeness is, according to Brown & Levinson (1978), how language users express their social distance in relation to others through utterances. In addition, politeness is a “special way of treating people, saying and doing things in such a way as to take into account the other person’s feelings” (Brown, 1980, p. 114. quoted in Freeman & McElhinny, 1996, p. 251). In spoken language, politeness is a useful tool to set, maintain, and save one’s face while any conversation is taking place in a specific context or situation. For this to happen, Brown & Levinson (*ibid.*) distinguished between two types of politeness patterns when speakers express their intention(s) through interaction. On the one hand, *positive face* shows the speaker’s intimacy, closeness and rapport towards the hearer’s face and vice-versa; on the other hand, *negative face* demonstrates the social distance between speaker and hearer, the each other’s need of independence that avoids impositions from outside. Politeness theory, thus, expresses tactfulness, modesty, generosity, and sympathy principles in accordance with some social characteristics within a particular cultural framework. Some examples of positive and negative politeness, respectively, are shown below¹⁴:

- (1)
 - a. How about letting me use your pen?
 - b. Hey, buddy, I’d appreciate it if you let me use your pen.

¹³ Cf. Goffman, 1974; Stenström, 1994.

¹⁴ Taken from Yule, 1998, p. 64-5.

WRITING AND INTERACTION

(2)

- a. I'm sorry to bother you, but can I ask you for a pen or something?
- b. I know you're busy, but might I ask you if – em – if you happen to have an extra pen that I could, you know – eh – maybe borrow?

In example (1), speakers share such a friendly involvement with each other that lessens their efforts to pervade the other's face limits. On the other hand, in example (2) the speaker's negative face claims to be treated with deference, which is respectfully recognized by each participant. Hence, efforts to overcome possible misunderstandings and/or threats are undertaken, like hesitations ("em", "eh", "you know", etc.) and mitigating devices ("I'm sorry to bother you", "I know you're busy", etc.). According to this, politeness is one manner of making people feel good and at ease whilst performing talk-in-interaction¹⁵.

Yet how can *face* be maintained when writing is the main channel for communication? It is undeniable that interaction is inherent in conversation, whether the dialogue is diffused through the target language or the students' mother tongue. However, when we write we do not immediately interact with the receiver (or reader) of our message, which can generally trigger complex communicational problems to the student. In consequence, learners' ought to perceive an *imaginary* reader and seek to "anticipate probable reactions and write the text accordingly" (Renkema, 1993, p. 87) and hereby build their message as

¹⁵ Cf. Coupland & Jaworski, 1999, p. 297.

if they were undertaking a *social practice*¹⁶. In view of this, students begin to perform face-saving strategies or, in other words, *face-work* strategy or “actions taken by a person to make whatever [she/he] is doing consistent with face [that] serves to counteract ‘incidents’ – that is, events whose effective symbolic implications threaten face” (Goffman, 1967, p. 12). As face is our *self-image*, in writing the writer sets her/his potential image, her/his confidences, personal features and intentions, which are caught by the reader’s interpretation. In the meantime, the writer has to manipulate the message according to the needs of the context in which the text is going to be inserted and thus guarantee her/his face. Put simply,

... writers, at least competent ones, are trying to second-guess their reader’s general state of background knowledge and their potential immediate processing problems. At the same time (competent) readers are interrogating authors on their present positions as well as trying to predict where the author’s lines of thought or description will lead. There is, as it were, a reciprocity of semantic effort to be engaged in by both sides; a contract binding writer and reader together in reaction and counter-reaction (Swales, 1990, p. 62-3).

In so doing, one attempts to approach the written channel to a more context-bound dependent format, for the one who sends the message as well as the one who receives it.

During writing tasks, the teacher is invited to become a *reflective practitioner*¹⁷ and thereby provide a fos-

¹⁶ Cf. Meurer & Motta-Roth, 1997, p. 13-28; Shieh & Donato, 1996.

¹⁷ Cf. Williams & Burden, 1997, p. 54; see also Miccoli, 1987, 1996.

WRITING AND INTERACTION

tering and confident classroom environment, through eliciting some pedagogical techniques that make clear what the students are proposed and asked for. Unlike speaking tasks in which mostly activities are pursued spontaneously, under the teacher's goal-directed guidance, writing, on the other hand, is a provoked task, submitted to a more complex observation and support. Nevertheless, compelling students to speak in a desirably good way is undoubtedly one important aspect to improve their writing abilities, since both activities are jointed processes¹⁸. In this concern, the teacher outlines the advantages in using *face-work strategy* and, by this means, encourages the students' interest and self-confidence. For this, some general and interconnected suggestions are presented as follows¹⁹:

Teachers draw students' attention to the kind of reader for that specific text:

Teachers elicit some possible necessities the reader might have and thus students manage their texts accordingly. By performing this strategy learners are able to second-guess readers' goals and needs and therefore create a skillfully interweaving in which deference, respect and knowledge of readers' needs are sustained.

Hoey (2001) points out that a text should be considered a place or 'site' in which writers and readers meet each other. According to this scholar, a text is seen as a two-sided phenomenon. On the one hand, writers control and produce most of the interaction and, on the other hand,

¹⁸ Cf. Villamil & Guerrero, 1996; Justicia et al., 1999.

¹⁹ Based on de Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981; Brown & Levinson, 1978; Byrne, 1996; Coupland & Jaworski, 1999, p. 334-5; Hoey, 2001; Santos, 1997.

readers have enough power to drop the text whether the latter does not respond to their expectations, interests and needs. Therefore, getting to know readers' face is surely a good strategy to protect writers' ones.

*Teachers draw students' attention
to the reader's kind of face:*

Positive Face

If the reader has a "positive face" the student may provide clear texts, perform simple notes, attend to the reader's interests and needs, seek agreement between each other, support the reader's aims, offer suggestions, etc. In the meanwhile, the writer tries to assert reciprocity, to be sympathetic and optimistic, to cooperate, and to share opinions.

Writers should avoid biased criticisms, disapproving expressions, complaints, reprimands, insults, overt disagreements or contradictions, etc. It is noticeably important that the writer avoids invading the reader's tactfulness limits imposed upon any social person, even if the reader's face openly expresses sympathy towards the writer's. Information is likely to be put forth under sincerity and politeness rather than aggressiveness. Hence, writers should often look forward to keeping their savoir-faire through the use of politeness expressions, requests, and references. From this standpoint, the writer (or student) should avoid irreverent notes, violent expressions, uncontrollable emotions, and evade from delicate topics like race, religion, politics, etc., unless the text elicits these topics in courteously and superficially ways. One linguistic strategy

WRITING AND INTERACTION

to assure writer's face is using *alignments* or 'prefaces' that soften the illocutionary²⁰ force of the message. According to Stubbs (1983), alignments "could be called personal statements" and not general ones (p. 186). Expressions like *personally I think, if I may express my opinion, if you do not mind, my real opinion is*, etc., are types of alignments. Hence, while writing tasks are being held, students ought to consider the reader's positive face with respect and reciprocity, which reinforces a positive evaluation between them.

Having the above in mind, *positive face strategies* are more commonly suited to congenial letters, requirements, personal messages, informal notes, informal e-mails, inter alia.

Negative Face

In order to develop face-saving strategies when the reader has a negative face, the writer should be clear, direct, avoid impositions, ambiguities and tautologies, be grateful, be polite and respectful, etc. These *negative face strategies* then are better attuned to scientific articles, dissertations, theses, formal letters, journals, essays, abstracts, scientific notes, official notes, inter alia.

Furthermore, reader's negative face claims to be recognized through *avoidance-based-strategies* by the writer. The latter is expected to satisfy and maintain the reader's needs using, for instance, impersonalising (e.g., passives) and softening expressions that assure the text's

²⁰ Illocutionary act is the function a sentence or utterance performs which has specific force towards specific intentions or goals (see Austin, 1999; Searle, 1972).

accuracy and appropriateness. In negative politeness, there likely to be a “natural tension” from the writer’s position and thus abilities to overcome the reader’s *face-threat* are required.

One useful strategy to get over this “tension” is to use Grice’s *Cooperative Principle* – a) the maxim of quantity (seek to give as much information as is need); b) the maxim of quality (seek to give genuine and reliable information); c) the maxim of relevance (inform what is indispensable or relevant); and d) the maxim of manner (seek a brief and clear way to give information). Although Grice has developed these maxims to be employed in conversation, they are certainly suitable to written texts. In other words,

although the Cooperative Principle has been elaborated only to the oral language use, it is likely suitable to written language. This is true because the written text is part of an interaction as well as the oral one. (...) In view of this, the interaction comprises an author whom sends a message to one or more readers. The reader’s participation takes place as the author intuitively her/his relation with the addressee beforehand. Hence, the author shapes her/his text according to these expectations and intuitions. (...) Therefore, the text itself is seen as a place wherein one author and one reader meet each other, converse, interact (Santos, 1997, p. 42)²¹.

²¹ My translation of “embora o Princípio de Cooperação tenha sido elaborado considerando apenas o uso da linguagem oral, este princípio é igualmente aplicável ao uso da linguagem escrita. Isso porque o texto escrito, da mesma forma que um texto falado, faz parte de uma interação. (...) Nesse caso, a interação contém um autor que envia uma mensagem a um ou mais leitores. A participação do leitor se dá na medida em que o autor antecipa, intuitivamente, as relações daquele; o autor, assim, dá forma ao seu texto segundo essas expectativas e intuições. (...) O texto,

WRITING AND INTERACTION

Grice's Cooperative Principle enhances text's discursive features and, at the same time, undermines major pitfalls for the reader's comprehension. It ensures that a text becomes relevant to the reader as the latter endeavors less effort to understand the former. The simpler the way words are distributed and collocated in a text, with obvious and relevant information, the easier the text is for the reader's uptake and hence agreeable and satisfactory results are reached. This relevance principle has been largely used to writing activities, mainly to students who are acquiring the first steps in building a text in a FL. This is true because of learners' meaning-making difficulties through the target language, whilst performing their written tasks, which is commonly normal during the first stages²².

In essence, students become acquainted with the way written discourse works as long as they arrange well-structured texts in order to reach the reader's comprehension, rather than ill-formed utterances with unclear meanings. In so doing, writers present their potential image in the text, which establishes their *footing*, i.e., their delineated social position towards the reader and the context or situation in which the message is inserted. Therefore, the text becomes itself transparent to the reader's needs, whom holds the message for her/his specific aims²³.

Discourse, thus, is viewed as language in use that represents values and meanings belonged to the writer and accepted or shared with the reader's intentions and beliefs,

portanto, é visto como um local onde um autor e um leitor encontram-se, dialogam, interagem" (Santos, 1997, p. 42).

²² Towards a study of meaning-making texts, under the light of lexical features, see Lewis, 1999.

²³ Cf. Goffman, 1998; Kramsch, 1998, p. 42-3.

ADAIL RODRIGUES JÚNIOR

forming, so to speak, an interplay that overcomes the physical gap between them. This connection lies on the principle that “people do not produce texts at random and without any purpose but have specific intentions to communicate and certain goals to achieve” (Georgakopoulou & Goutsos, 1997, p. 14).

COMPUTER-MEDIATED COMMUNICATION

The interaction strategies studied above are undoubtedly applied to Computer-Mediated learning. In a recent research, Paiva (1999) carried out a wide observation of the students’ behavior during electronic mail projects in UFMG. She elicited several advantages in computer-interaction, from lessening student’s insecurity to identifying learner’s self-reflection about the learning process. In addition, Paiva underlines that, amongst other things, through e-mail communication:

- writing acquires oral features;
- the learner has more opportunities to negotiate language meaning;
- the diversity function of language use increases;
- teacher-learner interaction and negotiation also increase;
- individual needs and interests are attended;
- classroom limits extend;
- personal subjects gain attention via electronic mail.

Most of the efforts undertaken to make a text acquire spontaneity and confidence if this activity is me-

WRITING AND INTERACTION

thodical and habitual, rather than provoked, scarcely, and challenging exercises. To sum up,

The various forms of electronic discourse clearly throw the book at some of our well-established conceptions about spoken and written genres. The new electronic medium allows for texts that do not fall neatly into any particular category. Thus, despite the fact that they are written, interactive forms like e-mail and e-chat are highly dialogic and relatively unplanned, with a potential broad, rapid dissemination and quick feedback... (Georgakopoulou & Goutsos, 1997, p. 37).

Computer-Mediated FL learning may thus enrich students' writing abilities in face-saving strategies because it approaches writing to a more naturally context-bound activity, like conversation or oral discourse. Electronic-Mail interaction hence weakens the gap between the addresser and the addressee of the message²⁴.

Running the risk of simplification, I briefly assure that Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC) has been undoubtedly acquiring a large activity field in human social interaction. Internet, with its typed electronic text-basis, has surprisingly widened world-user's interconnecting horizon, through which distance, people and nationalities are becoming cross-culturally linked by common interests, needs, shared goals and similar standpoints. As a result, it seems that a new communicational genre is gaining shape and space that offers power and status to whom deals potentially with its mechanisms. CMC is increas-

²⁴ See also Warschauer, 1999.

ADAIL RODRIGUES JÚNIOR

ingly calling scholarship attention for further and more profoundly research²⁵. In Yates words,

CMC itself is changing. For those users with the requisite resources it is possible today to send voice messages, moving color images, music, or any form of digitized data across the global computer network. This is the world of the multimedia 'document', where many different modes of communication become bound up and combined within a single text. (...) What counts as literacy has to change, as our reading and writing practices change in response to ever more complex and dynamic developments in communication technology (1996, p. 82).

CONCLUSION

I am deeply aware that the theoretical points discussed here are inherently imperfect. However, as a first attempt this essay evokes that a FL writing classroom should likely become a community in which students are seen as peers in a collaborative interaction guided by the teacher.

As time goes by, learners and teachers are introduced to new tenets that discreetly change their way of viewing education. This is due, on the one hand, to a more comprehensible evaluation and, on the other hand, to a biased one, while they handle educational and learning tasks. These tenets thus affect how FL (and also L1) literacy is obtained concerning culture, social status, family relationships, beliefs, cognitive features, and social milieu standards. In essence, these aspects are tightly connected

²⁵ Cf. Biber et al., 2000; Stubbs, 1996.

WRITING AND INTERACTION

to students' discourses originated from their social contexts. In these circumstances, Discourse Analysis is a powerful issue that has provided insights for the way social settings and classroom interaction are linked to each other²⁶.

Likewise, what students bring into classroom are their thoughts, wishes, goals, and experiences from their real life, that is to say, the inner skills they have to master their educational development. Therefore, when we talk about *classroom interaction* we cannot simply separate the learner from her/his social environment, otherwise the FL class becomes itself a “robot-making” context. It is crucially important to understand “that literate behavior involves a complex interplay between individual skills and knowledge of social practices” (McKay, 1996, p. 429). Furthermore, teachers are to encourage learners to share this knowledge for the sake of a real interactive class in which an adequate education – within a teacher/learner two-sided effort – is expected to take place. Thus, *face-work* can be a useful tool to embolden FL teachers in performing most of the classroom writing activities that have been used so far.

REFERENCES

AGAR, Michael. The Biculture in Bilingual. In: COUPLAND, N., JAWORSKI, A. (eds.). *Sociolinguistics: A Reader*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997. p. 464-71.

²⁶ Cf. Cazden, 1986; McCarthy, 1999; McGroarty, 1996, p.3-5; McKay, 1996, p. 433-41; Shieh & Donato, 1996.

ADAIL RODRIGUES JÚNIOR

AUSTIN, J. L. How To Do Things With Words. In: COUPLAND, N., JAWORSKI, A. (eds.). *The Discourse Reader*. London: Routledge, 1999.

BIBER, Douglas, CONRAD, Susan, REPPEN, Randi. *Corpus Linguistics: Investigating Language Structure and Use*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

BROWN, H. Douglas. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. New York: Longman, 1994.

BROWN, P. LEVINSON, S. C. Universals in Language Usage: Politeness Phenomenon. In: GOODY, Esther N. (ed.). *Questions and Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978. p.56-324.

BYRNE, Donn. *Teaching Writing Skills*. 8th imp. London & New York: Longman, 1996.

CAZDEN, Courtney B. Classroom Discourse. In: WITTROCK, Merlin C. (ed.). *Handbook of Research on Teaching*. 3rd ed. New York: McMillan Publishing Company, 1986. p.432-63.

COUPLAND, N., JAWORSKI, A. (eds.). *The Discourse Reader*. London: Routledge, 1999.

_____. (eds.). *Sociolinguistics: A Reader*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997.

DE BEAUGRANDE, R., DRESSLER, W. *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London: Longman, 1981.

FREEMAN, Rebecca, McELHINNY, Bonnie. Language and Gender. In: McKAY, S. L., HORNBERGER, N. H.

WRITING AND INTERACTION

(eds.). *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996. p.218-80.

GEORGAKOPOULOU, A., GOUTSOS, D. *Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1997.

GOFFMAN, Erving. *A Representação do Eu na Vida Cotidiana*. 8.^a ed. Trad. Maria Célia S. Raposo. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1999.

_____. Footing. In: RIBEIRO, B. T., GARCEZ, P. M. (orgs.). *Sociolinguística Interacional*. Trad. Beatriz Fontana. Porto Alegre: AGE, 1998. p.70-97.

_____. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. New York: Harper & Row, 1974.

_____. *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior*. New York: Anchor Books, 1967.

_____. The Neglected Situation. In: GIGLIOLI, Pier Paolo (ed.). *Language and Social Context*. London: Penguin, 1972. p.61-6.

GRICE, H. P. Logic and Conversation. In: COLE, P., MORGAN, J. L. (eds.). *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press, 1975. p.41-58.

GUMPERZ, John J. Communicative Competence. In: COUPLAND, N., JAWORSKI, A. (eds.). *Sociolinguistics: A Reader*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997. p.39-48.

HOEY, Michael. *Textual Interaction: An Introduction to Written Discourse Analysis*. London & New York: Routledge, 2001.

JUSTICIA, Fernando et al. The Sources of Error in Spanish Writing (Research Note). In: *Journal of Research in Reading*. United Kingdom: Blackwell. v. 22, n. 2, p.198-202, 1999.

KRAMSCH, Claire. *Language and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

KRASHEN, S. *The Input Hypothesis*. New York: Longman, 1985.

LEWIS, Michael. *The Lexical Approach*. 4th imp. England: Language Teaching Publications, 1999.

MAYBIN, Janet. Everyday Talk. In: MAYBIN, J., MERCER, N. (eds.). *Using English from Conversation to Canon*. London & New York: Routledge, 1996. p.5-41.

_____, MERCER, Neil (eds.). *Using English from Conversation to Canon*. London & New York: Routledge, 1996.

McCARTHY, M. *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. 8th imp. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

McGROARTY, Mary. Language Attitudes, Motivation, and Standards. In: McKAY, S. L., HORNBREGER, N. H. (eds.). *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996. p.3-46.

McKAY, Sandra L. Literacy and Literacies. In: McKAY, E. L., HORNBREGER, N. H. (eds.). *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996. p.421-45.

WRITING AND INTERACTION

_____. , HORNBERGER, Nancy H. (eds.). *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

MEURER, José L., MOTTA-ROTH, Désirée (orgs.). *Parâmetros de Textualização*. Santa Maria: Ed. UFSM, 1997.

MICCOLI, Laura S. Journal-writing as feedback and as na EFL-related-issues discussion Tool. In: *Revista de Estudos Germânicos*. FALE-UFMG, v. 8, n. 2, 1987, p. 59-66.

_____. Refletindo sobre o processo de aprendizagem: um estudo comparativo. In: PAIVA, Vera L. M. de Oliveira e. (org.). *Ensino de Língua Inglesa: Reflexões e Experiências*. Campinas: Pontes/UFMG, 1996. p.81-102.

OCHS, E., SHEGLOFF, E. A., THOMPSON, S. A. (eds.). *Interaction and Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

PAIVA, Vera. CALL and Online Journals. In: DEBSKI, Robert, LEVY, Mike (eds.). *WorldCall: Global Perspectives on Computer-Assisted Language Learning*. The Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger Publishers, 1999.

RENKEMA, Jan. *Discourse Studies: An Introductory Textbook*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1993.

RIBEIRO, Branca T., GARCEZ, Pedro M. *Sociolingüística Interacional*. Porto Alegre: AGE, 1998.

RICHARDS, J. C., PLATT, J., PLATT, H. *Dictionary of Language Teaching & Applied Linguistics*. 7th imp. England: Longman, 1997.

RICHARDS, Jack C., LOCKHART, Charles. *Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

SANTOS, Mauro B. Contrato de Cooperação e Implicaturas. In: MEURER, J. L., MOTTA-ROTH, D. (orgs.). *Parâmetros de Textualização*. Santa Maria: Ed. UFSM, 1997. p.39-58.

SEARLE, J. What is a Speech Act? In: GIGLIOLI, P. P. (ed.). *Language and Social Context*. New York: Penguin Books, 1972. p.136-54.

SHIEH, Robert J. J., DONATO, Richard. *Discursive Positioning in L2 Interaction: Conflict And Complementarity*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, 1996. (mimeo.).

STENSTRÖM, Anna-Brita. *An Introduction to Spoken Interaction*. New York: Longman, 1994.

STUBBS, Michael. *Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistics Analysis of Natural Language*. England: Basil Blackwell, 1983.

_____. *Text and Corpus Analysis*. Cambridge & Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers, 1996.

SWAIN, Merrill. Collaborative Dialogue: Its Contribution to Second Language Learning. In: ANNUAL AAAL CONFERENCE: Long Beach, California, 1995. (mimeo.).

SWALES, John M. *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

TSUI, Amy B. M. *Introducing Classroom Interaction*. London: Penguin, 1995.

VILLAMIL, Olga S., GUERRERO, Maria C. M. de. Peer Revision in the L2 Classroom: Social-Cognitive Activities, Mediating Strategies, and Aspects of Social Behavior. In:

WRITING AND INTERACTION

Journal of Second Language Writing. U. K., v. 5, n. 1, p.51-75, 1996.

WARSCHAUER, Mark. *Interaction, Negotiation, and Computer-Mediated Learning* [online]. 1999. p.1-13. Available from Internet: <<http://www.insa-lyon.fr/Departments/CDRL/interaction.html>>

WIDDOWSON, H. G. *Teaching Language as Communication*. 9th imp. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

WILLIAMS, Marion, BURDEN, Robert L. *Psychology for Language Teachers: A Social Constructivist Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

YATES, Simeon. Computer-Mediated English: Sociolinguistics Aspects of Computer-Mediated Communication. In: MAYBIN, J., MERCER, N. (eds.). *Using English from Conversation to Canon*. London & New York: Routledge, 1996. p.76-83.

YULE, George. *Pragmatics*. 4th imp. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

ADAIL RODRIGUES JÚNIOR

Recebido: Julho de 2001

Aceito: Julho de 2002

Endereço para correspondência:

Adail Sebastião Rodrigues Junior

Rua Riachuelo, 1803

30720-060 – Belo Horizonte, MG

E-mail: eparreijr@bol.com.br