

Referências bibliográficas

AARTS, J. Intuition-based and observation-based grammars. In: AIJMER, K.; ALTENBERG, B. (Eds.). **English corpus linguistics: studies in honour of Jan Svartvik.** London: Longman, 1991. p. 44-62.

AARTS, J.; GRANGER, S. Tag sequences in learner corpora: a key to interlanguage grammar and discourse. In: GRANGER, S. (Ed.). **Learner English on computer.** London: Longman, 1998. p. 132-141.

AIJMER, K. Modality in advanced Swedish learners' written interlanguage. In: GRANGER, S.; HUNG, J.; PETCH-TYSON, S. (Eds.). **Computer learner corpora, second language acquisition and foreign language teaching.** Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2002. p. 55-76.

ALTENBERG, B.; GRANGER, S. The grammatical and lexical patterning of make in native and non-native student writing. **Applied Linguistics**, v. 22, n. 2, p. 173-195, 2001.

ALTENBERG, B.; TAPPER, M. The use of adverbial connectors in advanced Swedish learners' written English. In: GRANGER, S. (Ed.). **Learner English on computer.** London: Longman, 1998. p. 80-93.

ANDERSEN, S. Computers in the humanities: providing faculty with new tools. In: LUTZ, R. W.; JACOBSON, E.; RADER, B. (Eds.). **Proceedings of the 12th Annual ACM SIGUCCS Conference on User Services.** New York: ACM, 1984. p. 143-148.

ASTON, G. Involving learners in developing learning methods: exploiting text corpora in self-access. In: BENSON, P.; VOLLER, P. (Eds.). **Autonomy and independence in language learning.** Harlow: Longman, 1997. p. 204-214.

ASTON, G.; BURNARD, L. **The BNC handbook:** exploring the British National Corpus with SARA. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998.

BAKER, P.; HARDIE, A.; MCENERY, T. **A glossary of corpus linguistics.** Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006.

BERBER SARDINHA, T. A influência do tamanho do corpus de referência na obtenção de palavras chave. **DIRECT Papers**, n. 38, p. 1-18, 1999a. Disponível em: <<http://www2.lael.pucsp.br/direct/DirectPapers38.pdf>>. Acesso em: 22 jan. 2008.

_____. O banco de palavras-chave. **DIRECT Papers**, n. 39, p. 1-12, 1999b. Disponível em: <<http://www2.lael.pucsp.br/direct/DirectPapers39.pdf>>. Acesso em: 22 jan. 2008.

_____. O corpus de aprendiz Br-ICLE. **Intercâmbio**, v. X, p. 227-239, 2001. Disponível em: <<http://www2.lael.pucsp.br/~tony/temp/publications/2001bricle-interc.pdf>>. Acesso em: 18 jan. 2005.

_____. Tamanho de corpus. **The ESpecialist**, v. 23, n. 2, p. 103-122, 2002. Disponível em: <http://www2.lael.pucsp.br/especialist/23_2_2002/BerberSardinha.pdf>. Acesso em 22 jan. 2008.

_____. **Lingüística de corpus**. Barueri, SP: Manole, 2004.

_____. (Org.). **A língua portuguesa no computador**. Campinas, SP: Mercado de Letras, 2005.

BEREITER, C; SCARDAMALIA, M. **The psychology of written composition**. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1987.

BIBER, D. **Variation across speech and writing**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

BIBER, D.; CONRAD, S.; CORTES, V. If you look at...: lexical bundles in university teaching and textbooks. **Applied Linguistics**, v. 25, n. 3, p. 371-405, 2004.

BIBER, D.; CONRAD, S.; REPPEN, R. **Corpus linguistics: investigating language structure and use**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

BIBER, D. et al. **Longman grammar of spoken and written English**. London: Longman, 1999.

BROWN, J. D. **Understanding research in second language learning:** a teacher's guide to statistics and research design. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

BOWKER, L.; PEARSON, J. **Working with specialized language:** a practical guide to using corpora. London: Routledge, 2002.

COLLINS, P. *Can / could and may / might in British, American and Australian English: a corpus-based account.* **World Englishes**, v. 26, n. 4, p. 474-491, 2007.

CONNOR, U.; GORMAN, T.; VÄHÄPASSI, A. The argumentative / persuasive task. In: GORMAN, T. P.; PURVES, A. C.; DEGENHART, R. E. **The IEA study of Written Composition I:** the international writing tasks and scoring scales. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1988. p. 155-171.

CONRAD, S. Corpus linguistic approaches for discourse analysis. **Annual Review of Applied Linguistics**, v. 22, p. 75-95, 2002.

DAVIDSON, C.; TOMIC, A. Inventing academic literacy: an American perspective. In: JONES, C.; TURNER, J.; STREET, B. (Eds.). **Students writing in the university:** cultural and epistemological issues. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1999. p. 161-169.

DE SMEDT, K. Some reflections on studies in humanities computing. **Literary and Linguistic Computing**, v. 17, n. 1, p. 89-101, 2002.

ENGLISH, F. What do students really say in their essays? Towards a descriptive framework for analyzing student writing. In: JONES, C.; TURNER, J.; STREET, B. (Eds.). **Students writing in the university:** cultural and epistemological issues. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1999. p. 17-36.

ERMAN, B.; WARREN, B. The idiom principle and the open choice principle. **Text**, v. 20, n. 1, p. 29-62, 2000.

FIRTH, J. R. **Papers in linguistics: 1934-1951.** London: Oxford University Press, 1957.

GARCIA, O. M. **Comunicação em prosa moderna:** aprenda a escrever, aprendendo a pensar. 20. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Editora FGV, 2001 [1967].

GAY, B.; JONES, C.; JONES, J. Writing assignments on a PGCE (secondary) course. In: JONES, C.; TURNER, J.; STREET, B. (Eds.). **Students writing in the university:** cultural and epistemological issues. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1999. p. 80-102.

GRABE, W.; KAPLAN, R. B. **Theory and practice of writing:** an applied linguistic perspective. London: Longman, 1996.

GRADDOL, D. **English next.** London: British Council, 2006.

GRANGER, S. **Learner English on computer.** London: Longman, 1998a.

_____. Prefabricated patterns in advanced EFL writing: collocations and formulae. In: COWIE, A. P. (Ed.). **Phraseology:** theory, analysis and applications. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998b. p. 145-160.

_____. The computer learner corpus: a versatile new source of data for SLA research. In: _____ (Ed.). **Learner English on computer.** London: Longman, 1998c. p. 3-18.

_____. A bird's-eye view of learner corpus research. In: GRANGER, S.; HUNG, J.; PETCH-TYSON, S. (Eds.). **Computer learner corpora, second language acquisition and foreign language teaching.** Amterdam: John Benjamins, 2002. p. 3-33.

GRANGER, S.; DAGNEAUX, E.; MEUNIER, F. **The international corpus of learner English** (Handbook and CD-ROM). Louvain-la-Neuve: Presses Universitaires de Louvain, 2002.

GRANGER, S.; RAYSON, P. Automatic profiling of learner texts. In: GRANGER, S. (Ed.). **Learner English on computer.** London: Longman, 1998. p. 119-131.

GRANGER, S.; TRIBBLE, C. Learner corpus data in the foreign language classroom: form-focused instruction and data-driven learning. In: GRANGER, S. (Ed.). **Learner English on computer.** London: Longman, 1998. p. 199-209.

GRIFFITH, A. **SPSS for dummies.** Indianapolis: Wiley, 2007.

HALLIDAY, M. A. K. **An introduction to functional grammar.** London: Arnold, 1994 [1985].

HANDS, P. (Ed.). **English grammar & usage**. São Paulo: Chambers / Martins Fontes, 2000.

HERMERSCHMIDT, M. Foregrounding background in academic learning. In: JONES, C.; TURNER, J.; STREET, B. (Eds.). **Students writing in the university: cultural and epistemological issues**. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1999. p. 5-16.

HOLMES, J. Doubt and certainty in ESL textbooks. **Applied Linguistics**, v. 9, n. 1, p. 21-44, 1988.

HUNSTON, S. Phraseology and the modal verb: a study of pattern and meaning. In: HEFFER, C.; SAUNTON, H. (Eds.). **Words in context: a tribute to John Sinclair on his retirement**. Birmingham: The University of Birmingham, 2000. p. 234-248.

_____. **Corpora in applied linguistics**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

HYLAND, K. **Teaching and researching writing**. London: Longman, 2002.

HYLAND, K.; MILTON, J. Qualification and certainty in L1 and L2 students' writing. **Journal of Second Language Writing**, v. 6, n. 2, p. 183-205, 1997.

JONES, C. The student from overseas and the British university: finding a way to succeed. In: JONES, C.; TURNER, J.; STREET, B. (Eds.). **Students writing in the university: cultural and epistemological issues**. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1999. p. 37-60.

JONES, C.; TURNER, J.; STREET, B. Section B: mystery and transparency in academic literacies. In: JONES, C.; TURNER, J.; STREET, B. (Eds.). **Students writing in the university: cultural and epistemological issues**. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1999. p. 125-126.

KENNEDY, G. **An introduction to corpus linguistics**. London: Longman, 1998.

KROGVIG, I.; JOHANSSON, S. Shall, will, should, and would in British and American English. **ICAME News**, n. 5, p. 32-56, nov. 1981.

LEA, M. R. Academic literacies and learning in higher education: constructing knowledge through texts and experience. In: JONES, C.; TURNER, J.; STREET, B. (Eds.). **Students writing in the university:** cultural and epistemological issues. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1999. p. 103-124.

LEECH, G. Teaching and language corpora: a convergence. In: WICHMANN, A. et al. (Eds.). **Teaching and language corpora.** London: Longman, 1997. p. 1-23.

_____. Preface. In: GRANGER, S. (Ed.). **Learner English on computer.** London: Longman, 1998. p. xiv-xx.

LILLIS, T. Whose ‘common sense’? Essayist literacy and the institutional practice of mystery. In: JONES, C.; TURNER, J.; STREET, B. (Eds.). **Students writing in the university:** cultural and epistemological issues. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1999. p. 127-147.

LORENZ, G. Overstatement in advanced learners’ writing: stylistic aspects of adjective intensification. In: GRANGER, S. (Ed.). **Learner English on computer.** London: Longman, 1998. p. 53-66.

MCCARTHY, M. What constitutes a basic vocabulary for spoken communication? **Studies in English Language and Literature**, v. 1, p. 233-249, 1999.

MCENEY, T.; WILSON, A. **Corpus linguistics.** Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1996.

MCENEY, T.; XIAO, R.; TONO, Y. **Corpus-based language studies:** an advanced resource book. London: Routledge, 2006.

MINDT, D. English corpus linguistics and the foreign language teaching syllabus. In: THOMAS, J.; SHORT, M. (Eds.). **Using corpora for language research:** studies in the honour of Geoffrey Leech. London: Longman, 1996. p. 232-247.

_____. Corpora and the teaching of English in Germany. In: WICHMANN, A. et al. (Eds.). **Teaching and language corpora.** London: Longman, 1997. p. 40-50.

MOITA LOPES, L. P. Fotografias da lingüística aplicada no campo de línguas estrangeiras no Brasil. **DELTA**, v. 15, n. especial, p. 419-435, 1999.

MURISON-BOWIE, S. **MicroConcord manual:** an introduction to the practices and principles of concordancing in language teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

NAKAMURA, J. Quantitative comparison of modals in the Brown and the LOB corpora. **ICAME Journal**, n. 17, p. 29-48, abr. 1993.

NEVES, M. H. de M. **A gramática funcional.** São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1997.

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

OLIVEIRA, L. P. de. **Variação intercultural na escrita:** contrastes multidimensionais em inglês e português. São Paulo, 1997. 358 p. Tese (Doutorado em Lingüística Aplicada e Ensino de Línguas) – Programa de Estudos Pós-Graduados em Lingüística Aplicada e Ensino de Línguas, Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo.

_____. Escolhas pedagógicas do educador e identidade cultural dos aprendizes. **Linguagem & Ensino**, v. 3, n. 2, p. 49-59, 2000.

PALACIOS-MARTÍNEZ, I.; MARTÍNEZ-INSUA, A. Connecting linguistic description and language teaching: native and learner use of existential there. **International Journal of Applied Linguistics**, v. 16, n. 2, p. 213-231, 2006.

PARTINGTON, A. “Utterly content in each other’s company”: semantic prosody and semantic preference. **International Journal of Corpus Linguistics**, v. 9, n. 1, p. 131-156, 2004.

PEARSON, J. **Terms in context.** Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1998.

PETCH-TYSON, S. Writer / reader visibility in EFL written discourse. In: GRANGER, S. (Ed.). **Learner English on computer.** London: Longman, 1998. p. 107-118.

POPPER, K. R. **Conjectures and refutations:** the growth of scientific knowledge. London: Routledge, 2002 [1963].

QUIRK, R. et al. **A comprehensive grammar of the English language.** Harlow: Longman, 1997 [1985].

RECSKI, L. Expressing standpoints in EFL written discourse. **Revista Virtual de Estudos da Linguagem – ReVEL**, v. 2, n. 3, p. 1-16, ago. 2004. Disponível em: <http://www.revel.inf.br/site2007/_pdf/3/artigos/revel_3_expressing_standpoints_in_efl_written_discourse.pdf>. Acesso em: 21 jan. 2008.

_____. Epistemic modality and spoken discourse: an English-Portuguese cross-linguistic investigation. **Linguagem & Ensino**, v. 9, n. 1, p. 159-185, 2006.

RINGBOM, H. Vocabulary frequencies in advanced learner English: a cross-linguistic approach. In: GRANGER, S. (Ed.). **Learner English on computer.** London: Longman, 1998. p. 41-52.

RÖMER, U. A corpus-driven approach to modal auxiliaries and their didactics. In: SINCLAIR, J. McH. (Ed.). **How to use corpora in language teaching.** Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2004. p. 185-199.

RUMSEY, D. **Statistics for dummies.** Indianapolis: Wiley, 2003

SCOTT, M. **WordSmith tools manual:** version 3.0. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998. Disponível em: <<http://www.lexically.net/wordsmith/version3/manual.pdf>>. Acesso em: 21 jan. 2008.

_____. **WordSmith Tools.** Versão 3.0. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

SCOTT, M.; TRIBBLE, C. **Textual patterns:** key words and corpus analysis in language education. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2006.

SEIDLHOFER, B. Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca. **Annual Review of Applied Linguistics**, v. 24, p. 209-239, 2004.

SHIRATO, J.; STAPLETON, P. Comparing English vocabulary in a spoken learner corpus with a native speaker corpus: pedagogical implications arising from an empirical study in Japan. **Language Teaching Research**, v. 11, n. 4, p. 393-412, 2007.

SINCLAIR, J. **Corpus, concordance, collocation.** Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.

_____. Corpus evidence in language description. In: WICHMANN, A. et al. (Eds.). **Teaching and language corpora.** London: Longman, 1997. p. 27-39.

_____. **Reading concordances:** an introduction. London: Longman, 2003.

_____. **Trust the text:** language, corpus and discourse. London: Routledge, 2004.

_____. Corpus and text: basic principles. In: WYNNE, M. (Ed.). **Developing linguistic corpora: a guide to good practice.** Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2005. p. 1-16. Disponível em: <<http://www.ahds.ac.uk/creating/guides/linguistic-corpora/chapter1.htm>>. Acesso em 13 mai. 2007.

SOUZA, C. M. de O. **Adverbiais conjuntivos na escrita de alunos brasileiros de inglês como língua estrangeira: uma pesquisa baseada em corpora.** São Paulo, 2003. 128 p. Dissertação (Mestrado em Lingüística Aplicada e Estudos da Linguagem) – Faculdade de Comunicação e Filosofia, Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo.

SWAN, M. **Practical English usage.** Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995 [1980].

STUBBS, M. British traditions in text analysis – from Firth to Sinclair. In: BAKER, M.; FRANCIS, G.; TOGNINI-BONELLI, E. (Eds.). **Text and technology: in honour of John Sinclair.** Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1993. p. 1-33.

TEUBERT, W.; ČERMÁKOVÁ, A. **Corpus linguistics: a short introduction.** London: Continuum, 2007.

TOGNINI-BONELLI, E. **Corpus linguistics at work.** Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2001.

TRIBBLE, C.; JONES, G. **Concordances in the classroom: a resource book for teachers.** London: Longman: 1990.

TSUI, A. B. M. What teachers have always wanted to know – and how corpora can help. In: SINCLAIR, J. (Ed.). **How to use corpora in language teaching**. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2004. p. 39-61.

TURNER, J. Academic literacy and the discourse of transparency. In: JONES, C.; TURNER, J.; STREET, B. (Eds.). **Students writing in the university: cultural and epistemological issues**. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1999. p. 149-160.

VAN EEMEREN, F. H. et al. **Fundamentals of argumentation theory**: a handbook of historical backgrounds and contemporary developments. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1996.

VAN PEER, W.; HAKEMULDER, J.; ZYNGIER, S. **Muses and measures: empirical research methods for the humanities**. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2007.

VIANA, V. P. Modals in Brazilian advanced EFL learners' compositions: a corpus-based investigation. **Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development**, n. 7, p. 77-86, 2006.

_____. Utilizando o programa WordSmith Tools na pesquisa sobre apreciação: uma sugestão metodológica. **Intercâmbio**, v. XVI, 2007. Disponível em: <<http://www.pucsp.br/pos/lael/intercambio/pdf/viana.prn.pdf>>. Acesso em: 22 jan. 2008.

_____. Computers and the humanities: introduction. In: ZYNGIER, S. et al. (Eds.). **Directions in empirical literary studies: in honor of Willie van Peer**. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2008. p. 157-159.

VIANA, V. P.; SILVEIRA, N. G.; ZYNGIER, S. Empirical evaluation: towards an automated index of lexical variety. In: ZYNGIER, S. et al. (Eds.). **Directions in empirical literary studies: in honor of Willie van Peer**. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2008. p. 271-282.

VICTORI, M. An analysis of writing knowledge in EFL composing: a case study of two effective and two less effective writers. **System**, v. 27, p. 537-555, 1999.

VIRTANEN, T. Direct questions in argumentative student writing. In: GRANGER, S. (Ed.). **Learner English on computer**. London: Longman, 1998. p. 94-106.

WIDDOWSON, H. G. **An applied linguistic approach to discourse analysis.** Edinburgh, 1973. 246 p. Tese (Doutorado em Lingüística) – Department of Linguistics, University of Edinburgh. Disponível em: http://www.oup.com/elt/catalogue/guidance_articles/discourse_analysis?cc=global. Acesso em: 30 jan. 2008.

10 Anexos

As páginas seguintes contêm 16 anexos com informações extras a respeito da pesquisa realizada.

10.1.

Página de inserção de dados no Br-ICLE

BRICLE - Text and learner profile input

- Please fill in the information below as it was provided by the student on his/her learner profile sheet. Then type or copy and paste the actual composition in the space provided. When you're done, please click ONCE on 'Done' at the bottom of the page. This will save the information in the preset formats and generate the codes needed for the corpus. You will be given a code on the next screen. Please write down that code in the space provided at the top of the learner profile paper questionnaire. Do not forget to keep the paper versions of both the profile and the composition. If the composition has been handed in on disk, though, the disk need not be kept. Thank you very much.
- All text input is [logged](#).
- If you make a mistake and press the 'Done' button, move on to another file. Do not enter the correct information again, as this will generate a new file code for the same essay. If you need to correct an input already saved, please contact tony4@uol.com.br. He will sort that out. There is no direct way to amend information already saved into a file on the server.

Name of who's filling out this form:

Learner Profile

Essay

Title:

Type: Argumentative

Conditions: Untimed

Examination: No

Reference tools: No Yes

What reference tools?

Bilingual Dictionary English Monolingual Dictionary Grammar Other

Author

Surname:

First Names:

Age: Sex: Female Male

Country: Brazil

Native language: Portuguese

Language spoken at home (if more than one, please give the average % use of each):

Language %

Language %

Other foreign languages in decreasing order of proficiency:

1st

2nd

3rd

4th

Education

Primary school- medium of instruction: Portuguese

Secondary school- medium of instruction: Portuguese

Current studies:

Current year of study: 1st

Institution: PUC/SP

Medium of instruction: Both English and ... (specify below)

Specify language for medium of instruction:

Years of English at school:

Years of English at university:

Stay in an English-speaking country:

Where?

When?

How long?

Date (as entered by student):

Text input

Guidelines (from ICLF Guidelines, January 2003)

1. The student's name and essay title (possible date, etc.) have to be removed and replaced by an unambiguous essay code*
(*This is generated automatically by web form)
2. Leave all the spelling mistakes made by students. If you do not receive the essays in electronic form from the students, pay attention not to add spelling mistakes when keying in the data.
3. References in the text to authors, e.g.-(Granger, 1995)- have to be removed and replaced by the symbol (R for reference).
4. Quotes have to be removed and replaced by the <*> symbol except if they are very short and/or integrated in the sentence (as subject e.g.)
N.B. We do not remove titles of books, journals, pop songs, etc because they generally make part of the sentence and if we remove them we'll have problems for the tagging.
5. Illegible words have to be preceded and followed by an angle bracket and a question mark:).
6. Ideally the texts should only have paragraph breaks. The double spacing between blocks of paragraphs should preferably be deleted.
In other words, type two 'Enter's to start a new paragraph.

Essay (type here or copy and paste, minding the guidelines above):

10.2.

Página de registro de dados no Br-ICLE

Text input log for BRICLE

Text code	Essay file	Learner profile	Entered by	Date entered
ICLE-BR-CAT-0001.1	BRCA1001.txt	BRCA1001-profile.htm		Tue Aug 24 10:33:53 EST 2004
ICLE-BR-CAT-0002.1	BRCA1002.txt	BRCA1002-profile.htm	teste	Tue Aug 24 10:39:55 EST 2004
ICLE-BR-CAT-0003.1	BRCA1003.txt	BRCA1003-profile.htm	Gisele Marion Rosa	Tue Aug 24 10:58:31 EST 2004
ICLE-BR-CAT-0004.1	BRCA1004.txt	BRCA1004-profile.htm		Tue Aug 24 11:37:00 EST 2004
ICLE-BR-CAT-0005.1	BRCA1005.txt	BRCA1005-profile.htm	Juliana Meres Costa	Tue Aug 24 21:52:35 EST 2004
ICLE-BR-CAT-0006.1	BRCA1006.txt	BRCA1006-profile.htm	Denise Delegá	Wed Aug 25 20:45:37 EST 2004
ICLE-BR-CAT-0007.1	BRCA1007.txt	BRCA1007-profile.htm	Denise Delegá	Wed Aug 25 20:48:43 EST 2004
ICLE-BR-CAT-0008.1	BRCA1008.txt	BRCA1008-profile.htm	Denise Delegá	Wed Aug 25 20:53:18 EST 2004
ICLE-BR-CAT-0009.1	BRCA1009.txt	BRCA1009-profile.htm	Denise Delegá	Wed Aug 25 20:57:07 EST 2004
ICLE-BR-CAT-0010.1	BRCA1010.txt	BRCA1010-profile.htm	Denise Delegá	Wed Aug 25 21:01:13 EST 2004
ICLE-BR-CAT-0011.1	BRCA1011.txt	BRCA1011-profile.htm	Denise Delegá	Wed Aug 25 21:03:41 EST 2004
ICLE-BR-CAT-0012.1	BRCA1012.txt	BRCA1012-profile.htm	Carla Fragozo	Thu Aug 26 14:14:00 EST 2004
ICLE-BR-CAT-0013.1	BRCA1013.txt	BRCA1013-profile.htm	Vander Viana	Sat Jun 18 10:43:07 ET 2005
ICLE-BR-CAT-0014.1	BRCA1014.txt	BRCA1014-profile.htm	Vander Viana	Sat Jun 18 10:54:07 ET 2005
ICLE-BR-CAT-0015.1	BRCA1015.txt	BRCA1015-profile.htm	Vander Viana	Sat Jun 18 11:02:18 ET 2005
ICLE-BR-CAT-0016.1	BRCA1016.txt	BRCA1016-profile.htm		Sat Jun 18 11:11:25 ET 2005
ICLE-BR-CAT-0017.1	BRCA1017.txt	BRCA1017-profile.htm	Vander Viana	Sat Jun 18 11:23:49 ET 2005
ICLE-BR-CAT-0018.1	BRCA1018.txt	BRCA1018-profile.htm	Vander Viana	Sat Jun 18 11:28:54 ET 2005
ICLE-BR-CAT-0019.1	BRCA1019.txt	BRCA1019-profile.htm	Vander Viana	Sat Jun 18 11:34:25 ET 2005
ICLE-BR-CAT-0020.1	BRCA1020.txt	BRCA1020-profile.htm	Vander Viana	Sat Jun 18 11:39:37 ET 2005
ICLE-BR-CAT-0021.1	BRCA1021.txt	BRCA1021-profile.htm	Vander Viana	Sat Jun 18 11:45:37 ET 2005
ICLE-BR-CAT-0022.1	BRCA1022.txt	BRCA1022-profile.htm	Vander Viana	Sat Jun 18 11:49:17 ET 2005
ICLE-BR-CAT-0023.1	BRCA1023.txt	BRCA1023-profile.htm	Vander Viana	Sat Jun 18 11:53:57 ET 2005
ICLE-BR-CAT-0024.1	BRCA1024.txt	BRCA1024-profile.htm	Vander Viana	Sat Jun 18 11:59:22 ET 2005
ICLE-BR-CAT-0025.1	BRCA1025.txt	BRCA1025-profile.htm	Vander Viana	Sat Jun 18 12:02:50 ET 2005
ICLE-BR-CAT-0026.1	BRCA1026.txt	BRCA1026-profile.htm	Vander Viana	Sat Jun 18 12:06:36 ET 2005
ICLE-BR-CAT-0027.1	BRCA1027.txt	BRCA1027-profile.htm	Vander Viana	Sat Jun 18 12:11:29 ET 2005
ICLE-BR-CAT-0028.1	BRCA1028.txt	BRCA1028-profile.htm	Vander Viana	Sat Jun 18 12:15:17 ET 2005
ICLE-BR-CAT-0029.1	BRCA1029.txt	BRCA1029-profile.htm	Vander Viana	Sat Jun 18 12:20:00 ET 2005

10.3. Questionário

LEARNER PROFILE

=====
Text code: (do not fill in)

Essay:

Title:

Approximate length required:	-500 words	0	+500 words	0
Conditions:	timed	0	untimed	0
Examination:	yes	0	no	0
Reference tools:	yes	0	no	0

What reference tools?

Bilingual dictionary:

English monolingual dictionary:

Grammar:

Other(s):

=====
Surname:

First names:

Age:

Male

0

Female

0

Nationality:

Native language:

Father's mother tongue:

Mother's mother tongue:

Language(s) spoken at home: (if more than one, please give the average % use of each)

Education:

Primary school - medium of instruction:

Secondary school - medium of instruction:

Current studies:

Current year of study:

Institution:

Medium of instruction:

English only **0**

Other language(s) (specify) **0**

Both **0**

=====
Years of English at school:

Years of English at university:

Stay in an English-speaking country:

Where?

When? How long?

Other foreign languages in decreasing order of proficiency:

I hereby give permission for my essay to be used for research purposes.

Date:

Signature:

10.4.

Estatísticas do Br-ICLE¹³¹

N	1	11-letter words	940
Text File	OVERALL	12-letter words	494
Bytes	309.062	13-letter words	267
Tokens	51.430	14-letter words	105
Types	5.455	15-letter words	40
Type/Token Ratio	10,61	16-letter words	19
Standardised Type/Token	55,98	17-letter words	33
Ave. Word Length	4,80	18-letter words	2
Sentences	2.410	19-letter words	0
Sent.length	21,29	20-letter words	0
sd. Sent. Length	11,36	21-letter words	0
Paragraphs	559	22-letter words	1
Para. length	92	23-letter words	0
sd. Para. length	43,53	24-letter words	0
Headings	0	25-letter words	0
Heading length		26-letter words	0
sd. Heading length		27-letter words	0
1-letter words	1.189	28-letter words	0
2-letter words	9.622	29-letter words	0
3-letter words	9.611	30-letter words	0
4-letter words	8.487	31-letter words	0
5-letter words	5.749	32-letter words	0
6-letter words	4.333	33-letter words	0
7-letter words	3.817	34-letter words	0
8-letter words	2.811	35-letter words	1
9-letter words	2.213	36-letter words	0
10-letter words	1.696	37-letter words	0

¹³¹ Neste estudo, a razão forma/item padronizada foi calculada em intervalos de 300 itens em todas as estatísticas geradas pelo *WordSmith Tools* (Scott, 1999).

10.5.

Estatísticas das redações da PUC-Rio

N	1	11-letter words	118
Text File	OVERALL	12-letter words	51
Bytes	39.136	13-letter words	28
Tokens	6.632	14-letter words	14
Types	1.618	15-letter words	4
Type/Token Ratio	24,40	16-letter words	0
Standardised Type/Token	53,33	17-letter words	2
Ave. Word Length	4,69	18-letter words	0
Sentences	300	19-letter words	0
Sent.length	22,11	20-letter words	0
sd. Sent. Length	11,16	21-letter words	0
Paragraphs	79	22-letter words	0
Para. length	83,95	23-letter words	0
sd. Para. length	36,95	24-letter words	0
Headings	0	25-letter words	0
Heading length		26-letter words	0
sd. Heading length		27-letter words	0
1-letter words	172	28-letter words	0
2-letter words	1.250	29-letter words	0
3-letter words	1.331	30-letter words	0
4-letter words	1.115	31-letter words	0
5-letter words	729	32-letter words	0
6-letter words	516	33-letter words	0
7-letter words	456	34-letter words	0
8-letter words	356	35-letter words	0
9-letter words	292	36-letter words	0
10-letter words	198	37-letter words	0

10.6.

Estatísticas das redações da UERJ

N	1	11-letter words	374
Text File	OVERALL	12-letter words	207
Bytes	129.264	13-letter words	115
Tokens	21.533	14-letter words	52
Types	3.391	15-letter words	16
Type/Token Ratio	15,75	16-letter words	7
Standardised Type/Token	57,38	17-letter words	15
Ave. Word Length	4,80	18-letter words	1
Sentences	983	19-letter words	0
Sent.length	21,91	20-letter words	0
sd. Sent. Length	11,68	21-letter words	0
Paragraphs	224	22-letter words	1
Para. length	96,13	23-letter words	0
sd. Para. length	42,33	24-letter words	0
Headings	0	25-letter words	0
Heading length		26-letter words	0
sd. Heading length		27-letter words	0
1-letter words	497	28-letter words	0
2-letter words	4.023	29-letter words	0
3-letter words	3.972	30-letter words	0
4-letter words	3.610	31-letter words	0
5-letter words	2.409	32-letter words	0
6-letter words	1.896	33-letter words	0
7-letter words	1.558	34-letter words	0
8-letter words	1.142	35-letter words	1
9-letter words	936	36-letter words	0
10-letter words	701	37-letter words	0

10.7.

Estatísticas das redações da UFF

N	1	11-letter words	339
Text File	OVERALL	12-letter words	173
Bytes	100.145	13-letter words	94
Tokens	16.399	14-letter words	29
Types	2.870	15-letter words	18
Type/Token Ratio	17,50	16-letter words	9
Standardised Type/Token	55,74	17-letter words	16
Ave. Word Length	4,89	18-letter words	0
Sentences	773	19-letter words	0
Sent.length	21,18	20-letter words	0
sd. Sent. Length	10,82	21-letter words	0
Paragraphs	176	22-letter words	0
Para. length	93,18	23-letter words	0
sd. Para. length	47,68	24-letter words	0
Headings	0	25-letter words	0
Heading length		26-letter words	0
sd. Heading length		27-letter words	0
1-letter words	364	28-letter words	0
2-letter words	3.014	29-letter words	0
3-letter words	3.031	30-letter words	0
4-letter words	2.575	31-letter words	0
5-letter words	1.816	32-letter words	0
6-letter words	1.348	33-letter words	0
7-letter words	1.307	34-letter words	0
8-letter words	961	35-letter words	0
9-letter words	697	36-letter words	0
10-letter words	608	37-letter words	0

10.8.

Estatísticas das redações da UFRJ

N	1	11-letter words	109
Text File	OVERALL	12-letter words	63
Bytes	40.517	13-letter words	30
Tokens	6.866	14-letter words	10
Types	1.668	15-letter words	2
Type/Token Ratio	24,29	16-letter words	3
Standardised Type/Token	54,89	17-letter words	0
Ave. Word Length	4,69	18-letter words	1
Sentences	354	19-letter words	0
Sent.length	19,10	20-letter words	0
sd. Sent. Length	11,53	21-letter words	0
Paragraphs	80	22-letter words	0
Para. length	85,82	23-letter words	0
sd. Para. length	42,32	24-letter words	0
Headings	0	25-letter words	0
Heading length		26-letter words	0
sd. Heading length		27-letter words	0
1-letter words	156	28-letter words	0
2-letter words	1.335	29-letter words	0
3-letter words	1.277	30-letter words	0
4-letter words	1.187	31-letter words	0
5-letter words	795	32-letter words	0
6-letter words	573	33-letter words	0
7-letter words	496	34-letter words	0
8-letter words	352	35-letter words	0
9-letter words	288	36-letter words	0
10-letter words	189	37-letter words	0

10.9.

Estatísticas das redações do LOCNESS

N	1	11-letter words	2.565
Text File	OVERALL	12-letter words	1.072
Bytes	979.999	13-letter words	688
Tokens	165.135	14-letter words	277
Types	11.146	15-letter words	129
Type/Token Ratio	6,75	16-letter words	47
Standardised Type/Token	53,49	17-letter words	24
Ave. Word Length	4,73	18-letter words	8
Sentences	8.575	19-letter words	2
Sent.length	19,24	20-letter words	4
sd. Sent. Length	9,98	21-letter words	0
Paragraphs	1.470	22-letter words	1
Para. length	112,34	23-letter words	0
sd. Para. length	70,35	24-letter words	1
Headings	0	25-letter words	0
Heading length		26-letter words	0
sd. Heading length		27-letter words	0
1-letter words	4.908	28-letter words	0
2-letter words	28.809	29-letter words	0
3-letter words	31.422	30-letter words	0
4-letter words	28.667	31-letter words	0
5-letter words	18.071	32-letter words	0
6-letter words	14.111	33-letter words	0
7-letter words	13.496	34-letter words	0
8-letter words	9.736	35-letter words	0
9-letter words	6.530	36-letter words	0
10-letter words	4.567	37-letter words	0

10.10.**Estatísticas das redações de participantes americanos (LOCNESS)**

N	1	11-letter words	2.053
Text File	OVERALL	12-letter words	906
Bytes	865.301	13-letter words	596
Tokens	146.221	14-letter words	240
Types	10.444	15-letter words	115
Type/Token Ratio	7,14	16-letter words	46
Standardised Type/Token	53,39	17-letter words	23
Ave. Word Length	4,71	18-letter words	7
Sentences	7.796	19-letter words	2
Sent.length	18,74	20-letter words	3
sd. Sent. Length	9,54	21-letter words	0
Paragraphs	1.267	22-letter words	1
Para. length	115,41	23-letter words	0
sd. Para. length	71,64	24-letter words	0
Headings	0	25-letter words	0
Heading length		26-letter words	0
sd. Heading length		27-letter words	0
1-letter words	4.322	28-letter words	0
2-letter words	25.130	29-letter words	0
3-letter words	28.091	30-letter words	0
4-letter words	25.854	31-letter words	0
5-letter words	16.362	32-letter words	0
6-letter words	12.330	33-letter words	0
7-letter words	11.970	34-letter words	0
8-letter words	8.495	35-letter words	0
9-letter words	5.703	36-letter words	0
10-letter words	3.972	37-letter words	0

10.11.**Estatísticas das redações de participantes britânicos (LOCNESS)**

N	1	11-letter words	512
Text File	OVERALL	12-letter words	166
Bytes	114.698	13-letter words	92
Tokens	18.914	14-letter words	37
Types	2.701	15-letter words	14
Type/Token Ratio	14.28	16-letter words	1
Standardised Type/Token	54,38	17-letter words	1
Ave. Word Length	4,87	18-letter words	1
Sentences	779	19-letter words	0
Sent.length	24,28	20-letter words	1
sd. Sent. Length	12,63	21-letter words	0
Paragraphs	203	22-letter words	0
Para. length	93,17	23-letter words	0
sd. Para. length	58,33	24-letter words	1
Headings	0	25-letter words	0
Heading length		26-letter words	0
sd. Heading length		27-letter words	0
1-letter words	586	28-letter words	0
2-letter words	3.679	29-letter words	0
3-letter words	3.331	30-letter words	0
4-letter words	2.813	31-letter words	0
5-letter words	1.709	32-letter words	0
6-letter words	1.781	33-letter words	0
7-letter words	1.526	34-letter words	0
8-letter words	1.241	35-letter words	0
9-letter words	827	36-letter words	0
10-letter words	595	37-letter words	0

10.12.

Freqüência relativa de verbos modais por corpus por grupos de 100.000 itens

Modal	Br-ICLE	LOCNESS
<i>Can</i>	476,38	395,43
<i>Could</i>	175,00	211,34
<i>May</i>	124,44	139,28
<i>Might</i>	31,11	35,73
<i>Must</i>	77,78	112,64
<i>Shall</i>	9,72	3,03
<i>Should</i>	241,10	281,59
<i>Will</i>	283,88	406,33
<i>Would</i>	363,60	508,67
Total	1.783,01	2.094,04

Referência temporal	Br-ICLE	LOCNESS
Não-passado	894,42	944,08
Passado	810,81	1037,33

Significados	Br-ICLE	LOCNESS
Permissão / Possibilidade / Habilidade	806,92	781,78
Obrigação / Necessidade	318,88	394,22
Volição / Predição	657,20	918,04

10.13.

**Freqüência relativa de verbos modais por redação em cada corpus
por grupos de 1.000 palavras**

Verbo modal	Br-ICLE		LOCNESS	
	<i>Mínimo</i>	<i>Máximo</i>	<i>Mínimo</i>	<i>Máximo</i>
<i>Can</i>	0,00	20,60	0,00	24,69
<i>Could</i>	0,00	17,89	0,00	18,22
<i>May</i>	0,00	10,85	0,00	10,29
<i>Might</i>	0,00	6,07	0,00	4,08
<i>Must</i>	0,00	9,67	0,00	8,43
<i>Shall</i>	0,00	8,10	0,00	1,23
<i>Should</i>	0,00	13,99	0,00	17,24
<i>Will</i>	0,00	18,46	0,00	26,27
<i>Would</i>	0,00	29,75	0,00	35,09

Referência temporal	Br-ICLE		LOCNESS	
	<i>Mínimo</i>	<i>Máximo</i>	<i>Mínimo</i>	<i>Máximo</i>
Não-passado	0,00	28,52	0,00	40,12
Passado	0,00	43,74	0,00	47,51

Significado	Br-ICLE		LOCNESS	
	<i>Mínimo</i>	<i>Máximo</i>	<i>Mínimo</i>	<i>Máximo</i>
Permissão / Possibilidade / Habilidade	0,00	22,47	0,00	32,39
Obrigação / Necessidade	0,00	13,99	0,00	17,24
Volição / Predição	0,00	29,75	0,00	43,12

10.14.**Resultados do teste ANOVA para a relação contrastiva de verbos modais nos dois corpora****ANOVA**

Modais

	Soma dos quadrados	df	Quadrado da média	F	Sig.
Entre os grupos	962,344	1	962,344	9,398	,002
Dentro dos grupos	30206,549	295	102,395		
Total	31168,893	296			

10.15.

Resultados do teste ANOVA para o uso contrastivo de cada verbo modal nos corpora investigados

ANOVA

		Soma dos quadrados	df	Quadrado da média	F	Sig.
Can	Entre os grupos	21,072	1	21,072	1,223	,270
	Dentro dos grupos	5084,366	295	17,235		
	Total	5105,439	296			
Could	Entre os grupos	7,833	1	7,833	1,041	,308
	Dentro dos grupos	2220,349	295	7,527		
	Total	2228,182	296			
May	Entre os grupos	3,246	1	3,246	,707	,401
	Dentro dos grupos	1355,033	295	4,593		
	Total	1358,279	296			
Might	Entre os grupos	,147	1	,147	,212	,645
	Dentro dos grupos	204,976	295	,695		
	Total	205,124	296			
Must	Entre os grupos	6,338	1	6,338	2,198	,139
	Dentro dos grupos	850,772	295	2,884		
	Total	857,109	296			
Shall	Entre os grupos	,407	1	,407	1,703	,193
	Dentro dos grupos	70,556	295	,239		
	Total	70,963	296			
Should	Entre os grupos	2,612	1	2,612	,248	,619
	Dentro dos grupos	3103,605	295	10,521		
	Total	3106,217	296			
Will	Entre os grupos	137,166	1	137,166	6,255	,013
	Dentro dos grupos	6468,666	295	21,928		
	Total	6605,832	296			
Would	Entre os grupos	237,768	1	237,768	6,539	,011
	Dentro dos grupos	10726,524	295	36,361		
	Total	10964,293	296			

10.16.**Freqüência relativa de verbos lexicais em sintagmas modalizados no LOCNESS**

Verbo	Freqüência relativa por 100.000 itens
Be	336,69
Have	101,13
Make	52,08
Do	43,60
Take	36,94
See	36,94
Allow	27,86
Use	26,64
Become	23,62
Go	23,01
Get	22,41
Give	21,80
Lose	21,19
Lead	19,38
Continue	16,96
Help	16,96
Find	16,35
Feel	15,74
Argue	15,14
Cause	14,53
Come	14,53
Say	14,53
Want	14,53
Happen	13,93
Look	12,72
Bring	12,11
Seem	12,11
Put	11,51
Result	10,90
Mean	10,90
Show	10,29
Change	10,29
Learn	10,29
Consider	9,69
Play	9,69
Work	9,69
Live	9,08
Pass	8,48
End	8,48
Receive	8,48
Remain	8,48

Teach	8,48
Like	8,48
Think	7,87
Decide	7,87
Decrease	7,87
Affect	7,27
Realize	7,27
Remember	7,27
Leave	6,66
Support	6,66
Improve	6,66
Stop	6,66
View	6,66
Buy	6,66
Afford	6,66
Involve	6,06
Spend	6,06
Begin	6,06
Expect	6,06
Solve	6,06
Understand	6,06
Accept	6,06
Stay	6,06
Watch	5,45
Act	5,45
Create	5,45
Include	5,45
Know	5,45
Need	5,45
Arise	5,45
Benefit	5,45
Provide	5,45