This Issue

This issue presents a variety of themes which covers distinct research areas. The first and second articles have genre theories as their common thread, but they approach them from different perspectives. In the first one, by addressing genre analysis theory and evoking Swales, Askehave & Swales, Bhatia, and Martin, among others, Ramos presents a pedagogical suggestion for the implementation of genre-based tasks in the classroom. The author contributes with a unique proposition, and discusses the relevance of using a three-phase model which combines social and linguistic aspects to the teaching of Languages for Specific Purposes.

In the second one, Rezende and Hemais compare scientific articles from the realm of Health Studies, written in Portuguese and English by Brazilian researchers, and written in English by native speakers. The authors, grounded on genre analysis theoretical concepts (Swales and Bhatia), describe the differences in the use of hedges in both languages.

The next three articles describe studies developed in school contexts. Szundy analyses the interaction between the teacher-researcher and some graduate students of English, focusing on the knowledge building process from the perspective of bakhtinian concepts of discourse genres, dialogism, authoritative discourse, persuasive discourse and polyphony.

Following this article, Biasi presents an exercise of critical reflection developed by the researcher and a public school teacher enrolled in a continuing education program. The study focuses on how the reflective inquiry was grounded on the four actions of critical reflection developed by Smith, and on their contribution to the teacher's reflection upon her own practice.

Focused on the school context, Mateus presents an exploratory study that aims at investigating the way pre-service teachers use computers in an undergraduate Language course, and the conceptions they have about the insertion of such a machine into pedagogical practice. Data collected and their outcomes are analysed from the perspective of social inclusion and of digital literacy.

This issue closes with the article by Khodadady who reports the performance of 34 non-native speakers of English on four testing methods: C-test, schema-based cloze multiple choice item test (MCIT), test-driven cloze test, and traditional cloze MCIT. In order to estimate empirical validity, the author used a disclosed TOEFL examination.

M.M.F.