DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 400 702 FL 024 182

AUTHOR Bardovi-Harlig, Kathleen
TITLE Pragmatics and Language Teaching: Bringing Pragmatics and Pedagogy Together.
PUB DATE 96
NOTE 21p.; In: Bouton, Lawrence F., Ed. Pragmatics and Language Learning. Monograph Series Volume 7, p21-39, 1996; see FL 024 180.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Class Activities; Contrastive Linguistics; *Grammar; Instructional Materials; Interlanguage; Language Research; Learning Processes; Linguistic Theory; *Pragmatics; *Research Utilization; Second Language Instruction; *Second Language Learning; *Second Languages

ABSTRACT

Discussion of the role of pragmatics research in language teaching looks at the role such research should play in the language classroom, and the role of researcher, teacher, and teacher educator in making that connection. It is noted that pragmatics research has discovered a number of differences in the ways in which first- and second-language learners acquire the target language: differences in speech acts used, in forms of speech acts, in choice of semantic formulas, and in the content of semantic formulas. Research has also revealed the importance of input and its sources, and cross-cultural and interlanguage pragmatics research has begun to help in development of pedagogically appropriate materials. It is argued that a speech act framework is useful for translating pragmatics research into classroom practice that helps learners attend to interactions and reactions and consider the effects of one choice of words over another. Learner-centered teaching methods are viewed as useful in this effort. Suggestions are offered on the selection of speech acts on which to focus in the second language classroom and techniques for presenting new speech act information, drawing on results of research. Contains 44 references. (MSE)

PRAGMATICS AND LANGUAGE TEACHING: BRINGING PRAGMATICS AND PEDAGOGY TOGETHER

Kathleen Bardovi-Harlig

PRAGMATICS AND LANGUAGE TEACHING: BRINGING PRAGMATICS AND PEDAGOGY TOGETHER

Kathleen Bardovi-Harlig

The research in interlanguage pragmatics provides a needs-assessment for pragmatics and language teaching. The research clearly shows that language learners have difficulty in the area of pragmatics, regardless of their level of grammatical competence. This paper explores the classroom as a source of input, and the role that classroom activities and pedagogical materials as part of that input.

The goal of this paper is to explore the notion of teaching with respect to pragmatics, the role that pragmatics research plays or should play in bringing pragmatics into the language classroom, and the job that each of us whether language teachers, teacher educators, or researchers should play in such an endeavor. I titled the original plenary address on which this paper is based "Pragmatics and Language Teaching, Bringing Pragmatics and Pedagogy Together" because I believe that bringing pragmatics into the classroom successfully will require the joint effort of many professionals involved in different endeavors related to pragmatics.

Needs Assessment

First, I would like to address the question, "why bring a focus on pragmatics into the classroom?" For many participants of the Conference on Pragmatics and Language Learning throughout the nine years of our meetings, it has been a fundamental assumption that what we discovered in pragmatics and language learning would ultimately be beneficial to the classroom. Others, both researchers and teachers, have taken a more wait-and-see attitude. Whatever one's attitude toward the relationship of the study of pragmatics and language acquisition to language teaching at the outset, I believe that the results are now back on this question. The inquiry undertaken by the participants in this conference and throughout the field of interlanguage pragmatics provides us with a clear needs assessment: Learners show significant differences from native speakers in the execution of certain speech acts and in conversational functions such as greetings and leave takings.

We have found this to be the case with a variety of first languages and with learners at a variety of levels of grammatical proficiency. That is to say, a learner of high grammatical proficiency will not necessarily show concomitant pragmatic competence. We have also found at least at the higher levels of grammatical proficiency that learners show a wide range of pragmatic competence. Advanced nonnative speakers are neither uniformly successful, nor uniformly unsuccessful, but the range is quite wide. They are more likely to be less successful than native speakers on the same task where contextualized reaction data is available (as in the case of conversations and academic interviews).

There are many ways in which learners differ from native speakers. I will divide the differences between learners and native speakers into four main categories and then give an example of each: native and nonnative speakers may use different speech acts, or where the same speech acts are used, these may differ in form, semantic formula, or content. First, learners may perform different speech acts than native speakers in the same contexts. For example, in our work on the academic advising session, Beverly Hartford and I have observed that native speakers produce more suggestions than nonnative speakers per advising session, whereas nonnative speakers produce more rejections per advising session than native speakers do. So, in the same context, native speakers exert control over their course schedules by making suggestions; in contrast, the nonnative speakers control their course schedules through rejections, by blocking the suggestions of their advisors (Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 1993a).

The second way in which nonnative production may differ from the native speaker norm is in the form of a speech act. In a longitudinal study of pragmatic development in the advising session, we found that in early sessions native and nonnative speakers differed in what speech acts they produced, whereas in subsequent sessions they produced the same speech acts, but these differed in form (Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 1993a). In the subsequent advising sessions, nonnative speakers increased their use of suggestions showing that they recognized that such a speech act is expected. However, while frequency of use of suggestions moves toward the native speaker norm, linguistic form is much slower to develop. Learners often do not use the mitigators used by their native speaker peers, and often use aggravators which are never used by native speakers.

For example, native speakers make suggestions as found in (1)-(3).

(1) Perhaps I should also mention that I have an interest in sociolinguistics and would like, if I can, to structure things in such a way that I might do as much sociolinguistics as I can.

(2) I was thinking of taking sociolinguistics

(3) I have an idea for spring. I don't know how it would work out, but..

In contrast, in the nonnative sessions we often hear the suggestions found in (4) and (5).

(4) In the summer I <u>will</u> <u>take</u> language testing

(5) So, I, <u>I just</u> <u>decided</u> on taking the language structure.

A third way in which native and nonnative speakers differ is in the choice of semantic formulas. For example, we found that native speakers and nonnative speakers in the advising sessions and in discourse completion tasks which role play the advising sessions, both used more explanations than any other semantic formula when making rejections. However, only native speakers used alternatives, and in fact, they used these next most frequently, ranking just after explanations (Bardovi-Harlig, 1991, 1993b; Hartford & Bardovi-Harlig, 1992).

A fourth way in which native and nonnative speakers differ is in the content of semantic formulas. In the case of rejections, we have found that both groups use the explanation most frequently, but native speakers and nonnative speakers differ in the content of their explanations. In an experiment designed to test differences in the content of rejections based on the natural data collected from the advising sessions, we gave native speakers reasons for rejecting courses which included several reasons given in nonnative advising sessions, but not in native speaker sessions. These included reasons such as a course being too difficult, too easy, or even telling the advisor that his or her own course was uninteresting. Native speakers in the experiment invented other reasons to reject the courses whereas nonnative speakers used the reasons given in the experiment, reflecting their production in the actual advising sessions (Hartford & Bardovi-Harlig, 1992).

Beebe, Takahashi & Uliss-Weltz (1990) have also found differences in content in conversation where English speakers and Japanese speakers of English use different content in explanations following refusals. The Americans are characterized as providing more details and the Japanese as being a bit vague compared to the American norm. When refusing an invitation for example, an American might say "I have a business lunch that day" whereas a Japanese speaker might say "I have something to do." In a very telling example Beebe reports that a Japanese graduate student declined an invitation by saying "I have to go to a wedding" which certainly seemed quite definite in its content, until they learned some weeks later that the wedding had been the woman's own. And thus, the refusal once again seemed vague when judged by American expectations.

We see differences then in at least four areas, use of different speech acts, and differences in form, semantic formulas, and content. In sum, we have evidence from a variety of sources that learners differ noticeably from identifiable native-speaker norms. From a pedagogical view, this can be interpreted as a needs assessment.

There are at least two reasons why learners typically show different patterns of realization than natives speakers do. First, cross-cultural pragmatics has shown that different mature first languages have different realization patterns, and second, and I think at least equally important, is the fact that learners are learners. They do not have the full range of linguistic devices at their disposal. It is the second source of differences that is particularly susceptible to change in the course of acquisition and potentially through instruction.

The Importance of Input

Regarding the issue of language acquisition, one question that comes to mind for both researchers and teachers is whether learners are exposed to appropriate and sufficient input. In our work on learnability in pragmatics, we have hypothesized that at least in part, learners either don't receive the relevant input or don't receive it from sources they consider relevant, or they may not notice the relevant input due to either lack of pragmatic awareness or possibly even grammatical competence. (We take this issue up more fully in our forthcoming paper on input in the institutional setting (Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, in press).

Classrooms as sources of input. If at least part of the problem is input, and I believe that it undoubtedly is, then one of the goals in facilitating the development of pragmatic competence is providing pragmatically appropriate input. And classrooms are indisputably good sources of input. For foreign language learners they may be the sole source of input (depending of course on the learner). I will return to ways to further exploit the classroom toward the end of this paper.

Pedagogical Materials as Input. In this section I would like to continue with the idea of input and extend it to pedagogical materials. I am going to refer specifically to published textbooks. Now, I realize that published materials are often conservative and not as innovative as teachers' own materials, but textbooks do play an important role in providing input and moreover, they are easily accessible, widely available and let's not forget that--to the learners--they are high prestige sources of input.

By and large, textbooks containing conversations or dialogues do not present pragmatically accurate models to learners. As an illustration, I offer the results of a survey of textbooks we did as part of a pedagogical article on teaching closings (Bardovi-Harlig, Hartford, Mahan-Taylor, Morgan, & Reynolds, 1991). The survey examined the presentation of closings by twenty current ESL textbooks which contained dialogues. In surveying the textbooks we discovered that only 12 included what we considered complete closings represented in at least one of the dialogues and that very few did so on a consistent basis. Only one text, Improving Oral Communication, had several examples of complete closings. Textbooks typically represent conversations as getting only as far as shutting down a topic and occasionally as far as a preclosing. As an example, consider this conversation from Lado (1989).

(6) Incomplete closing (shutting down the conversation)

Stanley: Hi, Dick.
Dick: Hi Stanley. Did you go to the football game yesterday?
Stanley: No, I went to the movies with my kids. Did our team win?
Dick: No, they didn't. They lost.
Stanley: Did they lose by much?
Dick: They lost by twelve points.
Stanley: Oh, that's awful. I'm glad I didn't go.[1] (Lado , 1989)

Over the years, since 1989, graduate students in the TESOL Methods course at Indiana University have been collecting examples of a variety of speech acts and comparing them to a number of ESL/EFL textbooks for a range of skills. The criterion for textbook selection is the use of dialogues by the textbooks. These include listening, conversation, and grammar textbooks, as well as multiskills textbooks. The textbooks, even the new ones, are found lacking in at least two ways. First, it is often the case that a particular speech act, or language function is not represented at all. Evidence is lacking. This is quite frequent. Next, other speech acts are poorly represented, that is, they are not realistic. For example, in his plenary address, to this conference, Larry Bouton showed that 80% of the invitations in one ESL textbook used a form of invitations which appeared only 26% of the time in a published corpus on native-speaker invitations. As another example, requests are plentiful in textbooks. They are perhaps the easiest to find of all the speech acts or conversational functions. Yet, they don't occur with even as little as an attention getting "Excuse me" or variation according to the imposition of the request.[2] The textbook situation is in fact bleak, but it is not hopeless.

There are a few new books which do try to present relevant information to learners. One such book is Speaking Effectively: Strategies for Academic Conversation, by Janet L. Kayfetz which includes a chapter on requests. Important characteristics of this chapter are that the speech act (requests) is clearly labelled, that a variety of models for realizing requests are given, and that extended practice is provided through various scenarios. Learners are provided with models and encouraged to try their own requests through a series of role plays based on scenarios. The scenarios are all situated in the academic setting (a setting in which academic bound ESL/EFL students will need to function), and the students always play themselves (students) when making requests. The author provides examples of responses to requests as well, and interprets them for the learners as in Example (7). The responses in Example (7) reply to a request for an extension of a due date.

(7) Responses to requests (Kayfetz, 1992, pp. 48-49)

Firm denial

a. I'm sorry, but that won't be possible. I want all papers on the due date.

Softened Denial

b. I'm sorry, but that won't be possible. I was hoping to get all the papers on the due date. I do not want to make exceptions unless an individual case warrants it.

By providing responses and interpreting them, the textbook prepares learners for responses to their requests and helps them understand whether they have been accepted or not, or are still being considered. The learner can then determine his or her next course of action: to thank the interlocutor, to continue to negotiate, or to even give up for the time being.

This textbook has gone a long way toward remedying some of the common flaws in textbook presentation. I think it provides a good model of what we should consider when selecting a textbook for a course or when developing pedagogical materials.

It also has some shortcomings which should be addressed in the context of providing input for learners. As I mentioned earlier, one strength of the chapter is it provides learners with alternate request forms, but a corresponding weakness is that it does not rank the request in anyway for the students. Consider the list of request formulas provided under the heading "Making Your Request" as shown in Example (8) (Kayfetz, 1992, p. 48).

(8) Making Your Request

a. I would like to request ______________________________
b. I request that you ______________________________

c. With your permission, I want to ___
d. I am requesting that you ___
e. Would it be possible for you to ___
f. Would it be possible for me to ___

Although all of the forms listed are, in fact, possible realizations of requests, only some are likely to be used by students who are native speakers of American English when they address faculty, the scenario established by the textbook. Moreover, the alternatives given are not ranked in any way for the students by the author. In our study of authentic student requests to faculty (Hartford & Bardovi-Harlig, 1995), we found that students do use the formulas "Would it be possible for me" or "Would it be possible for you" and even less often "I would like to request..". But we saw no occurrences of "I am requesting that you do something," nor would I ever expect a graduate student to approach me as either an advisor or a faculty member with a request formulated in such a way.

If the first main area for improvement is to provide learners with some indication of why speakers select different request forms, the second main area of interest concerns the content of the request itself. The content of the request is frequently discussed in the literature as part of the imposition of the request (Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989; Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993). The range of imposition of requests is somewhat limited by the academic setting, and the requests do not show great swings in imposition which are possible in the world at large, such as borrowing someone's car or asking them to babysit a child for a weekend on the high end, to passing the salt or reporting the time on the low end. Nevertheless, in the academic setting, the degree of imposition of requests does vary. Some of the requests which are used in this chapter from the textbook have the potential to be high imposition requests. In a survey of 32 graduate students (half native speakers, half nonnative speakers of American English), we asked respondents to rank commonly received requests as either "high" or "low" imposition. Twenty-eight out of 32 students we surveyed ranked asking for an extension of term papers and other due dates as high imposition. Yet, there is no attempt in this chapter to rank impositions. In its list of requests to role play, the chapter also includes asking the instructor for an A- rather than a B+. This is viewed by faculty as being a very risky request to teach and practice, especially without explanation or elaboration.

Another text, Communicating in the Real World: Developing Communication Skills for Business and the Professions by Terrence G. Wiley and Heide Spruck Wrigley, does discuss the weight of certain requests in the business setting. It further tells students that bosses do expect to have explanations for certain requests and even cautions against inventing explanations.

In Example (9) we see an excerpt from a full conversation provided in the chapter entitled "Language Functions" (Wiley & Wrigley, 1987, pp. 26-27).[3] The textbook glosses the turns of the interlocutors by providing what are essentially semantic formulas. The learners are taken through an extended negotiation of Ms. Ibrahim's request for a day off, to a compromise, and finally, a closing.

(9) "Let Me Tell You About My Situation"

Ms. Ibrahim: Excuse me, Mr. Winting. Could I talk to you a minute? *(request for permission to interrupt)*
Mr. Winting: Sure, go ahead. *(permission granted)*
Ms. Ibrahim: I have a problem. My parents are arriving form Kuwait tomorrow and they need to be picked up at the airport because they don't speak any English. *(explanation of problem: reason for request)* I would like to take a personal holiday so that I will be able to get them. *(request for permission to take the day off)* I am caught up on my work, and Ms. Sindaha knows what to do if there are problems. *(assurance that work will not be interrupted because of personal problems)*
Mr. Winting: Well, as you know, we have a contract due in a few days, and we really could use every person in the office in case any last-minute problems come-up. *(stalling; appeal for the other person to withdraw her request)*
[Conversation continues for seven turns]

The conversation is followed by several short sections which discuss issues related to making requests in the workplace, such as "Making Requests and Asking for Permission," "Tips for Taking Requests and Asking Permission" (this section includes "Look at the Overall Situation," "Don't Fabricate (Invent) Emergencies," "Keep a Low Profile", and "Giving Reasons and Making Excuses."

This text also serves as a promising model for materials development. However, I suspect that the degree of pragmatic and situational detail in this textbook stems from the fact that it is addressed to novice business students (who happen to be language learners) who cannot be expected to know the rules of interaction in a new setting. In contrast, materials developed exclusively for language learners tend to shy away from telling learners, particularly adult learners, how to behave. This is yet another complex issue, but the approach developed by Wiley and Wrigley does offer an avenue for exploration in materials development.

Neither of these books is representative of the available published materials. Although they may have shortcomings, they are significant attempts to help learners to prepare for interaction in specific settings.

Why are dialogues and other examples of invented language use so hard to get right? As Wolfson told us over the years, it is because pragmatic or sociolinguistic competence is not amenable to introspection (Wolfson, 1989). Although it may be possible to introspect on one's own grammatical competence, it is not possible to do the same for language use. The bottom line is that we need to observe language use in order to provide reasonably authentic--and representative--models of language use.

Although I personally consider it unlikely that good textbooks and materials alone will be sufficient for learners to increase their pragmatic competence, I consider it even more unlikely that they will do so without good materials which comprise a significant portion of the positive evidence to which learners are exposed.

The Role of Research

How can research help in the development of pragmatically appropriate materials? Cross cultural pragmatics research and interlanguage pragmatics research has resulted in a number of quite reasonable descriptions of potential target languages for specific speech acts and conversational exchanges. Cohen and Olshtain estimate that "the research literature provides relatively detailed descriptions of realization strategies for perhaps eight speech acts in a variety of situations (i.e., apologies, requests, complaints, disapproval, refusals, disagreement, gratitude, compliments)" (1993, pp. 34). As yet, English is still the best represented language, but Japanese, Chinese, German, Hebrew, French, and even Kiswahili are becoming increasingly available.[4] The data which the research offers as potential models are not exhaustive, but they are available and useful. For example, Omar (1995) in Kiswahili and Takenoya (1995b) in Japanese have already brought the result of their research into the foreign language classroom.

It should not be thought at any time in this discussion that research has the answers to all the questions in pragmatics and language learning. Far from it. Although the descriptions of some speech acts, for example, are fairly complete, there is still more to do. We are now beginning to ask new questions such as "How does pragmatic competence develop?," "Which speech acts really matter in terms of getting them right--and in which areas does deviation from the norm exact the highest price from learners?" Some of these questions could be answered by observing learners in classrooms.

Speech Acts Framework

At this point in the paper I would like to consider the analytic framework in which this paper is situated. In this paper so far, I have explicitly adopted a speech acts framework to which I've added conversational functions of openings and closings. This is not the only possibility, of course, but it is one I use in teacher education and also in collaboration with teachers.[5] I use the speech act framework in teaching both for its accessibility and for the availability of descriptions of language use in that framework.

The most important point is the accessibility of the notion of speech acts to both teachers and language learners. As speakers, as communicators, as language users, we know many of the terms already. We are aware of the intended effect of utterances, what we call the illocutionary force, and we can and do refer to illocutionary force in daily conversation. We have all heard utterances such as those in Example (10) in which a speaker names a particular speech act.

(10) Colloquial naming of speech acts

a. George is so stubborn that he won't apologize.
b. You owe me an apology.
c. I wrote my father-in-law to thank him for the gift.
d. It's OK, you don't have to thank me.
e. He refused to do it.
f. I'm going to call and complain.

In addition to the accessibility of the notion of speech acts, what we might have called "psychological reality" in the 1970s, there is a large body of research in the speech act framework, as I've already mentioned. Such descriptions are rich resources for materials development.

I should also note that there are different ways of analyzing conversations and that the speech act framework represents only one way of looking at language use. Examples of very impressive training programs in pragmatics can be found in some International Teaching Assistants programs. These typically do not take a speech act approach. Reports of methods and research carried out in these programs can be found in the work of Catherine Davies at the University of Alabama (Davies, 1994; Davies & Tyler, 1994) Andrea Tyler in her work at University of Florida (now at Georgetown) (Tyler, 1992, 1994), and Jessica Williams at the University of Illinois at Chicago (J. Williams, 1992; Hoejke & Williams, 1994).

Goals

Before we go into the classroom let us examine the goals of bringing pragmatics and pedagogy together. I have tried very hard not to say "Let's teach pragmatics." I do not want to evoke the image of the teacher-centered classroom where the teachers "tell" and the learners "receive" the information. I think our endeavor instead, is one in which we help learners increase their pragmatic awareness.

Over the years working with a number of language-teacher colleagues, especially, Becky Mahan-Taylor, Alwiya Omar, Dudley Reynolds, and Shona Whyte, Beverly Hartford and I have developed and led in-service workshops in pragmatics at university ESL programs, and at state, regional, and national conferences. The teachers who have attended these workshops have challenged us all to clarify our thinking about the outcome of focusing on pragmatics in the classroom.

By increasing pragmatic awareness we mean a variety of things--we hope to help learners listen to interactions, to watch for reactions, to consider what may result from one choice of words over another. Offering a model of an American manner of performing particular speech acts is only one part of increasing pragmatic awareness on the part of the learner. It is up to a learner whether he or she attempts American-style compliments, complaints, or closings, for example. A focus on pragmatics in the classroom also offers learners tools to interpret and to respond to a variety of speech acts when they are addressed to them. Our chief goal is increased pragmatic awareness; this may include but is by no means limited to production alone.

Addressing pragmatics as part of language pedagogy empowers students to experience and experiment with the language, using the language class as an opportunity for learners to expand their communication across cultural boundaries and to thereby participate in the very purpose of language, which is communication. I think that the mood of ESL teachers with whom I've worked is that it must be left up to the learners how far they want to go in adopting certain linguistic behaviors. This is a source of some debate in the field as is indicated by the lively discussion at the conference which followed Takenoya's presentation on the acquisition of address terms by American learners of Japanese (Takenoya, 1995b). In retrospective interviews, American males learning Japanese as a foreign language reported that they were hesitant to use certain features of the Japanese address system which they considered sexist. After one member of the audience ventured that successful language learners must give up part of themselves, the audience broke into earnest discussion concerning whether learners could establish limits for themselves and still be successful learners. This is an issue which teachers and researchers alike must seriously address, and not a matter which can be resolved here.

Language-Teaching Methods

I am going to briefly touch on language teaching methods here. Part of what is going to help us help learners reach this goal are current methods of teaching and more important the attitudes and principles which are the basis for those methods. Language classrooms are becoming increasingly learner-centered, with learners viewed as knowers and discoverers. Learners are increasingly being asked to take responsibility for their own learning. Language acquisition is increasingly viewed as a significant force in the language teaching classroom. We now recognize--as a result both of second language acquisition research and classroom innovation moving the focus from the teacher to the learner--that classroom input, in both second and foreign language classrooms, can never fully specify the target language input for learners. Moreover, for any individual learner input always underdetermines eventual competence. In addition, I see classrooms in which teachers function both as facilitators and co-learners with their students. And this practice will prove to be quite fruitful in our quest to bring pragmatics into the classroom.

Evaluating a Speech Act Framework for Pedagogy

Against these goals and assumptions I would like to evaluate two frequent objections to a speech-act framework as a basis for pedagogy. I tackle these problems here to bring them to the reader's attention, so we can dismiss them, and so that the reader will not say later "she didn't tell us about these."

A potential problem in pedagogical pragmatics is the sheer number of speech acts, as Marion Williams (1988) and John Flowerdew (1990) observe. M. Williams argues that the large number of language functions and speech acts makes the teaching of specific acts an unattainable goal and instead suggests that "the focus should . . . be . . . on using language in ongoing discourse, in a particular context, for a particular purpose, and as part of a strategy" (M. Williams, 1988, p. 46). Although one might agree with M. Williams that it is impossible to teach all language functions or speech acts, I further claim that there is also a large number of language contexts and purposes, and that teaching these is equally prohibitive. It is impossible to prepare students for every context or even all of the most common situations they will face in natural language settings.

Materials development and input will never be exhaustive. The point of having pragmatically accurate materials is to have classroom materials which are easily accessible and high prestige sources, representing authentic interaction. But the materials will never represent every speech act in every possible situation. Not because it is too enormous a task--and it is--but because we don't believe that learners acquire language that way. We use authentic language and representative cases as input--as triggers--for learners to acquire more. If we believed that learners only learn what is modeled and what they memorize, then we would have an enormous task indeed. The input would have to fully specify any and all of the expected output.

Our position, therefore, is that the real responsibility of the classroom teacher is not to instruct students specifically in the intricacies of complimenting, direction-giving, or closing a conversation, but rather to make students more aware that pragmatic functions exist in language, specifically in discourse, in order that they may be more aware of these functions as learners. We as teachers must be knowledgeable of these speech acts and their component parts in order to determine what is naturalistic input for our students, but it would be impossible to impart this knowledge concerning every speech act explicitly. We believe that if students are encouraged to think for themselves about culturally appropriate ways to compliment a friend or say goodbye to a teacher, then they may awaken their own lay abilities for pragmatic analysis.

Flowerdew also points out that there is no teaching order specified by speech act theory. This is absolutely true. Unlike generative grammar which claims to be a theory of acquisition, no comparable claims were made by speech act theory. Thus, I would say that it is not the responsibility of such a theory to suggest either an acquisition order or an instructional order. In fact, I will even go so far as to question such a concept as ordering speech acts. It suggests to me a structural syllabus which hardly seems appropriate to such an inherently communicative notion as a speech act. And yet, we all need starting points. Where shall we begin?

Starting Points

There is probably no "best" or "most crucial" speech act for instruction. Selections should be made according to learner needs or interests and by current or future type of target language contact. As I see it, there are two potential starting points. We can identify a speech act for instruction either through observing students' conversational or written language use, or by asking students to identify areas of difficulty. One of the earliest TESOL Quarterly articles to treat the use of specific expressions which differ pragmatically was a paper entitled "Excuse me and I'm sorry" by Borkin and Reinhart (1978). This paper came out of the classroom work of two ESL teachers who noticed that their learners were having difficulty in using these two expressions and in distinguishing them from each other.

Another option is to ask learners what they want to be able to do with words. One of the teachers in the Intensive English Program at the Center for English Language of Indiana

University regularly does this. He believes that learners know what they want to learn to do. One semester his class wanted to know how to order a pizza over the phone. This may seem simple, but before dismissing this as unworthy of classroom time, consider what goes into the act of ordering a pizza. In ordering a pizza, learners engage in minimal greetings (this is a service encounter so greetings are appropriately short), state the request, answer questions posed by the order-taker as to size, type, additional purchases such as drinks or bread sticks, and then provide an address and perhaps directions to the student's residence.

The answers to these two questions, "What do teachers see learners struggling with?", and "What do learners want to learn?" are potentially important to research as well. We know that learners often differ from the native speaker norm on a variety of speech acts. What we do not know, by and large, is how much it matters. I owe this observation to Gabi Kasper (Kasper, 1995). We need to distinguish between trivial and consequential deviation from the norm. In teaching, the difference between aesthetics and communicative necessity is important. Where should we use our limited resources and time? For research, the answer to the question "Which differences matter?" will reveal yet other important facets of language use, highlighting problematic variation.

In rereading Flowerdew's critique of speech act theory as a basis for pedagogy, I was struck by the absence of any mention of the learner. No matter how good the materials or how tightly structured and articulated the syllabus, raising pragmatic awareness must involve more than materials and a syllabus. Methods of language teaching and our view of language acquisition clearly play a role.

Clearly, the goal of getting pragmatics into the classroom represents a huge materials development project. But some of the materials don't need to be developed, instead they need to be collected. Even if we collected authentic dialogues and played them and had learners listen and repeat until the dialogues were memorized we would still not achieve our pedagogical goals or meet our learner's communicative needs. Utilized in this manner, I believe that even authentic materials would be doomed to failure.

In contrast, the learner must take a key role in the discovery process, and because no one knows all the answers, the teacher and the researcher go along on the journey. Good materials are not sufficient. New techniques for developing noticing which necessarily involve the learner must also be devised. One easy recommendation is to have learners be their own ethnographers--to have them do their own observations. That is an excellent suggestion, as far as it goes. I find it to be a suggestion that comes up too often and too easily. It is a goal to which we can aspire, and learners at most levels can collect their own data--but only if they have been prepared. One job of the language classroom is to help learners be successful. What lies between pushing learners out of the classroom-nest to collect their own input on the one hand, and the dialogue rut on the other?

Into the Classroom

I will conclude with a few concrete examples of activities which we have used at Indiana University which are designed to increase pragmatic awareness. Activities are important because good materials are necessary, but not sufficient.

What I am going to say here, I owe to my language-teacher colleagues.[6] Keep in mind that some materials can be developed for the classroom, some are collected, and some can be produced live, before your students' eyes and ears.

One way of introducing a speech act and encouraging students to think about how it functions is to examine that function in their own language and culture, as suggested in the ESL text The Culture Puzzle. In developing activities for our paper on teaching closings (Bardovi-Harlig, et al, 1991), we found that a successful discussion concerning closings was easily generated and did not require the introduction of technical vocabulary. This type of activity gives students not only a basis of comparison, but also the opportunity to share a speech act, at which they are clearly expert, with their classmates. Through guided discussion students become aware of the pragmatic rules governing their native language and the ramifications of enacting such rules appropriately and inappropriately. The awareness of communication goals that this activity generates can then be applied to the target language in the instructional setting.

The students in one class in which the activity was conducted, agreed that their languages, like English, require speakers to announce their intention to close. They maintained that in their native languages abrupt closings were impolite, as were speakers who refused to respond to other speakers' attempts to shut down a conversation.

Natural language samples can be incorporated into the classroom in a variety of ways. For beginning students, activities such as "The Classroom Guest" help develop listening, speaking, and pragmatic skills. In the "Classroom Guest" the instructor arranges for someone to interrupt the class--to deliver a message, ask a question, or make any other brief and believable exchange. Before the preplanned interruption, the instructor turns on a tape recorder that can pick up the voices of both the teacher and the visitor and records the entire exchange. When the visitor leaves, the teacher asks the students what was said. After the class discussion, two students are asked to recreate the scene through role play, with help from the rest of the class. The teacher also records the reenactment. Next, both exchanges are played to the class and the differences between the "real" exchange and the students' reenactment are discussed.

I want to consider a further example of the "classroom guest" in Kiswahili which was adapted for Kiswahili by Aliwya Omar. As Example (11) shows, greetings are typically very long in Kiswahili (Omar, 1992a, p. 22).

(11) Two acquaintances pass each other and greet

X:	Shikamoo	Shikamoo
Y:	Marahaba. Habari?	OK. News?
x:	Nzuri.	Good.
Y:	Hujambo?	Are you fine?

X:	Sijambo.	I am fine.
Y:	Habri za kwenu?	News of your home?
X:	Nzuri.	Good.
Y:	Watu wote hawajambo?	Is everybody fine?
X:	Hawajambo.	They are fine.
Y:	Watoto?	The children?
X:	Hawajambo.	They are fine.
Y:	Haya bwana.	OK, bwana.
X:	Je, salama?	Peaceful.

It is important that learners observe native speakers in action, because when such extended greetings are addressed to them, Omar reports they think that they have already answered the question (1992b). An additional interpretation that comes to mind is that they may think that such rephrasings are addressed to them because they are learners. On the contrary, the Kiswahili speaker who addresses multiple greeting turns to the learner treats the learner as more competent than he is, and the learner, by not replying, actually short circuits his own input. The teacher or native speaker interlocutor cannot continue to greet if the learner cannot hold up his end of the conversational opening. Thus, in cases such as this, where learners lack the competence to keep input coming, it is particularly important that they have native speaker models. When a learner observes native speakers engaged in a greeting, they have the opportunity of observing a full greeting sequence which is neither limited by cultural expectations nor their own ability to provide the requisite responses.[7] In another activity we developed for closings, learners reconstruct closings from a series of conversational turns presented on individual strips of paper. The class is divided into pairs or small groups of 3-4 learners. Each group is given a set of paper strips, with one sentence from a closing written on each strip. Each group is assigned a different situation, and uses the strips to reconstruct a "goodbye." Typically we include a topic shut down, a preclosing, and the terminal pair, with optional arrangements as in Example (12).

(12) Sample Scrambled Closing

Shut down	A:	Well, That's the news about my sister, then.
	B:	Yeah, she has quite a life.
Preclosing	A:	Well.
	B:	All right.
Arrangements	A:	I'll pick you up on Thursday at 1:00.
	B:	Okay, see you then.
Terminal Pair	A:	Goodbye.
	B:	Bye.

For more advanced students, closings in more than one register can be mixed and learners can be given different situations. They then reconstruct closings appropriate for their particular situations. For example, the group writing a closing between a professor and a student would use strips with more formal expressions than would the group writing a closing between two friends. After the groups finish writing, two members from each group act out their closing. Following the presentations the appropriateness of each dialogue is discussed. This technique can be used with other conversational exchanges and speech acts as well.

One technique that was suggested to us in the course of a workshop on pragmatics that we did at Midwest TESOL in 1993 is to have learners observe native speaker role play. The teacher reported that she had her ESL learners who were living in dorms with native speakers ask them to role play certain situations. In that way, the learner was in control of the situation and could ask for repetitions, could ask the NS questions about his or her performance, and could anticipate in advance when the targeted speech acts or function would occur.

Teachers of intermediate and advanced learners may find that asking students to gather linguistic data outside of the classroom is a challenging follow-up to in-class activities. Students may be asked to focus on specific speech acts by gathering examples themselves. After classroom work which prepares the learners, learners may begin their collection of data from recorded sources such as radio, television, video tapes and movies, as well as books and plays. These offer alternative sources for foreign language students as well. Next, learners can move to observing live conversations. Once these samples have been recorded (either taped or written down from memory), students can compare different ways of saying goodbye in different contexts.

Teachers should be aware of limitations which are inherent in the data collection process. For example, some acts or conversational functions are more easily observed than others. Apologies, for example, are most often done privately. In other cases, such as conversational closings, an untrained or unsuspecting observer cannot observe a closing from the beginning because by the time a casual observer hears the actual closing, or the terminal pair, "Goodbye/Goodbye" or "Goodbye/Seeya" or other alternatives, the important turns leading up to the closing which form an integral part of the closing are long gone. (See Example 12). In contrast, openings, or greetings, are relatively easy to observe. As speakers approach each other, we expect them to greet and we can be prepared to observe from the beginning,

These are but some activities which we have used, and there are others. Holmes and Brown (1987), for example, offer many possibilities for learning about compliments. Pragmatics can also be integrated when focussing on various skills too, as Frescura's 1991 article on listening comprehension shows. Frescura develops a listening comprehension lesson in Italian (as a foreign language) whose content is disagreement. Materials and activities can and have been developed, but they have been relatively isolated occurrences among the vast array of pedagogical materials.

There is also preliminary evidence that instruction in pragmatics has a desirable affect. Morrow (1995) showed in his conference paper that instruction in complaints and refusals helped learners achieve long term goals in clarity and somewhat less impressive improvement in the use of politeness markers. Bouton has shown dramatic effects of instruction on implicature where learners who received only six hours of instruction--that is, one hour a week for six weeks--surpassed learners who had not received instruction on implicature, but who had been students at the university for three years! (Bouton, 1994, and this volume).

In closing, what do we need at this point? I would like to consider what needs to be done at the present to bolster the joining of pragmatics research and language teaching. We need continued work in description of pragmatics, to increase both our range of speech acts and the range of languages. We need to develop preliminary materials based on authentic language to serve as input to learners. The materials should not only utilize authentic language, but must take into account distribution and frequency of occurrence of the alternative forms presented to learners. Through collaboration we will need to determine how learners best learn pragmatics. And above all, we need to continue to share our findings, whether at conferences such as Pragmatics and Language Learning, TESOL, or ACTFL, or by establishing pragmatics files for language programs.

There is clearly a meaningful task for everyone interested in working on pragmatics, whether your specialty is second language acquisition, materials development, innovations in language teaching, methods, classroom oriented research; whether you are a researcher, teacher educator, or language teacher; whether the language you teach is English, Italian, Japanese, or Kiswahili. With joint effort, we can bring pragmatics and pedagogy together, together.

THE AUTHOR

Kathleen Bardovi-Harlig is Associate Professor in the Program in TESOL and Applied Linguistics at Indiana University in Bloomington, Indiana.

NOTES

[1]If the ending of this conversation doesn't strike you as odd, have two students read the dialogue, then walk away from each other when they reach the end. The effect is immediate and obvious. I use this demonstration in teacher-preparation courses and with learners. It is a good way to begin a discussion on how to end a conversation.

[2]See also M. Williams (1988) for a comparison of language used in business meetings and the language models in business-English textbooks.

[3]In addition to requests, this chapter includes some examples of eight functional categories, expressing lack of comprehension, asking for clarification/double checking,

making a suggestion, making an offer, expressing disagreement, expressing dissatisfaction, responding to criticism, and showing sympathy.

[4]Among the studies of languages other than English, see for example, for Japanese, see Kasper (1992), Takenoya (1995a, 1995b, & in press), Rose (1994); for Chinese, Kasper (in press); for Kiswahili, Omar (1991, 1992a & b); for Hebrew, Blum-Kulka (1982), Olshtain & Weinbach (1987); for German, House & Kasper (1981); see also, Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper (1989).

[5]This is not the only framework we have used in our research in which we use both a speech act framework and discourse analysis to interpret the conversations in which the speech acts are realized. See Hartford and Bardovi-Harlig (1995b) for explicit discussion of the analytic framework.

[6]I would especially like to thank Rebecca Mahan-Taylor, Alwiya Omar, and Dudley Reynolds for their insightful collaboration over the years.

[7]Such models may, of course, be provided on videotape or by computer (which would have the advantage of being reusable), but I particularly like the immediacy of having the interaction take place in front of the learners. It is the presentation of models, not the medium, which is the focus of this activity.

REFERENCES

Bardovi-Harlig, K. & B.S. Hartford. (1993a) Learning the rules of academic talk: A longitudinal study of pragmatic development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 15*, 279-304.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. & B.S. Hartford. (1993b) Refining the DCT: Comparing open questionnaires and dialogue completion tasks. In L. Bouton & Y. Kachru (eds.), *Pragmatics and Language Learning, Monograph 4* (pp. 143-165). Urbana-Champaign, IL: DEIL.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. & B.S. Hartford. (1991) Saying "No": Native and nonnative rejections in English. In L. Bouton & Y. Kachru (eds.), *Pragmatics and Language Learning, Monograph 2* (pp.41-57). Urbana-Champaign, IL: DEIL.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. & B.S. Hartford. (1990) Congruence in native and nonnative conversations: Status balance in the academic advising session. *Language Learning, 40*, 467-501.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. & B.S. Hartford. (in press) Input in an Institutional Setting. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18(2).*

Bardovi-Harlig, K., B.A.S. Hartford, R. Mahan-Taylor, M.J. Morgan, & D.W. Reynolds. (1991) Developing pragmatic awareness: Closing the conversation. *ELT Journal, 45*, 4-15.

Beebe, L.M., T. Takahashi, & R. Uliss-Weltz. (1990) Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. In R. Scarcella, E. Andersen, & S.D. Krashen (eds.), *On the development of communicative competence in a second language* (pp. 55-73). Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1982) Learning how to say what you mean in a second language: A study of speech act performance of learners of Hebrew as a second language. *Applied Linguistics, 3*, 29-59.

Blum-Kulka, S., J. House, & G. Kasper (eds.). (1989) *Cross-cultural pragmatics*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Borkin, A. & S. Reinhart. (1978) Excuse me and I'm sorry. *TESOL Quarterly, 12*, 57-69.

Bouton, L. (1994) Can NNS skill in interpreting implicatures in American English be improved through explicit instruction?--A pilot study. In L. Bouton & Y. Kachru (eds.), *Pragmatics and language learning, Vol·5*, pp. 88-109). Urbana-Champaign, IL: DEIL, University of Illinois.

Cohen, A.D. & E. Olshtain. (1993) The production of speech acts by EFL Learners. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*, 33-56.

Davies, C.E. & A.E. Tyler. (1994) Demystifying cross-cultural (mis)communication: Improving performance through balanced feedback in a situated context. In C.G. Madden & C.L. Myers (eds.), *Discourse and performance of international teaching assistants* (pp. 201-220). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Davies, C.E. (1993) ITA Academic Session. The 28th Annual TESOL Convention, Baltimore.

Flowerdew, J. (1990) Problems of Speech Act Theory from an applied perspective. *Language Learning, 40*, 79-105.

Frescura, M. (1991) Listening comprehension and the development of sociopragmatic competence: A proposal for Italian as a second language. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 48*, 118-134.

Hartford, B.S. & K. Bardovi-Harlig. (1992a) Closing the conversation: Evidence from the academic advising session. *Discourse Processes, 15*, 93-116.

Hartford, B.S. & K. Bardovi-Harlig. (1992b) Experimental and observational data in the study of interlanguage pragmatics. In L. Bouton & Y. Kachru (eds.), *Pragmatics and Language Learning, Monograph·3* (pp. 33-52). Urbana-Champaign, IL: DEIL.

Hartford. B.S. & K. Bardovi-Harlig. (March, 1995) At your earliest convenience: A study of written student requests to faculty. Paper presented to the Ninth International Conference on Pragmatics and Language Learning. University of Illinois, Urbana.

Hoejke, B. & J. Williams. (1994) Communicative competence as a theoretical framework for ITA education. In C.G. Madden & C.L. Myers (eds.), *Discourse and performance of international teaching assistants* (pp. 11-26). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Holmes, J. & D. Brown. (1987) Teachers and students learning about compliments. *TESOL Quarterly, 21*, 523-546.

House, J. & G. Kasper. (1981) Politeness markers in English and German. In F. Coulmas (ed.), *Conversational routine: Explorations in standardized communication situations and prepatterned speech* (pp. 157-185). The Hague: Mouton.

Kasper, G. (January, 1995) Report to the board of the National Foreign Language Resource Center. University of Hawaii at Manoa.

Kasper, G. & S. Blum-Kulka (eds.). (1993) *Interlanguage Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kasper, G. (ed.). (1992) *Pragmatics of Japanese as native and target language*. Honolulu: Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center, University of Hawaii at Manoa.

Kasper, G. (ed.). (in press) *Pragmatics of Chinese as native and target language*. Honolulu: Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center, University of Hawaii at Manoa.

Kayfetz, J.L. (1992) *Speaking effectively: Strategies for academic conversation.* Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Lado, R. (1989) *Lado English series 2.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Morrow, C. (1995) The effect of classroom instruction on ESL learners' production of complaint and refusal speech acts. Paper presented to the Ninth International Conference on Pragmatics and Language Learning. University of Illinois, Urbana.

Olshtain, E. & L. Weinbach. (1987) Complaints-A study of speech act behavior among native and non-native speakers of Hebrew. In M.B. Papi & J. Vershueren (eds.), *The pragmatic perspective: Selected papers from the 1985 International Pragmatics Conference* (pp. 195-208) Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Omar, A.S. (1991) How learners greet in Kiswahili. In L. Bouton & Y. Kachru (eds.), *Pragmatics and language learning, Vol·2*, pp. 59-73. Urbana-Champaign, IL: DEIL, University of Illinois.

Omar, A.S. (1992a) Closing Kiswahili conversations: The performance of native and non-native speakers. In L. Bouton & Y. Kachru (eds.), *Pragmatics and language learning, Vol·4*, pp. 104-125. Urbana-Champaign, IL: DEIL, University of Illinois.

Omar, A.S. (1992b) *Opening and closing conversations in Kiswahili: A study of the performance of native speakers and learners.* Unpublished PhD dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington.

Omar, A.S. (1995) Requests in Kiswahili: The performance of native speakers and learners. Paper presented to the Ninth International Conference on Pragmatics and Language Learning. University of Illinois, Urbana.

Rose, K. (1994) On the validity of discourse completion tests in non-Western contexts. *Applied Linguistics, 15*, 1-14.

Takahashi, T. & L.M. Beebe. (1987) The development of pragmatic competence by Japanese learners of English. *JALT Journal, 8*, 131-155.

Takenoya, M. (1995a) Terms of address in Japanese: Patterns of use by native speakers and American learners of Japanese. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington.

Takenoya, M. (1995b) Effect of gender in acquisition of Japanese. Paper presented to the Ninth International Conference on Pragmatics and Language Learning. University of Illinois, Urbana.

Tyler, A.E. (1994) Effective role-play situations and focussed feedback: A case for pragmatic analysis in the classroom. In C.G. Madden & C.L. Myers (eds.), *Discourse and performance of international teaching assistants* (pp. 116-133). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Tyler, A.E. (1992) Discourse structure and the perception of coherence in international teaching assistants' spoken discourse. *TESOL Quarterly, 26*, 713-729.

Wiley, T.G. & H.S. Wrigley. (1987) *Communicating in the real world: Developing communication skills for business and the professions.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Williams, J. (1992) Planning, discourse marking, and the comprehensibility of international teaching assistants. *TESOL Quarterly, 26*, 693-711.

Williams, M. (1988) Language taught for meetings and language used in meetings: Is there anything in common? *Applied Linguistics, 9*, 45-58.

Wolfson, N. (1989) *Perspectives: Sociolinguistics and TESOL.* Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.

FL 024182

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC®

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Pragmatics & Language Learning, Volumes 3 to 7

Author(s): L. F. Bouton

Corporate Source: DEIL, Univ. of Illinois

Publication Date: 1992 - 1996

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following options and sign the release below.

[X] Sample sticker to be affixed to document

Check here

Permitting microfiche (4"x 6" film), paper copy, electronic, and optical media reproduction

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Level 1

Sample sticker to be affixed to document [ ]

or here

Permitting reproduction in other than paper copy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Level 2

Sign Here, Please

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Signature: Lawrence F Bouton	Position: editor
Printed Name: LAWRENCE F BOUTON	Organization: DEIL, UIUC
Address: DEIL, UIUC, 3070 FLB 707 S. Mathews, Urbana, IL	Telephone Number: (217) 333-1507
	Date: 6/19/96

OVER

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information reguarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor: DEIL, Univ of Illinois (Urbana-Champaign)

Address: 3070 FLB, Univ of IL, 707 S. Mathews.

Price Per Copy: Varies

Quantity Price: $55 (v3-7)

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name and address of current copyright/reproduction rights holder:

Name:

Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse on
Languages & Linguistics
1118 22nd Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20037

If you are making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, you may return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Facility
1301 Piccard Drive, Suite 300
Rockville, Maryland 20850-4305
Telephone: (301) 258-5500

(Rev. 9/91)