DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 403 779 FL 024 409

AUTHOR Hullah, Paul; O'Sullivan, Barry
TITLE Reader Autonomy: Language Learners Responding to Literary Texts.
PUB DATE 96
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization Regional Language Center Seminar (31st, Singapore, 1996).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Ambiguity; Attitude Change; College Students; *English (Second Language); Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Literature Appreciation; *Personal Autonomy; *Poetry; *Reading Instruction; Second Language Learning; *Student Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Japan

ABSTRACT

A study investigated how asking students to evaluate a poem-reading task stimulated their autonomy as learners. Subjects were 51 Japanese university students of English. During one 90-minute class period, students were given a brief poem with pre-reading, reading, and post-reading tasks. The poem, entitled "40-Love," had ambiguous references to both love and tennis. Pre-reading tasks included identifying their feelings in anticipation of reading a poem, telling what they think poems are usually about, and identifying their feelings about poetry in English. Tasks during reading included answering questions about the poem's content, choosing an alternative title, and responding to questions about non-literal content and message, and what happens after the period of the poem. Post-reading tasks inquired about enjoyment of the poem and perceptions of the tasks, and invited students to make up an original question about the poem as if they were teaching others. It was found that a generally negative attitude toward poetry was replaced by a more positive one, despite a general perception that poetry is difficult, unclear in meaning, and more difficult than prose reading. Students also showed an eagerness to go beyond the level of the assigned task. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Reader Autonomy: Language Learners Responding to Literary Texts

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paul Hullah and Barry O'Sullivan
Okayama University, Japan

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Barry O'Sullivan
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

ED 403 779

Introduction

In a paper presented at RELC 1995, Sims offered evidence in support of his hypothesis that when L2 learners read out of a personal interest they both read more and with greater apparent efficiency—in terms of measured performance—than those learners who are directed in their reading. Sims' non-directed students were reported voluntarily to have read quite a deal more than their peers, who were lead through a more conventional reading skills based approach. They selected, or rejected, texts on the recommendation or advice of fellow students, or because they 'liked' or 'didn't like' them—a practice which mirrors what often happens in the 'real' world of L1 reading. Post-programme testing indicated that the non-directed group had gained more in terms of measured achievement than their conventionally taught counterparts.

Further to these findings, Weir (1994) appeared to call into question the very way we teach reading as a series of sub-skills. Factor analysis of his data failed to establish the existence of these sub-skills, highlighting instead the presence of a single 'reading skill'.

While further research is undoubtedly required to confirm these findings, between them they pose an interesting question in terms of the teacher's role in a classroom situation in which the reading of literary texts is the primary focus. While not enough to rush out and abandon the overt teaching of reading skills for a bohemian 'read anything you like'

FL 024 409

approach, the two studies reported above suggest that it may be useful to involve the learner in the selection of reading texts, and even in the selection or evaluation of the tasks that are designed to accompany the text. This approach is also suggested by McCarthy and Carter's (1994) identification of a perceived lack of intellectual challenge as being among the greatest drawbacks to the way we presently teach literature. This lack of stimulation may well affect the way the learner interacts with the text, in terms of the motivation to become personally involved with it.

In an ideal world learners would have the freedom to choose their own reading material. However, in practical situations it is not usually possible for students to do so—whether it is because they are following a prescribed course of study; that they do not have the maturity; they are not informed readers or that the number of students in a class makes such individualisation unfeasible. On the other hand, once a text has been selected, it may be valuable for learners to attempt to see the reasoning behind the tasks they are subsequently set. Too often we, as teachers, simply formulate a number of questions which we see as opening up the text to the reader. By asking learners for their opinion as to the worth of these tasks we are setting up a situation in which both teacher and student learn a valuable lesson, while highlighting an aspect of reader autonomy hitherto relatively unexplored (though see Crabbe 1991 and Cotterall 1995), that is of text *and* task evaluation by the reader. Students must not only attempt to respond to a particular question, but also in evaluating it must think about why it was asked and if it caused them to think in any specific direction. Effectively, the task becomes an extension of the text, thus a part of the total text itself as experienced by the learner.

In this way the idea of 'reader autonomy' takes on an additional shade of meaning or direction, in that when the learner is encouraged to interact

with both the text and the task (s)he will be better placed to develop the capacity to be a successful independent reader. Little (1991: 4) sees this 'capacity—for detachment, critical reflection, decision making and independent action' as being at the heart of autonomy.

In addition to the obvious benefits to the learner, the teacher will have valuable feedback about the true worth of every task they set. This will have the effect of helping them to understand how the learners approach the answers they write and how they see those answers as being affected by the teacher's intervention, leading to tasks which help the learner explore the text at a deeper level.

This paper therefore set out to explore the feasibility of introducing the concept of task evaluation to the learner reader through its inclusion in the tasks set around a particular literary text.

The Study

The Subjects: The subjects involved in this study were 74 Japanese university students (women = 37: men = 37), with an average age of 19.1 and an average of 7.33 years of formal study of English. As 56 students checked that they had not been exposed to poetry at any time during their studies it was decided to use only the reactions of this number to the tasks set, and to the final questionnaire, as it was felt that the extent of previous exposure and any effect it may have had on the learners could not be controlled for. Of this group 51 were found to have totally completed all of the tasks set and so this was the final number chosen for analysis. This group consisted of 19 women and 32 men.

The Setting: The task was designed to be completed in a single 90 minute period, and was performed during the students' normal course of studies; they were not informed until after the lesson that their responses would form the data for this research. The students consisted of the members of two classes, while the lessons were held in consecutive periods in the afternoon of the same day. The data were entered into a specially prepared programme on a Macintosh computer and analysed using the Statview 4 statistical package.

The Task: A short poem was presented, sight-unseen with no advance warning to the students who were midway through a year's course which had involved them in reading a simple modern prose short story but no poetry. The poem '40-LOVE', written by the popular contemporary British poet Roger McGough was chosen for various reasons, not least its obvious combination of simplicity and suggestiveness. The poem's brevity was clearly advantageous in a project of this kind but we also favoured its emblematic quality in terms of structure on the page and its ability, using unproblematic vocabulary, to weave an ambiguous and intriguing semantic pattern.

It was hoped that the students' familiarity with one level of the poem's referential scope — the game of tennis — would interact with their lack of first-hand experience of the text's simultaneous concern — love (or the lack of it) as felt by a middle-aged couple — thus generating awareness of the metaphorical nature of the text, its linguistic ambiguities, and stimulating positive interest in the language and structure of the poem. Once this awareness and interest had been engendered in the students by means of a series of given activities, a follow-up questionnaire was offered to each student, asking him or her firstly to evaluate the effectiveness of each task and secondly to suggest

another useful original activity, thus involving the student in further interaction with the poem — extending the learning process beyond the parameters of the text itself into a new arena where formulation of the original task necessitated intellectual consideration of the poem from a radically different perspective — and giving us an idea of how reader autonomy might be able to assist us, as teachers, in tailoring tasks to suit and satisfy the learner more efficiently.

Before the students saw the actual poem, Pre-Reading Tasks were completed in order to 'warm up' and prepare the learners for what was about to come — i. e. 'poetry in English' — and from the varying responses to these tasks we were able to gauge each respective student's expectations of or pre-conceptions concerning the subject of poetry itself in general and the prospect of reading a poem in English in particular.

Results and Discussion

As the task in this case comprised of three independent sections, the results will be similarly presented.

The Pre Reading Tasks

In the first task the students were asked to circle one or more adjectives (or to supply their own) which best described their feelings on discovering that they were about to read a poem. The results are shown on Table 1:

Adjective	Total responses	Women	Men
Anxious	17	9	8
Bored	15	3	12
Nervous	12	2	10
Unconfident	7	4	3

Confident	1	0	1
Excited	1	1	0
'Think'	1	0	1

Table 1: Responses to task #1

The results show that the adjectives selected to describe feelings upon approaching poetry were almost entirely of a negative order; anxiety, apprehension, lack of confidence and plain boredom were the predominant moods conveyed. The final expression, the only occasion in which a student chose the 'other' option, appears to signify that the topic of poetry makes him think, though about what is not clear—it could well be a somewhat inaccurate translation from the Japanese of the concept 'to reflect (on life)'.

To the question 'What are poems usually about?' the most common response was 'Love' while the second most popular answer was 'Life'. For the final Pre-Reading Task, students were told the title of the poem they were about to read — '40-LOVE' — and asked what they thought such a poem might be about. Notably just two of the students answered 'Tennis'. Instead, by far the majority of respondents adapted their answer to suit their response to the earlier question (What are poems usually about?) and to fit the general concepts suggested by the terms '40' and 'LOVE'. For example:

Question: What are poems usually about?
Response: Love story.

Question: What do you think a poem called '40-LOVE' might be about?
Response: Forty kinds of love story.

or:

Question: What are poems usually about?

Response: Love.

Question: What do you think a poem called '40-LOVE' might be about?
Response: There are forty kinds of love.

That the most common response to the general question 'What are poems usually about?' was 'Love' and the most popular replies to the more specific 'What do you think a poem called '40-LOVE' might be about?' were 'Forty kinds of love' or 'Love at forty years old' would seem to support the notion that readers instinctively expect poetry to operate on a general, non-specific, (or 'deep') thematic level ('Love' or 'Age') rather than convey information about specific events ('40-LOVE' being a language pattern specific to the discourse of tennis scoring).

In addition to the above mentioned tasks, students were asked to choose from a given list of terms those which best described their feelings about poems in English. The results, see Table 2 below, seem to reinforce the earlier choices of negative adjectives when asked their feelings about studying a poem as a classroom text.

Adjective	Total	Women	Men	Adjective	Total	Women	Men
difficult	48	19	29	easy	3	0	3
dull	24	6	18	interesting	27	13	14
boring	28	7	21	enjoyable	23	12	11
clear in meaning	7	3	4	unclear in meaning	44	16	28
easier than prose	11	6	5	more difficult than prose	40	13	27

Table 2: Pre Reading Description of Feelings

The Reading Tasks

Students were then allowed to see and read the poem. Two key words — 'tennis' and 'net' — were blanked out. This had the calculated effect of making the poem's title and emblematic structure (plus, debatably, the vague noun 'game') the only remaining clues as to the text's surface literal subject matter (a game of tennis). This strategy was designed to encourage students to proceed and persist beyond the literal (as they seemed eager to do anyway, judging from the responses to the Pre-Reading activities outlined above) and interact with the language of the poem at a non-specific, general, open-ended level. The effect of the strategy was of promoting a plurality of readings and stressing the fact that meaning is not fixed but variable according to the creative reader's selective decisions regarding the prioritising of one linguistic term above another. In short, we wanted to encourage students towards free play within the text, allowing them to create original meaning from the language before them.

To assist in the achievement of this aim, questions were asked which, we hoped, encouraged the students to progress beyond the specific 'factual' information contained within the poem to an area where conjecture was required to 'fill in' the 'background' to the situation described in the text itself. Questions fell into three categories:

1) The first question posed, 'How old do you think that the couple are?' (to which most respondents answered '40'), was designed to fix the learners attention onto (or at least make them aware of) the poem's literal level.

2) Subsequent tasks — 'Do you think that the couple are happy?'; 'Why do you think so'; 'Choose a suitable alternative title for the poem' — called for students to use a literal reading as a platform from which to

draw conclusions about the tonal and thematic content of the text. A bridge between the literal and the imaginative, metaphorical plane was thus erected.

3) Finally, more abstract tasks — 'Do you think that the shape of the poem has any meaning?'; 'What do you think happens when the "they" in the poem go home?'; 'Using your own words, write one sentence to explain what you think the poem is about?' — invited the students to leave the literal level behind and creatively extrapolate the text into a new, extended area of meaning. Thus, having engaged with the language of the text in specific terms they were then allowed fairly freely to approach the poem from a constructively critical angle: having adopted the terminology of the text, they were then asked to adapt it, enlarge upon it and formulate original opinions based upon evidence garnered at the initial, literal reading of the poem itself.

The responses to questions in the second and third categories as described above confirmed that students had revelled in the chance of leaving specific detail behind in favour of a self-generated (autonomous?), imaginative extrapolation of the poem's content. In fact, quite a few replies to the task 'Do you think that the couple are happy? Why do you think so?' suggested an overwhelming eagerness to leave the constricting confines of the text and create a world (a narrative) for the poem's protagonist couple outside the poem itself. A survey of responses to two of the activities confirms this:

a) **What happens when the couple go home?**

'They eat dinner happily'; 'Cooking'; 'They have relaxation'; 'They each have a family'; 'They eat lunch'; 'They have a happy life'; 'They sit on chairs'; 'They love each other very much'; 'I think nothing happens';

'They go to bed quickly and sleep deeply'; 'The game ends and they must return to separate homes'; 'The man kisses the woman'; 'They become old'; 'They divorce'; 'They have tea and enjoy talking'; 'Death approaches them'.

b) **Alternative Titles.**

'Life'; 'One Day'; 'Happy and Sad'; 'Afternoon'; 'Deepest Love'; 'Calm Love'; 'Warm Atmosphere'; 'Secret Love'; 'Sin of Passion'; 'Ordinary Love'; 'Middle-Aged Couple'; 'The Shape of Love'; 'Playing Love'; 'Ties'; 'Strawberry'; 'Lovely Children'; 'End of Love'; 'Lost Love'; 'Love is Always Here'.

We reason that the elision of the two pivotal terms 'tennis' and 'net' was a key factor in fostering this eagerness to interact with the text at a non-specific imaginative level; students were using the language of the poem itself as a catalyst by which to create original narratives to provide a background to the original text. Thus the alternative titles offered were predominantly general in nature; when '40-LOVE' was used in a different class without the elision of the words 'tennis' and 'net', the most popular alternative title offered was 'Game of Tennis', whereas in this study not one student offered such a title. The nature of the tasks we gave the students fulfilled the purpose of allowing the text not to be restrictive but to be a stimulus to lead students to bring into play extra-textual language forms and collocations, encouraging creativity as well as demanding comprehension.

The Post Reading Tasks

When asked if the had enjoyed the poem the results indicated a somewhat limited positive response, see Table 3 below. While it was not really expected that all of the students would be satisfied with the class activity, this was a somewhat disappointing result, especially in that the additional descriptive statistics show that there was a wide range of reply.

	Impression
Mean	4.078
Std. Dev.	1.426
Std. Error	.200
Count	51
Minimum	1.000
Maximum	7.000
# Missing	0

Table 3: Overall Impression of Poem

When asked to look again at the list of adjectives used to describe their feelings on completion of the tasks the results give a somewhat more detailed account of what was happening.

Adjective	Total	Women	Men	Adjective	Total	Women	Men
difficult	41 (48)	16 (19)	25 (29)	easy	10 (3)	3 (0)	7 (3)
dull	14 (24)	5 (6)	9 (18)	interesting	37 (27)	14 (13)	23 (14)
boring	18 (28)	6 (7)	12 (21)	enjoyable	33 (23)	13 (12)	20 (11)
clear in meaning	7 (7)	3 (3)	4 (4)	unclear in meaning	44 (44)	16 (16)	28 (28)
easier than prose	13 (11)	4 (6)	9 (5)	more difficult than prose	38 (40)	15 (13)	23 (27)

Table 4: Post Reading Description of Feelings (Pre Reading in brackets)

A comparison of the results with those of the similar Pre-Reading task—these results are repeated in Table 4 above, along with the post-reading results, for ease of comparison—seems to paint a brighter picture, with a significant swing towards the more positive of the adjectives, certainly in

the first three lines. In the final two pairs there is little or no difference, with the general consensus among the students that poetry still represents a difficult and elusive text.

The results shown on Table 5, below, follow very much in line with that of the overall opinion of the poem. In general there appears to be a positive, if mixed, reaction to the questions, with only question #3 causing any real concern. This question, which asked students to reflect on the possible importance of the shape of the poem, was seen as being of little value by a sufficient number of the students to warrant either removal or rewriting in any future application of the task.

	Mean	Std. Dev.	Std. Error	Count	Minimum	Maximum	# Missing
Q1	4.275	1.744	.244	51	1.000	7.000	0
Q2	4.275	1.484	.208	51	1.000	7.000	0
Q3	3.471	2.004	.281	51	1.000	7.000	0
Q4	4.588	1.525	.214	51	2.000	7.000	0
Q5	4.451	1.501	.210	51	1.000	7.000	0
Q6	4.608	1.313	.184	51	2.000	7.000	0
Q7	4.098	1.565	.219	51	1.000	7.000	0
Q8	3.804	1.523	.213	51	1.000	6.000	0

Table 5: Reaction to Set Tasks

The other question to raise interest was number 8, in which students were asked what they thought happens when the couple 'go home'. The responses in this case were the only time in which there was an near significant difference between the women and the men—the means were 4.32 and 3.5 respectively. It might well be interesting to reword this question, more explicitly to ask 'what happens next' in order to further compare the different responses.

Original Tasks

Finally, the students were asked to imagine that they were an English teacher. They were invited to 'make up an original question about '40-LOVE' which they thought would help [their] students to enjoy the poem'. Only 4 students left this section blank or wrote 'I don't know'. For various reasons — one most definitely being lack of time — some respondents failed to offer an *original* activity but, notably, instead referred back to the tasks we had given — 'I would make questions like 2, 3 and 5'; 'It's difficult. I will ask same questions as 1, 2 and 7 above'; 'It is like question 8'.

Original activities offered spanned four broad categories (admittedly with some overlapping):

1) Those requiring specifically textual attention to detail — 'How many people are there in this poem?'; 'What are they doing?'; 'What is the 'game'?'; 'What does 'go home' mean?'; 'Why is the word 'between' separated?'; 'Draw a picture of the poem'; 'What kind of love is in the poem?'

2) Those seeking personal emotive response — 'Do you like the poem?'; 'Do you like the couple? (2)'; 'Do you want to become like the couple in the poem?'

3) Those demanding imaginative extrapolation of the text — 'What is the man's name?'; 'Do you think they are married?'; 'How do they usually live?'; 'How many children do they have?'; 'What happens in the future? (2)'; 'Make a new poem using the words of the poem'; 'Is the writer a man or a woman?'

4) Those which effectively left the text behind and moved wholly into new, general intepretational (free expression) territory — 'What do you

think "love" is? (4)'; 'What do you think about love? (2)'; 'If your lover has a husband or wife, what are you doing? (2)'; 'What will be your life when you are 40?'; 'What does age 40 mean to you?'

All of these questions denote *a priori* comprehension of the terms and meaning of the poem itself and, furthermore an eagerness to use the text as a springboard from which to dive into a pool of creative language usage.

Conclusions

This paper investigated the potential importance of reader evaluation of both a text and of the tasks designed to help the learner gain meaning from this text. Among the interesting findings of this study was that the generally negative attitude towards poetry by learners, irrespective of whether they had previously experienced it in an L2 situation, was replaced, to a great extent, with a more positive attitude, even though the general perception that poetry was difficult, unclear in meaning, and more difficult than prose remained. This response seems to add credence to the claim by McCarthy and Carter (1994), referred to in the introduction, that the texts we select for use in L2 reading situations should intellectually challenge, and therefore stimulate, the learner.

In terms of the range of responses to the evaluation of individual questions asked, learners indicated, in their willingness overtly to criticise teacher generated tasks, an eagerness to go beyond the level of task usually presented to them. This eagerness is reflected in the responses to the questions themselves. As reported above, the learners showed a clear willingness to go beyond the text in search of meaning.

It could be justifiably argued that, by omitting the important words 'tennis' and 'net' we failed to provide the learners with a whole text upon which to base their final question evaluations. However, it is this very incompleteness which we see as being responsible for the creativity shown in the learner responses. This calls for an acceptance on the part of the teacher/task writer of the need to move beyond the literal 'story' of the text to a more imaginative, creative, and, we would argue, more stimulating interpretation. So long as it is based on evidence presented within, or suggested by, the text this creative meaning can be justified. Interpretations or extrapolations based on errors in language comprehension, and which are clearly unsustainable must continue to be interpreted by the teacher/evaluator as deviant.

It is clear from the learners' reaction to the tasks set that there is some considerable room for improvement. Obviously, it would be unwise to reinforce learners' negative feelings towards poetry by including the initial 'how do you feel about reading a poem?' questions in a regular classroom task. On the other hand, questions relating to previous or perceived knowledge of poetry may well be a useful starting point.

Asking the learners to evaluate the set question appears to have been quite successful for a number of reasons, both related to the learners themselves and to the teacher. The response to question #3—which related to the importance of the 'shape' of the poem—, for example, suggests that the wording may have been too vague, or that, without the key words ('tennis' and 'net') it may not have been appropriate to set the question either at all or at least so early in the class. Similarly the mixed responses to question #8—What happens when they go home?—shows that the nature of the learner must be considered when creating tasks, this may include their gender, age, language level, and language and cultural

background, and communicative ability (L1/L2). In addition, the responses to the final task, to make up an original question about '40 – LOVE', show that the learners had not simply criticised the set questions, but had given thought to what they considered the important elements of the poem, indicating at least the beginnings of a capacity to examine a text from a number of different perspectives. It is this capacity that we see as forming the basis of true autonomy as a reader of literary texts.

This study represents a beginning. Changes in the procedure suggested by the responses of the learners, together with the inclusion of either a think-aloud introspection protocol or a post-lesson interview which could provide material for a more extensive post-task questionnaire or provide data in themselves, would further add to our knowledge of how and why learners react to a text in particular ways. In addition, this data could help us to clarify the degree to which the tasks we set promote the kind of reader autonomy we see as the principle goal of the learner.

Bibliography

Cotterall, S. 1995. Developing a course strategy for learner autonomy. *ELT Journal* 49(3): 219 - 227.

Crabbe, D. A. 1991. Bringing Evaluation and Methodology Closer Together. In S. Anivan (ed.) *Issues in Language Programme Evaluation in the 1990s.* Singapore: SEAMEO RELC.

Little, D. 1991. *Autonomy: Definitions, Issues and Problems*. Dublin: Authentik

McCarthy, M. and R. Carter. 1994. *Language as Discourse.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sims, J. 1995 *Extensive Reading for Pleasure vs Skill-Based Instruction.* Paper presented at the RELC Conference, Singapore. April 1995.

Weir, C. 1994. *Reading as Multi-Divisible or Unitary: Between Scylla and Charybdis*. Paper presented at the RELC Conference, Singapore. April 1994.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: READER AUTONOMY: LANGUAGE LEARNERS RESPONDING TO LITERARY TEXTS

Author(s): PAUL HULLAH AND BARRY O'SULLIVAN

JALT 95 conference paper? ___ yes (no) Other conference: RELC (SINGAPORE)

Publication Date: 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 and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following two options and sign at the bottom of the page.

	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all **Level 1** documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all **Level 2** documents	
☑ Check here **For Level 1 Release:** Permitting reproduction *in* microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical) ***and*** paper copy.	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	☐ Check here **For Level 2 Release:** Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical), but ***not*** in paper copy.
	Level 1	**Level 2**	

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 and disseminate 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."

Sign here→ please

Signature: [signature]

Printed Name/Position/Title: BARRY O'SULLIVAN VISITING PROFESSOR

Organization/Address: OKAYAMA UNIVERSITY
3-1-1 TSUSHIMA-NAKA
OKAYAMA-SHI, JAPAN 700

Telephone: (086) 251 7686

FAX: (086) 255 7244

E-Mail Address: eng_bos@cc.okayama-u.ac.jp

Date: Jan 10th 1997

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 regarding 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:
Address:
Price:

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:
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

(Rev. 6/96)