

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 448 926

PS 029 156

AUTHOR Graham, James A.; Sell, Marie A.
TITLE Episodes of Pragmatic Behaviors in Parent-Child Interactions.
PUB DATE 1996-03-00
NOTE 14p.; Paper presented at the Biennial Conference on Human Development (14th, Birmingham, AL, March 29-31, 1996).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Age Differences; Comparative Analysis; Content Analysis; *Interpersonal Communication; Language Usage; *Parent Child Relationship; *Parents as Teachers; *Pragmatics; *Preschool Children; Preschool Education; Verbal Development
IDENTIFIERS Dyads

ABSTRACT

Noting the importance of pragmatic behavior, or the socially-appropriate use of language, to parents of preschool children, this study examined developmental changes in the pragmatic teaching of preschoolers and differences in parents' goals for pragmatic teaching in private versus public interactions. Participating in the study were 29 parent-child dyads (with children ranging in age between 30 and 70 months), who were videotaped for 30 minutes. Transcripts were coded for episodes of pragmatic behavior that occurred in the dyadic interaction. Findings indicated that pragmatic behaviors across the age groups largely focused on issues of what to say and how to say it. The teaching use of pragmatic behaviors in public interactions was relatively important to parents of children between 2.5 and 4 years. The proportion of spontaneous pragmatic behaviors increased dramatically between the youngest group (54 percent for 30- to 35-month-olds) and older children (at least 75 percent). The spontaneous use of pragmatic behaviors was the most common form of input (78 percent overall), followed by direct prompts (12 percent), and indirect prompts (8 percent). Pragmatic behaviors were more often prompted with direct, as opposed to indirect, comments. The direct prompts used were relatively routine and dealt with either a linguistic or behavioral social norm or a pragmatic elaboration or clarification. When pragmatic episodes focused on correcting the child's linguistic misbehavior, the prompts were indirect. (KB)

Running head: EPISODES OF PRAGMATIC BEHAVIORS

ED 448 926

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- 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.

Episodes of Pragmatic Behaviors in Parent-Child Interactions

James A. Graham

The College of New Jersey

And

Marie A. Sell

Porter-Leath Children's Center

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

James A.
Graham

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Authors Notes

Correspondence should be addressed to James A. Graham, The College of New Jersey, Department of Psychology, P.O. Box 7718, Ewing, NJ 08628-0718. E-mail address: jgraham@tcnj.edu.

PS 029156

Abstract

Pragmatic behavior, or the socially-appropriate use of language, is important to parents of preschool children. Becker (1994) noted several questions that still remain to be answered, including issues such as developmental changes in the pragmatic teaching of preschoolers, and whether there are differences in the parents' goals for pragmatic teaching in private versus public interactions. The present study addressed these issues. Twenty-nine parent-child dyads were videotaped for 30 minutes. Transcripts were coded for episodes of pragmatic behavior that occurred in the dyadic interaction. Results indicated that pragmatic behaviors across the age groups largely focused on issues of what to say, and how to say it. The teaching and use of pragmatic behaviors in public interactions is relatively important to parents of children between 2 1/2 and 4 years. The spontaneous use of pragmatic behaviors was the most common form of input (78% overall). Pragmatic behaviors were more often prompted with direct, as opposed to indirect, comments. Additional discussion focuses on a content analysis of the direct versus indirect prompts in the different age groups.

Episodes of Pragmatic Behaviors in Parent-Child Interactions

Pragmatic behavior, or the socially-appropriate use of language in social contexts (Place and Becker, 1991), is important to parents of preschool children. The proper use of pragmatic skills is known to facilitate effective communication and social interaction (Prutting, 1982). The essential means through which people initiate and maintain social relationships is through communication, which is the foundation of social interaction (Hazen and Black, 1989). Becker (1994) noted that, although parents view pragmatics as an aspect of language that must be taught to their children, very little research has examined the means by which this teaching occurs. In one of the few studies to address this issue, Becker examined episodes of pragmatic teaching for 5 preschool children in the home context. Grief and Gleason (1980), Gleason, Perlmann, and Greif (1984), and Pellegrini, Brody, and Stoneman (1987) have found that parents' teachings largely focused on issues of what to say (e.g., "What's the magic word?"), how to say it (e.g., "Use your inside voice"), and when to say it (e.g., "Answer me when I ask you a question"). Parents' styles tended to be indirect in nature, and ranged from prompting, to modeling, to reinforcing the correct use of pragmatic behavior (Becker, 1987).

As Becker noted several questions that still remain to be answered, including issues such as developmental changes in the pragmatic teaching of preschoolers, and whether there are differences in the parents' goals for pragmatic teaching in private versus public interactions. In the present study, these issues were addressed. Children from 2-1/2 to 5-1/2 years were video taped in parent-child play sessions with one of their parents. Six age groups were created, each covering a six-month period, with the exception of the last group that covered an 11-month period. These age groups allowed for developmental comparisons. Additionally, the parents and children were video taped with an experimenter present, which created a "public" interaction situation as opposed to the "private" (in-home) interactions which served as the source of pragmatic teaching episodes in Becker's study. Thus, the present study sought to examine the following

questions: 1) What is the nature of pragmatic episodes in parent-child play interactions? 2) Are there identifiable developmental changes over the preschool age range in these pragmatic episodes?, and 3) Do pragmatic episodes in public interactions differ from pragmatic episodes in private interactions?

Method

Participants

Twenty-nine parent-child dyads participated in the study. Parents were drawn from a subject pool in the psychology department at a large mid-southern university. Parents received credit for their participation in the study. Children ranged in age from 30 to 70 months ($M = 42$ mos). There were 21 (72%) European-American and 8 (28%) African-American dyads. Ten (34%) of the children were females, and 24 (83%) of the parents were mothers. Parents ranged in age from 19 yrs. 7 mos. to 43 yrs. 9 mos. ($M = 30$ yrs. 8 mos.). The age ranges and means for each of the six age groups are noted in Tables 1 and 2.

Materials

A university classroom was used to video tape the parent-child sessions. A 4' by 6' piece of carpet and a toy box containing a variety of toys (e.g., dolls, trucks, blocks, Duplo) were placed on the floor in one corner of the room. A video camera was approximately 10 feet away from the dyad.

Procedure

Each parent-child dyad was videotaped for 30 minutes, playing with the same set of toys. Instructions to the dyads were minimal. Parents were asked to 1) play with their children on the carpet; 2) keep their children facing the camera as much as possible; and 3) play with their children as they would at home. The parents and children were told

they could play with any of the toys they wished. An experimenter remained in the room during the taping. At the end of the session the dyad was thanked for their participation.

Transcription and Coding

Each video tape was transcribed for all utterances, relevant actions, and checked for accuracy by a second trained transcriber. Pragmatic episodes were classified in terms of 1) the behavior being addressed; and 2) the form of input used. In addition, instances in which pragmatic behavior were used spontaneously in the interaction (e.g., "Can I have a blue block, please?") were also recorded. There were 15 a priori pragmatic behavior codes which were divided into four groups: 1) what to say; 2) how to say it; 3) when to say it; and 4) how to behave. There were 10 a priori codes for input that fell into three forms: 1) prompts; 2) other forms; and 3) spontaneous use of pragmatic behaviors. See Tables 1 and 2.

The final phase of the coding process was reliability. Each episode was coded independently and interrater agreement was then discussed. Reliability for pragmatic behaviors and forms of input was .85 and 1.00, respectively.

Results and Discussion

The findings are described in three sections. First, the nature of the pragmatic episodes in parent-child interactions is presented in terms of (a) frequencies of behaviors, and (b) forms of input. Second, findings related to issues of developmental changes are described. Furthermore, the differences in pragmatic teaching episodes in public and private interactions are examined.

Nature of Pragmatic Episodes in Parent-Child Play Interactions

Question 1 was to determine the nature of pragmatic episodes in parent-child play interactions. As was found in Becker's (1994) study, the pragmatic behaviors (Table 1) that occurred in this interaction context largely focused on issues of what to say, and how to say it. Table 2 shows the forms of input for the pragmatic episodes. Spontaneous use

of pragmatic behaviors was by far the most common form of input (78% overall), followed by direct prompts (12% overall) and indirect prompts (8% overall).

Issues of Developmental Changes

In answering question 2, it is interesting to note that 75% of all pragmatic behavior episodes occurred in the youngest three age groups (A, B, and C), indicating that the teaching and use of pragmatic behaviors in public interactions is relatively important to parents of children between 2-1/2 and 4 years. (Proportions of pragmatic behaviors by age groups are presented in Table 1). Additionally, the proportion of spontaneous pragmatic behaviors increased dramatically between the youngest group (A) and the other groups. For the youngest children, 54% of the pragmatic behaviors were spontaneously generated, whereas for the other groups, at least 75% of the behaviors were spontaneous.

Public Versus Private Interactions

The third question concerned differences in pragmatic teaching episodes in public and private interactions. To examine this question, only the prompted pragmatic episodes were analyzed. When pragmatic behaviors were prompted, they were more often prompted with direct (64% overall), as opposed to indirect (36%) overall, comments. This is in marked contrast to Becker's (1994) finding, who reported that parents used indirect prompts most often.

One possible explanation for this difference may be understood in terms of "saving face" (Brown and Levinson, 1978). At play here, are both the possible face threat to the child for being "corrected" on pragmatic usage in public, and the possible face threat to the parent for having others learn that their child is not always accurate in their use of pragmatic language (much of which deals with politeness and manners). A content analysis of the prompted pragmatic episodes (see Table 3) indicated that the direct prompts used were relatively routine and dealt with either a linguistic social norm (e.g., "Say please"), a behavioral social norm (e.g., looking at the speaker while

listening), or a pragmatic elaboration or clarification (e.g., a discussion of the correct use of a common phrase). Thus, despite the fact that the pragmatic teaching occurred in a public interaction, the threat to the child's "face" for these types of prompts was relatively low. Additionally, it may have been specifically because the interaction was public that the parent was more direct. An indirect prompt may have been misunderstood by the child, leading to emphasizing an embarrassing situation. In other words, the parent's goal may have been to address the situation as quickly as possible and continue with the interaction.

In some instances, pragmatic episodes focused on correcting the child's "linguistic misbehavior" (e.g., answering back). It was in these instances that parents tended to use indirect prompts with their children (see Table 3). It is also in these instances that the child's "face" might be most threatened. The parent's goal for using an indirect prompt may have been to save the child's "face."

In most cases, the child complied with a parent's indirect prompt that corrected a "linguistic misbehavior." Two times, however, the child did not (see Table 4). In both of these instances, the parent "backed off" by changing the topic or re-directing the child's attention. Interestingly, this is true even when the child's continuation of the pragmatic violation did not occur immediately (see example 2 in Table 4). In these instances, perhaps since the child challenged the parent in a public interaction the parent's goal changed from saving the child's "face" to saving his/her own "face."

In conclusion, the present study showed that the topics of pragmatic teaching episodes in parent-child play contexts are similar to those topics in other in-home contexts. Further, there seems to be more emphasis on pragmatic teaching during the 2-1/2 to 4-year old age range than during the 4- to 5-1/2 year range. Interestingly, the styles that parents adopted in these pragmatic episodes differed from the styles Becker (1994) reported. One reason for the difference may be due to the parents' goals that underlie their pragmatic teaching. It should be noted, though, that the present discussion

of parents' goals is speculative since this study did not explicitly examine that question. Future research should examine parents' goals for pragmatic teaching in interactions with their preschool children, and how these goals may change as the context of the interaction changes.

References

- Becker, J. (1994). Pragmatic socialization: Parental input to preschoolers. Discourse Processes, 17, 131-148.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S.C. (1978). Politeness: Some universals in language use. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gleason, J.B., Perlmann, R., & Greif, E. (1984). What's the magic word: Learning language through politeness routines. Discourse Processes, 7, 493-502.
- Greif, E, & Gleason, J.B. (1980). Hi, thanks, and goodbye: More routine information. Journal of Child Language, 9, 159-166.
- Hazen, N., & Black, B. (1989). Preschool communication skills: The role of social status and interaction context. Child Development, 60, 171-178.
- Pellegrini, A., Brody, G., & Stoneman, Z. (1987). Children's conversational competence with their parents. Discourse Processes, 10, 93-106.
- Place, K., & Becker, J. (1991). The influence of pragmatic competence on the likeability of grade-school children. Discourse Processes, 14, 227-241.
- Prutting, C. (1982). Pragmatics and social competence. Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, 47, 123-134.

Table 1. Proportion of Types of Pragmatic Behavior Episodes by Age Group

| Behavior | Age Group | | | | | | Across Ages |
|-------------------------|-----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------|
| | A | B | C | D | E | F | |
| What to Say | | | | | | | |
| 1. Apology | .03 | .22 | .17 | .27 | .18 | 0 | .15 |
| 2. Please | .23 | .05 | .13 | .45 | .07 | .17 | .18 |
| 3. Thank you | .30 | .49 | .50 | .18 | .61 | .58 | .44 |
| 4. Bless you | .03 | 0 | 0 | 0 | .36 | .08 | .08 |
| 5. Subject Matter | .06 | .05 | 0 | 0 | 0 | .08 | .02 |
| 6. Greeting/Good-bye | .03 | .05 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | .01 |
| How to Say It | | | | | | | |
| 7. Volume | .03 | .14 | .04 | 0 | 0 | .08 | .05 |
| 8. Tone of Voice | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9. Clarity | .01 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | .002 |
| 10. Pronunciation | .06 | .03 | .04 | .09 | 0 | 0 | .04 |
| When to Say It | | | | | | | |
| 11. Turn-taking | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12. When to talk | .01 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | .002 |
| 13. Responding | .04 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | .08 | .02 |
| How to Behave | | | | | | | |
| 14. Rule of Interacting | .08 | 0 | .08 | 0 | 0 | 0 | .03 |
| Other | | | | | | | |
| 15. Other | .03 | 0 | .04 | 0 | 0 | 0 | .01 |
| No. of Episodes | 65 | 37 | 48 | 11 | 28 | 12 | 201 |

Note: Age Groups: Group A 30-35 mos, Group B 36-41 mos, Group C 42-47 mos,
Group D 48-53 mos, Group E 54-59 mos, Group F 60-70 mos.

Table 2. Proportion of Forms of Input by Age Group

| Input Form | <u>Age Group</u> | | | | | | Across Ages |
|---------------------------------|------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------|
| | A | B | C | D | E | F | |
| | | | | | | | Prompts |
| 1. Direct comment on omission | .09 | .05 | .02 | 0 | 0 | .08 | .04 |
| 2. Direct comment on error | .11 | .05 | .08 | 0 | 0 | .08 | .05 |
| 3. Directive | .08 | .03 | 0 | 0 | .04 | 0 | .03 |
| 4. Indirect comment on omission | .06 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | .08 | .02 |
| 5. Indirect comment on error | .03 | .08 | .08 | .09 | .07 | 0 | .06 |
| Other | | | | | | | |
| 6. Modeling interaction | .02 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | .003 |
| 7. Reinforcement | 0 | 0 | .02 | 0 | 0 | 0 | .003 |
| 8. Repetition | .05 | .05 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | .02 |
| Spontaneous Use | | | | | | | |
| 9. In interaction | .52 | .62 | .75 | .82 | .79 | .67 | .70 |
| 10. In play context | .02 | .11 | .04 | .09 | .11 | .08 | .08 |
| No. of Episodes | 65 | 37 | 48 | 11 | 28 | 12 | 201 |

Note: Age Groups: Group A 30-35 mos, Group B 36-41 mos, Group C 42-47 mos, Group D 48-53 mos, Group E 54-59 mos, Group F 60-70 mos.

Table 3. Prompted Pragmatic Behavior Episodes

| | Indirect Comment on Omission | Indirect Comment on Error | Direct Comment on Omission | Direct Comment on Error | Directive |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------|
| Linguistic Social Norm | 5 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 0 |
| Behavioral Social Norm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Elaboration/ Clarification | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| Volume | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Correcting Behavior | 0 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 0 |

Note: Categorization of errors and omissions are based on participant perception.

Definitions and Examples:

Linguistic Social Norm: linguistic routine expected in social interaction.

| | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <i>Indirect Comment on Omission:</i> | <i>Direct Comment on Omission:</i> |
| M: "What do you say?" | M: "Say please!" |
| C: "Please." | C: "Please." |

Behavioral Social Norm: an expected behavior based on rules of social interaction.

Direct Comment on Error:
M: "Look at me! Look at me!"

Elaboration/Clarification: parent requests or models an elaboration or clarification of child's utterance.

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|
| <i>Indirect Comment on Error:</i> | <i>Direct Comment on Error:</i> | <i>Directive:</i> |
| C: "A 'quare." | C: "I'm sorry." | M: "Say car." |
| M: "What is it called?" | F: "Why are you sorry" | C: "Car." |
| | "You didn't do anything wrong." | |

Volume: speaking too loud or soft for interaction.

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <i>Indirect Comment on Error:</i> | <i>Direct Comment on Error:</i> |
| C: (Whispers) | C: (Whispers) |
| M: "What?...What?" | F: "You don't have to whisper." |
| I can't hear you." | "You can talk loud." |

Correcting Behavior: child's "linguistic misbehavior" is corrected.

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <i>Indirect Comment on Error:</i> | <i>Direct Comment on Error:</i> |
| M: "Turn around! Turn around!" | C: (Squeals) |
| C: "I don't wanna." | M: "Oh, cut that out!" |
| M: "Scuse me?" | |

C= Child; F= Father; M= Mother

Table 4. Examples of Parental Face Saving

Example 1:

M: "I don't wanna build a house. You build a house."

C: "No!" (loudly)

M: "(Child's name)!"

C: "Hell no!"

M: "You want to build a house?"

Example 2:

Part A:

C: (Looks toward camera) "Get outta here!"

M: "Who are you talking to?" (Gently slaps child on wrist) "Don't talk to nobody like that."

Part B:

C: (Looks toward camera) "Get outta here girlie girl!"

M: "Stop talking to girlie girl and pay attention!"

C: "I want her to get out!"

M: "What happened to the piece here, (child's name)?"

C= Child; M= Mother



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



REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

| | |
|--|--|
| Title: <i>EPISODES & PRAGMATIC BEHAVIORS IN PARENT-CHILD INTERACTIONS</i> | |
| Author(s): <i>Graham, J.A., & Sell, M.A.</i> | |
| Corporate Source: | Publication Date: <i>April 1996</i> |

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 media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). 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 three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p>PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY</p> <p align="center"><i>Sample</i></p> <p>TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)</p> </div> <p align="center">1</p> <p align="center">Level 1</p> <p align="center"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p>PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY</p> <p align="center"><i>Sample</i></p> <p>TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)</p> </div> <p align="center">2A</p> <p align="center">Level 2A</p> <p align="center"><input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p>PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY</p> <p align="center"><i>Sample</i></p> <p>TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)</p> </div> <p align="center">2B</p> <p align="center">Level 2B</p> <p align="center"><input type="checkbox"/></p> |
|---|--|--|

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no 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 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: <i>James A. Graham, Ph.D.</i> | Printed Name/Position/Title: <i>JAMES A. GRAHAM, Ph.D. ASST PROF. of Psychology</i> | |
| Organization/Address: <i>The College of NJ, DEPT of Psychology PO Box 7718 EWING, NJ 08628</i> | Telephone: <i>609 771 2638</i> | FAX: <i>609 637 5178</i> |
| | E-Mail Address: <i>jgraham@tcnj.edu</i> | Date: <i>1/18/01</i> |

Conference on Human Development (Birmingham, AL, April 1996) (over)

629029156



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 this 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: |
|---|

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1100 West Street, 2nd Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080

Toll Free: 800-799-3742

FAX: 301-953-0263

e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov

WWW: <http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com>