

LANGUAGE TEACHING AT BERKELEY

VOLUME NO. 18 ISSUE NO. 2 SPRING 2003

PUBLISHED BY
Berkeley Language Center
B-40 Dwinelle Hall #2640
University of California, Berkeley
Berkeley, CA 94720-2640
Phone 510.642.0767
Fax 510.642.9183
http://blc.berkeley.edu

EDITOR
Victoria Williams
510.642.0767 x 19
victoria@socrates.berkeley.edu

GRAPHIC DESIGNER
Orlando Garcia
space@uclink.berkeley.edu

BERKELEY
LANGUAGE CENTER

Claire Kramsch
Director
510.643.5136

Mark Kaiser
Associate Director
510.642.7221

SERVICES
510.642.0767
Administrative Services x 10
Classroom Services x 19
Duplication Services x 29
Library Services x 24
Recording Studio x 12
Technical Services x 14

IN THIS ISSUE

Language and Culture.....	1
Notes from the Associate Director.....	6
Notes from the Field.....	7
BLC Fellows' Reports.....	8
Conference Reports.....	12
Announcements.....	14
Calendar.....	19

Ellen Crocker and Kurt Fendt, creators of *Berliner sehen*, an immersive multimedia environment for language and culture studies being developed at MIT, demonstrated their groundbreaking work for the language learning and teaching community at UC Berkeley. BLC Associate Director Mark Kaiser spoke with them in November 2002.

MK: Ellen, Kurt, would you describe for the readers of the BLC newsletter the Berliner sehen software?

KF: *Berliner sehen* is a very rich archive of conversations that were taped in two neighborhoods in Berlin in 1995. All the conversations, as well as archival materials—photos, news clips, and other materials from German public and private archives—come together in an interface where the students can select different notions that bring up materials in contexts. This is a very important aspect of the *Berliner*

sehen project: the materials are not available as isolates; they may be experienced only in contexts. And the contexts can be changed and reconfigured by selecting different categories, different notions, such as “The Self,” “Others,” and “The Neighborhood.” By focusing on these aspects, students get a deep insider’s view of what the people in front of the camera actually think about their neighborhood and how they experience living there. In addition, through the archival materials, the students get yet another very important perspective in contrast to the private view through the characters and that is the historical perspective or the public view of historical events. The title *Berliner sehen* has a double meaning in German: it’s the Berliners seeing themselves and our seeing the Berliners. It is important that we bring together these perspectives and that we also allow the students to bring in their perspectives in seeing and interpreting the material and then sharing these perspectives.

Practically speaking, a total of about eighteen hours of conversations are cut up into shorter

clips of about forty-five to ninety seconds. These clips are organized according to the eight people we filmed conversing with about sixty other people and nine broad notions that describe the content of those conversations. The conversations were filmed in different situations: work or professional life, private life, and family life. There is, for example, an intimate conversation between father, son, and grandson. We wanted to focus not only on the different issues that people talk about that are relevant to them, but also on different registers: how they talk to each other, how they talk to other people. The students can compare how one individual talks to various people in different ways and even tells the same story in a variety of ways. This creates an interesting nar-

rative microcosm of the neighborhood where people tell stories about themselves, about events, the past. Moreover, since different people remember the same events differently, it’s an interesting

crisscrossing of stories, of narratives. We get a multi-faceted view instead of a single-dimensional approach that focuses on only one topic at a time. In creating the material for *Berliner sehen*, the conversation topics were not determined before filming, and the students do not access the material through topics; a variety of topics appear naturally in these conversations, however. The students select the materials that they find interesting or that they think are relevant for an assignment. They collect these materials into their own workspaces, exclusive to each student, and combine materials to create new contexts. They can then make these collections “public” to the rest of the class, so that classmates can see each other’s collections and draw on them, either for classroom presentations or for essays.

MK: Could you describe for me the genesis of the project? As you developed the project, did the project change or take on a different focus?

EC: In 1990 Kurt and I were discussing possibilities for working with multimedia and, specifi-

cally, for working with a very interesting initiative that was going on at MIT that was supporting the development of computer-assisted learning. At that time, Kurt was teaching German as a second language in the German-speaking part of Switzerland and I was teaching German as a foreign language at MIT. For me, trying to work with cultural materials meant my bringing things back from Germany, or from wherever I was able to glean them, and transporting them into the classroom. For Kurt, it was exactly the opposite: he was transporting his students into the landscape, into the environment, having them go out and work as ethnographers in the city and bring back their findings. My thinking was that it would be great for students studying in a second language setting to be able to converse with students in a foreign language setting about the same kinds of materials because their experiences with those materials would be so different. Therefore, we began to work on the idea of building a body of material that would not have to be translated for the foreign audience. In other words, materials that were typically being produced in foreign languages in the United States always provided the option of transcripts and glossaries. My notion was to have a material that would have an interesting, if not necessarily the same, value for second language learners as it would for foreign language learners.

KF: The possibilities of multimedia at that point were such that we could actually bring these materials together and offer the students a very new and novel way of working with them. It was not just presenting them with the materials but also allowing them to do something with them, to be creative. Of course, we were not the first at MIT to develop this kind of project. There were well-developed models for us to draw upon. For example, Gilberte Furstenberg's *A la rencontre de Philippe* or *Dans un quartier de Paris* and Douglas Morgenstern's *No recuerdo*. These projects all developed virtually new genres in using multimedia for foreign language education, namely interactive narrative, interactive documentary, and combinations of the two. We looked at the MIT models that were being used quite successfully in the classroom, but

wondered what was missing for us. How could we go beyond these models? How could we avoid the interview format, for example, since that would have meant our defining what was going on in Germany in 1990, after The Wall came down, and deciding what the issues were. Instead we wanted the people who were being affected by those changes to speak about how they were experiencing them and how they were affecting their lives, how they were changing their identities and the communities in which they live. For this reason we picked the format of conversations between people who knew each other. That's very important. Usually interviews are done with strangers, but these were people who already knew each other in various contexts and on various levels.

EC: It also became clear that what was available to us in Berlin was an exciting moment where two German-speaking cultures were coming together, talking about themselves and others and about

The title *Berliner sehen* has a double meaning in German: it's the Berliners seeing themselves and our seeing the Berliners.

the culture: What is the German culture? People are referring to the past, to the present or the future continuously in everyday conversations. This was something we were able to observe on our own and we realized that to be able to capture this moment for students of culture would be invaluable. You hear, you see the referencing to the culture and to the community in the everyday conversations that are going on about all kinds of other things. We realized that although this referencing was the kind of thing that one might want to think of as a topic, we wouldn't have to phrase it as a topic for the conversations. People would arrive at topics on their own anyway; this was going to happen in a natural fashion.

We selected a prize-winning filmmaker in Berlin who does documentary biographies that are not so much biographies as they are portraits of people and who works on a fine line between personal narration, fiction, and documentary

in making these portraits. Together we figured out a system for filming people in their natural environments with others whom they knew. In so doing, we were hoping not only to capture their authentic language, their ideas expressed as authentically as possible, but also to provide students with the possibility to immerse themselves in an individual life, a personal view of history, the history of the common person. We wanted to reveal how historical events affect individual lives and how culture is tangibly part of people's lives and not something separate.

MK: You describe a goal of presenting to students a body of authentic material and yet at the same time you've created something that students do not receive passively. In effect, they become authors themselves using this material as building blocks. You have an authorial role in the way you've manipulated this material; your director had an authorial role. There are many authors here.

KF: I'm not quite sure if the students really become authors. It's a question of how you define authorship because in its current incarnation, the students cannot really add their own material to *Berliner sehen*. I see them more in the role of editors; they're taking existing material and putting it together in a new format. Is that actually authoring or is it editing? I agree, though, that students have a creative role in this process. We're providing a framework to a very large body of material that the students bring meaning to through their interaction and creation. They are really creating, and adding, very specific new meaning to the material by bringing together and combining pieces that would otherwise not come up in these connections and contexts.

Making new collections of the materials is an important role for the students because it suddenly puts them in a very different position, in a new role in the learning process. This creative, editorial, authorial role in working with *Berliner sehen* also transfers to the classroom. After working with *Berliner sehen*, either alone or in pairs, the students have something to say. Other students working on the same assignment, with

the same material, will come back with slightly or very different experiences. Their reports will differ, sometimes slightly, sometimes more. It creates a very natural, conversational situation for the students, where they actually have something to talk about. It's not that we tell them, "Now talk about Berlin." They now have a reason to talk because they have different information, a true information gap. The classroom then also becomes the location where the material gets richer. The students who worked on one specific aspect hear all the contributions from the other students and realize there's so much more behind a particular person or story. This then sparks more motivation to go back to the material, to call up their own collections if they want to support an argument, for example. Now they have the material to prove what they are saying or to contradict what someone else is saying. That puts them in a very different role.

But I think your question also points to the role of the teacher. If the students become the authors, the creators, where is the teacher? We're no longer the ones—at least conventionally—who supply the material, who direct how the material is being used, and direct the way the students interpret the material. The students come back with interpretations that we, as authors, or as faculty

using the materials, have never thought of. The question then becomes what does a teacher do in such a situation. The teacher can no longer say that an interpretation is right or wrong. This puts the teachers in a different role as well. How do we react? How do we support the students in this process of understanding and creating meaning, without imposing our own views? It's no longer a kind of top-down approach; it levels the playing field. This material generates that very interesting difference.

MK: So what is the role of the teacher?

EC: It's very important that the teacher is the facilitator and makes sure that the kinds of conversations that are going to bring about the most interaction, the most interchange between the students, are possible. It's very important in terms of pacing; it's very important in terms of the way you integrate the unit of *Berliner sehen*, let's say as a learning unit, into a curriculum. It's important that the students have the preparation that's necessary in order to be able to understand how to interact in this fashion. And then, during the work with *Berliner sehen*, it's up to the teacher to be the observer of these interactions to make sure that the students are able to cope in their conversations with each other and that they get as much as they possibly can out of them.

The teacher's role is also to help students go beyond *Berliner sehen*. Students will immediately come up with quite abstract ideas, very far-reaching ideas, about past events, or possibly even about the current situation. They may want to find out what's going in the politics now. It's important that we find out how to guide the students to what kinds of resources are accessible. Some of our students at MIT may go off to Widener Library at Harvard and research things, and while others may not have the time to do that, that doesn't mean that they don't have access to other resources, for instance

on the Web. We need to do our own research with the students to support them in their search for further kinds of information that are not available in *Berliner sehen*. Working in this way with the students, over a number of semesters, you begin to get an idea of the kinds of materials you want to have prepared ahead of time for class. You determine how much time you're going to need as you work through the unit in order to support what the students are doing in class. This really is much more of a facilitator role. You feel you're more on a par with your students.

We're providing a framework to a very large body of material that the students bring meaning to through their interaction and creation.

MK: How does Berliner sehen fit into the curriculum, into a course? Is it a course in itself or part of a course?

KF: There are different ways of integrating this material. So far at MIT we've used it in intermediate classes above the German 3, or third semester, level and

also in upper-level classes. We've used it in two different arrangements: in an intensive intermediate class, where the material is used throughout almost the entire three-and-a-half-week course, and in semester courses as a two- or three-week unit. Ellen is trying out a one-week unit using *Berliner sehen* in the middle of the term and a second unit at the end of the term. What is interesting now that other universities are using *Berliner sehen* is that we see many different ways of integrating it into the curriculum. At Harvard, Sylvia Rieger is using it in a Berlin literature course, integrating it throughout the semester, using it as another way of looking at Berlin through the eyes of literary authors and through the people in Berlin. *Berliner sehen* can actually be used on different levels, and for different purposes, depending on what the focus is.

EC: In general we've found that the material of *Berliner sehen*, as fascinating, as extensive as it is, can't really be the content of an entire course, even in the intensive course where for a three-and-a-half-week period the students are meeting with us three hours a day, five days a week. We find that it's much more interesting to work with *Berliner sehen* in conjunction with other kinds of materials, be it film, other kinds of documentary

materials, other pieces of literature, short stories. I've used a variety of short stories that may or may not have anything to do with Berlin, but may have more to do with a certain way of narrating. For instance, I'm using *Berliner sehen* in German 4, the fourth semester course. These students have been studying language and some literature but are at a point where they are able to work with longer literary works, for instance, Bertolt Brecht's drama *Leben des Galilei* or *Schachnovelle* by Stefan Zweig.

When students are working with *Berliner sehen* they are building bridges between texts. We're doing this anyway as we're reading literature—trying to read one text against another. In *Berliner sehen*, we have yet a different kind of text: these are conversations, but they're still texts. They're being juxtaposed with a variety of documents—letters, posters, articles; historical, archival pictures, photographs,

archival films such as the DEFA films that are documentary films in themselves. Yet, unlike working with a piece of literature, there is no one central text. When we're reading a play or a novel, then that's the central text. However, when we're working with *Berliner sehen*, no one text is the central text. The students then have to create their own line of reasoning. That becomes a very interesting process: how to create your own argument, how to create your own whatever-it's-going-to-be, be it a story or a news article for a fictional news article. It might be a discussion of issues, an argument for a debate; students develop many different kinds of final projects, when we're using the software in German 4.

At other institutions, we've seen an even wider variety. At Vassar College where they've been using *Berliner sehen* for a couple of years, they've tried the material with a third semester course and the students came up with the idea of building a real soap opera around these figures. I think some of what they experienced in building the soap opera was the excitement they had in discussing possible personalities for these figures in the MOO that they use. They already have a fictional space that they work in and then they were adding these other characters to that space. This is something that we wouldn't dream of doing at MIT but it works very well for them. They were very excited about it.

We are in the process of developing the *Berliner sehen Exchange*—an open exchange between instructors implementing *Berliner sehen* in a curriculum. This exchange is actually an online repository of all the kinds of materials that we feel we can freely provide for each other—syllabi, teaching assignments. It includes video segments of classroom sessions, digital photographs of the black boards or white boards after a working session. All of this can be annotated by the participants in the *Exchange*. There are forums built into the *Berliner sehen Exchange* software that allow the participating instructors to converse about some of the issues they have in teaching and also to comment on what worked and what didn't.

We're going to have this system work in somewhat the same way as *Berliner sehen* does. In other words, we are tagging all of our materials with the features defining our own experience with these courses. What is the level of the course? What is the length of the course? Is it a three-week course? Is it a semester course? How many students are involved? What kind of college are we teaching at? Is it a four-year college, a university? Are there graduate students in the course? We have to have a way of sorting through this material. Right now, it's easy to glance through everything, but once a few more people are working with the *Exchange*, we'll see that we have a huge body of material. Moreover, any one user may want to look at a particular segment of that material, let's say all the syllabi for fourth-semester courses or all the syllabi for courses that are teaching *Berliner sehen* within a literature course. That tagging will then work in the same way as it does in *Berliner sehen*, that it allows you to pull up, to select, a certain portion of material that is pertinent to

This really is much more of a facilitator role. You feel you're more on a par with your students.

your particular inquiry.

KF: We also want to provide a way to comment the thinking process, the experience that the instructors had working with the material in the classroom, as well as the student texts that came out of particular assignments. This is especially important for people who are starting to teach with *Berliner sehen*: that they get a sense of how it's being used, as a starting point for developing their own ideas. They can then make modifications of assignments, of the syllabus, and then report back to the *Berliner sehen Exchange* what they did, why they changed something, and how it worked. It's an ever-growing repository of experiences that can be searched and sorted. One is able to constantly reconfigure the materials, much in the same way as *Berliner sehen* does, so for instance, all the first assignments that have been designed for starting a unit with *Berliner sehen* in a literature course. What were the second assignments that followed?

MK: All the collaboration that's generated amongst faculty, as well as the collaboration of the students in working on their projects, is remarkable. The other thing that strikes me is that this software is a wonderful mechanism for keeping the authentic spoken language in literature classes.

EC: Let me go back to the notion of collaboration on all levels. As we're working on *Berliner sehen Exchange*, with the idea of having faculty collaborating across the boundaries, from the outset we have also thought of *Berliner sehen* as a wonderful possibility for students around the world to be collaborating. One of the first groups of schools we contacted, the Goethe Institutes all over the world, have students learning German in very different environments. Some are studying in Germany, maybe even in Berlin, and in Tokyo or Athens. Wouldn't it be interesting to be able to converse with other students working with the same material? Again, this is not an original idea. Other people are working on this kind of thing, although they don't necessarily have this kind of material to work with. I think that Gilberte Furstenberg also has this idea for the *Cultura* audiences. Although we don't yet have the facility for it—it will be

a possibility once we have the larger MetaMedia framework—we're thinking of having classes at various institutions work with each other. At the very least, what they're doing with *Berliner sehen*, but then hopefully also, beyond.

MK: That leads me into the next question? What is next for *Berliner sehen*? Where does it go from here?

KF: Well, it will go in a couple of different directions, but it all will converge to a larger and more interesting project. The version that we're using right now has only a limited set of materials, although all the materials we have produced so far are ready to be integrated. We at MIT are beginning to test a new version that links all the users at the different campuses to one central MIT server where all the materials are available and where the interaction between students is going on. Having all the users and student collections stored on the MIT server opens up new possi-

bilities for collaboration among students at different campuses. They can form their own groups. Students at Berkeley, for example, can work with students at Vassar on the same materials but in different set-ups. This is an exciting development.

We are also in the process of adding more material to *Berliner sehen*. Ellen and I go back to Berlin frequently and collect more material from archives. Of course, in teaching with the material we also see where we need to branch out and find more supporting material. We have also developed a prototypical interface that allows students to access the material not only in the current fashion, through those notions and the people that we have featured prominently in the conversations, but also through a spatial arrangement. For example, all the locations that are mentioned in the conversations are plotted on a map of Berlin on which you can zoom in and out. By clicking on a particular location, the students will get only the materials that pertain to that specific location. The same is true for time references: we can arrange the material along a multi-layered time line so that the students have multiple ways of accessing it. They can switch between the different modes of working with the material. The direction we want to take is to allow for different ways of representing the same materials.

EC: Some of the questions that we get from students and instructors are: To what extent can we go into this material and maybe use it, but perhaps not use the actual individuals' stories? Do we have to go in through the people? The evolution that Kurt just mentioned speaks to that. Yes, it would be fascinating if we could have access through other filters. We initially began with this manner of navigation, through the individuals and through these notions, but getting in through the city itself, or through a time line looking at the history of these areas, could also be a fascinating possibility for courses that have a historical orientation.

KF: It's important, too, that the material is always contextualized, but contextualized in a different way. It's not like a Web search where we get just a list of links and we don't really know what the original context is. Here in *Berliner sehen*,

even though you work with an enormous amount of material, you always see the materials in a contextualized fashion: through the people, through the broader notions, or through the spatial arrangement, the city layout. The students have various ways, various frames of reference for interpreting the material. I think that's crucial. It's even more important for a material as complex as the one that we have developed, that the students know exactly what their frame of reference is, what perspectives they can bring to the material.

MK: It is the most exciting piece of software I've ever seen for foreign language study and I congratulate you.

KF: Thank you. We were talking earlier about bridging the gap between language and the literature courses. In devising and conceptualizing the project, we looked at aspects of literary theory and how it might influence our design. One important concept behind *Berliner sehen* was Wolfgang Iser's "Aesthetics of Reception," as laid out in his books *The Implied Reader* or *The Act of Reading* where he looks at the way in which literary texts are actively constructed during the reading process. He does not focus on the author but rather on the reader and the process of reading. How do readers interpret and understand a text and what is the exact process? To broadly summarize one aspect of Iser's concept: whenever we read part of a text, this is our current focus. As we continue reading, however, what we have read gets pushed to what Iser calls "the horizon" and thus provides the background for what we're reading next which then becomes our new focus. There's this constant exchange between what we're reading based on what we have already read, this exchange between the focus and the horizon. These notions very much influenced the concept and even the interface design of *Berliner sehen*: that we have a center and a periphery of materials and a very easy interplay, where what you focus on together with what is on the periphery defines how you understand the document in the center.

Also influential was the notion of hypertext theory or hypertext in its original sense, not in the sense that it is implemented in the World Wide Web. The World Wide Web is a very limited

application of the original hypertext idea as devised by Vannevar Bush or Theodore Nelson. Hypertext is a way of reconfiguring texts and having multiple layers of texts, almost like a palimpsest, where you can look through different arrangements. This is exactly what we were are trying to do in *Berliner sehen*: that you can constantly reconfigure the material; that you can focus on a text and look at it in different contexts by reconfiguring the materials, almost like looking through the different layers of a palimpsest.

It's really about reconfiguration and having no fixed links. There's a clear difference with what's going on the Web because, to come back to your question of authorship, on the Web, someone created those links and to go to another page you have to follow this link, you click on an authored link. You are not in control. In *Berliner sehen*, however, you are in control because the software creates links dynamically as you work.

MK: I think that when the students feel that they have some degree of control of the material they're using, they feel more ownership. There's a motivating factor there. So much of the software that's been created to date has been software where the student has no control, where they're being marched down a path.

KF: Absolutely. To allow this freedom was extremely important for us, although it's not easy to be consistent across the entire project, from presenting the material to the students to allowing them the process of creating their own. Switching from a browsing mode into a more creative mode needs to be a consistent, seamless interaction. Much of the thinking and conceptualizing has gone into making that happen.

NOTES FROM THE ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR

by Mark Kaiser

Periods of contracting university budgets are always difficult and painful—for students, instructors, and staff. Inevitably, we are called on to do more with less, and clearly, the quality of education is adversely affected. Because of budget reductions, the BLC had to lay off our programmer with expertise in multimedia development, and we have had to plan for an additional five percent budget reduction for fiscal year 2003-04. These reductions will have a negative impact on our ability to purchase media materials, upgrade computer labs, and support the development of media materials.

In light of the budget reductions, we are considering accelerating the retirement of our circulating tape collection and replacing it with Internet-based sound recordings. The more heavily enrolled languages would be the first affected. Currently, the BLC offers approximately 7,000 tapes for in-house use and an additional 8,000 tapes for overnight checkout. This system is still heavily used by many students, although not

nearly as extensively as five years ago, in part because of changes in pedagogy. In addition, we sell copies of the tapes at cost, if the publisher permits us to do so. Our current practice is complicated by the fact that many students would prefer to have the audio available on CDs, which would add additional production costs.

During fall semester 2002, we created a system for distributing the lab audio over the Internet and piloted materials for an Arabic course. The audio files were made accessible from the BLC's website (see "Online Language Lessons," but note that access requires a password because of our agreements with publishers). We have prepared similar materials for French 1 and 2 for the spring semester, and hope to have the lab audio for Russian and German available shortly. By the fall of 2003, we expect that most of the large-enrollment language courses will have their audio distributed this way.

Most publishing houses are now distributing the audio for lab exercises on

CDs, and the production of cassette tapes is an added step and expense in our production process. Therefore, for those items that we make available over the Internet, we no longer intend to produce cassette tapes for in-house and take-home circulation, and we will sell the items in CD format only. Moreover, it is our intent to convert series currently in our collection in tape format only to digital format and distribute those items over the Internet or by sale on CD, at which time we will stop circulating the item in cassette tape format. Eventually, the circulation of cassette tapes, one of the pillars of language lab services for the past several decades, will come to an end, something that summons many emotions on the part of BLC staff.

I invite feedback on this plan from instructors and students. Please contact me at mkaiser@socrates.berkeley.edu.

The Berkeley Language Center deadline for new materials for fall 2003 is April 1, 2003.

Contact Marianne Garner at LL-Lib@socrates.berkeley.edu, 642-0767 x 24, about acquiring language learning materials for your fall semester classes.

If you would like to schedule the use of Berkeley Language Center facilities for the fall semester, contact Victoria Williams at victoria@socrates.berkeley.edu, 642-0767 x 19.

NOTES FROM THE FIELD

What Education Abroad Teaches: The Three Rs of EAP

by **Richard Kern,**
Associate Professor,
Department of French

Greetings from France! This past summer I began a two-year stint as Director of the UC Education Abroad Program (EAP) Study Centers in Lyon and Grenoble. Things are off to a good start—despite the usual challenges of getting oneself and one’s family integrated into a new environment—and I wholeheartedly encourage my faculty colleagues to consider serving as a Study Center Director at one of EAP’s thirty-four sites worldwide. It is certainly a dream job for anyone interested in language learning.

I’ve been impressed by our students from UC. They are energetic, involved, eager to learn, open-minded, tolerant of uncertainty and ambiguity, and full of questions. They are also talented. One of our pre-med students got a perfect 20/20 in her biochemistry class this fall (a grade of 20 is virtually unheard of in France). We have six musicians who perform with the Grenoble University Symphony Orchestra. We have dancers who perform professionally and semi-professionally. We have journalists who write columns for publications back home. Many of our students participate actively in interest groups and sports teams. Our students do a lot, and they learn a lot from pursuing their interests in a new cultural context.

Needless to say, I think that EAP represents a fantastic opportunity for our students. It is an opportunity that we should do more to promote at UC—not only in language and area-studies departments, but in all departments.

In an attempt to begin to formulate some of the ways that all EAP students can benefit from study abroad, I’ll re-appropriate (in French!) the old ‘Three Rs’ paradigm. Instead of reading, ‘riting, and ‘rithmetic, I’ll propose that EAP fosters *Responsabilisation*, *Repertoire*, and *Recul*.

Responsabilisation. Besides being one of the longer words in the French language, this is a key concept in education abroad. The idea is: guide students, but don’t do for them what they can do for themselves. This principle has worked wonders in developing students’ self-confidence and independence (even if it is a bitter pill for some to swallow at first). The housing search is a prime example. Students must find their own housing, which has become increasingly difficult to do in Lyon and Grenoble. Students have to pound the pavement, make phone calls, negotiate with landlords (sometimes hassle with the crustier ones), get turned down, and keep trying. But when success comes, it is sweet.

On the academic side, we could easily collect course information from the various university partners and give this to our students each semester so they could pick their courses at the Study Center office. We prefer, however, to tell students where they can find all this information on their own and have them do it. This has several advantages: it puts them in the shoes of French students (who get no hand-holding whatsoever from faculty or the administration); it helps them know their way around the university; it gets them to go to the offices where they will find all kinds of other information that will likely be helpful; it allows them to make contact with university staff; it proves to them that they can find their way in what sometimes seems a confusing institutional environment. As one student put it: “The most important thing I’ve learned here is that I can actually do what seemed impossible at first.”

Repertoire. Looking for housing, taking courses in various disciplines, making friends, pursuing personal interests all place particular demands on students’ competencies—linguistic and otherwise. EAP students’ communicative and experiential repertoires necessarily expand as they live and study in a foreign country. One area I find particularly fascinating is how students come to deal with new literacy practices in their coursework. All

too often Americans studying in France are told that they have succeeded in displaying lots of information in an exam, but that their writing lacks *method*, the systematic logic that would make the information coherent and meaningful. EAP students in France must learn about *plans*, *problematiques*, *dissertation*, and many other rhetorical forms to structure their thought and their writing if they are to be able to formulate ideas in ways their professors will be able to relate to. This will undoubtedly serve them well when they return to UC with an expanded repertoire of abilities in argumentation.

Recul. This is the “stepping back,” the distanced stance, that gives students perspective on their experiences, their studies, and their lives. Learning new sets of “basics”—basics of culture, communication, academic skills, living skills, and so on—provides students with something to compare to their old familiar patterns of thinking, talking, and being. The familiar patterns are still there, of course, but they are no longer invisible, and they are no longer the only patterns available. *Recul* allows students to view their repertoires (in either their native culture or their second culture) with a critical awareness that students find refreshing and liberating.

I am thankful for the privilege to accompany our EAP students through their revisiting of the Three Rs, and I invite you to not only encourage your students to participate in EAP but also to consider becoming involved in EAP yourself.



BLC FELLOWS' REPORTS

The Oral Proficiency Interview: What Else Can It Tell Us?

*by Agnes Dimitriou, Lecturer,
Department of Spanish and Portuguese*

The oral proficiency interview (OPI) has become one of the standard instruments for evaluating the speaking proficiency of an individual. It is a holistic measurement providing a macro picture of this skill. Just because it is a macro view does not mean that we cannot look at the interview data in a more detailed fashion to discover what other aspects of oral language the speaker realizes during the interview. One such approach would be to assess the different speech acts that occur, using such categories as established by Wilkins:

1. Modality (certainty, conviction, desire)
2. Evaluation (judgment, approval)
3. Suasion
4. Argument (information, agreement)
5. Exposition (explanation, comparison)
6. Personal reactions
7. Emotional relations

These categories offer another measurement of language usage that might, upon further examination, be used to assess oral proficiency.

My study deals with students who study in Spain or Chile, for a semester or a year, through the Study Abroad Program of the University of California. I interviewed the students the semester before they left and then interviewed them again in Spain or Chile at the end of their stay. There is no question that students who study abroad do improve their speaking skills. Another salient question that can be asked, however, is of what does this improvement consist. Although the complete study deals with twenty-five students, my BLC project focused on one student who took classes

taught in Spanish at the University of Chile, a public institution, in the spring of 2001.

On the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) scale, this subject was an 'intermediate mid' in the interview before going to Chile and an 'intermediate high' in the second interview. Her preparation before going to Chile consisted of two years of Spanish at a community college and some conversation courses in Spanish through the University Extension. Briefly, 'intermediate' speakers have the ability of articulate comprehensible statements or questions of their own making about the immediate environment and have enough language competence to survive in the target language culture.

For this subject, the amount of language in the second interview in Chile was three times that of the first interview in Berkeley. While the first interview lasted about twenty minutes and the second slightly over twenty-five minutes, the first was marked by long pauses, while the second consisted of continuous speech. In addition, the profile of the interview showed a greater variety of speech acts. I made a selection of three topics from the interviews occurring at the five-minute, fifteen-minute, and twenty-minute points. The topics turned out to be similar in the first two instances:

Before

Topic 4: description of Santa Rosa
Topic 9: travel to India
Topic 15: exams at Berkeley

After

description of the family situation in Chile
mountain climbing in the Andes
a typical Sunday in Santiago

A gross profile of this speaker shows the following speech acts:

Before

personal (2)
exposition (9)
modality (4)
argument (12)
evaluation (0)

After

personal (1)
exposition (15)
modality (2)
argument (14)
evaluation (7)

A more detailed profile would show the greater variety that occurred in the second interview. However, in order to make these kinds of assessments, one would need to transcribe the interviews—no small task. Once my study is completed, I will determine whether it is possible to make micro observations beyond the speech acts captured by the oral proficiency interview. Perhaps I will then be able to offer an evaluation that gives even greater depth to this assessment technique.

Reference

Wilkins, David A. *Notional Syllabuses: A Taxonomy and Its Relevance to Foreign Language Curriculum Development*. London: Oxford University Press, 1991.



Lopsided Conversations: The Negative Potential of Online Cross-cultural Communication

by *Paige Daniel Ware*,
Ph.D. Candidate,
Graduate School of Education

Recent literature in language education has suggested that computer-mediated communication has the potential to foster communicative competence between students matched in cross-cultural, online partnerships. My presentation examined the asynchronous written discourse that took place in a telecollaborative project between two groups of university students: students of German in the United States and students of English in Germany. While the telecollaboration did promote a greater quantity of writing and an increase in student motivation, a linguistically grounded analysis of the writing indicated that the students' communicative choices did not always promote engagement in interaction.

While the online medium might have the potential to promote student motivation and to offer opportunities for target language acquisition, this potential is predicated on the active engagement of all student participants. The findings of my analysis have shown that communication breakdown is only one of the areas where attention in research on online communication should be focused. Just as important as "miscommunication" is the notion of "missed communication." In other words, the online context may differ from face-to-face communication in that it emphasizes the need to display engagement, at the same time that it provides novel opportunities for disengagement from interaction.

Miscommunication in this study was about the negotiation of relational, instrumental, and identity goals (Coupland et al., 1991). First, in the virtual context, students had difficulties establishing relationships through a common base of knowledge. They tended to overestimate or underestimate their online partners' knowledge. This led to students offering either too much context, which was viewed as didactic and condescending, or not enough context, which was

perceived as too casual or disinterested. In effect, without the ability to resort to real-time interactional tactics such as interruptions or paralinguistic cues, students communicating online tended to encounter difficulties in building relationships.

Secondly, students carried different perceptions of the instrumental goals of the online writing. The different assumptions they held about the purpose of the exchange affected how they framed the activities. For some students, the primary purpose was to engage with their partners in a collaborative exchange of cultural perspectives, while for others the goals were motivated by the desire for developing linguistic proficiency.

Finally, in negotiating identity goals, students often avoided communicating a sense of themselves through written language. The asynchronous writing did not seem to promote a better understanding of the heterogeneity in the classrooms. Instead, in the many-to-many interactions provided by the asynchronous forum, students tended to retreat from self-description in what they perceived as a face-threatening environment, in which misunderstandings could be 'frozen,' or stored by the medium for their peers to view

My study highlights the negative potential of online cross-cultural communication by demonstrating how the communicative choices that students make can lead, not to greater communication, or even to fruitful moments of miscommunication, but rather to 'missed' communication. In online communication, students in this study tended to avoid misunderstandings by disengaging from interactions. They thereby missed the potential for understanding that the integration of technology had intended to provide.

Coupland, Nikolas, H. Giles, and J. M. Wiemann, eds. *"Miscommunication" and problematic talk*. London: Sage Publications, 1991.



New Approaches to Latin Pedagogy

by *William Short*,
Ph.D. Candidate,
Department of Classics

Under the auspices of the BLC Fellowship, I put under scrutiny the longstanding division of "grammar-teaching" and "reading-teaching" in Latin pedagogy. This linguistic schizophrenia has proved to be exceptionally problematic; it has both prevented students from achieving a comfort and facility with the language, and has contributed to the overall decline in interest and support for Classical Studies as a whole. Students are, in their early Latin careers, exposed to pure linguistic data: that is, paradigms, morphology, lists of vocabulary, and rules of syntax. The texts used in these early stages are usually simplified, and repetitive, to the point of absurdity; what is more, they are utterly divorced from any context whatsoever, let alone from contexts which may have some significance to the student, or with which the student may have some familiarity or comfort.

A textbook paradigm, a single sentence for exercise, is the only referential sphere for grammar, morphology, and syntax. The point of the isolated textbook sentence is not to produce any real meaning or sense: it is merely to illustrate a point of grammar or syntax. The student is therefore excused from making any connection between a sentence's grammar and structure and that sentence's meaning, and does not develop essential skills of contextualization, the skill of garnering meaning from the 'context of situation.' Thus, the language becomes a foreign entity and classrooms become places in which students cannot experience the language acting referentially outside of the textbook and capable of being contextually meaningful. The enormous amount of data that they are asked to memorize cannot then be synthesized into an understanding of how linguistic data produces contextual meaning and makes sense. Students in such situations, while often very proficient learners of language data, do not commonly develop a sense of the language as anything other than a code. Finally, when students complete the

BLC FELLOWS' REPORTS

grammar-section of their curriculum, they find themselves in courses where they are expected to deal with highly contextualized, highly stylized literary texts. Many students are unable to cope with this dramatic shift of focus; language teaching has now been replaced by literature teaching, and yet students have not been prepared for literary texts and contexts.

I sought to investigate with my project how teachers might re-integrate these two methods in order to prepare students to read Latin literature carefully, closely, intelligently, and with a more refined sense for meaning. To help remedy this disjuncture of methodologies, I looked to some of the methods that have historically proven useful and effective, but that have been neglected in the modern trend for intensive language crash-courses. This involved casting a greater focus on active language use and composition, and drew some inspiration from the "communicative method" that has shown some benefits to teachers of modern languages. Primarily my focus was on developing classroom activities that would allow students both to acquire a facility with linguistic data and to become familiar with Latin literary contexts, with what they might reasonably expect to find in Latin literature and what they might expect to see in the language of these contexts. This included activities designed, in the first place, to allow students to experience the language as their own in a personally meaningful way. Furthermore, they were intended to show in what ways, as M. A. K. Halliday has it, "the situation in which linguistic interaction takes place gives the participants a great deal of information about the meanings that are being exchanged, and the meanings that are likely to be exchanged." These activities, and my project as a whole, was based on the firm belief that teaching our students to use clues both from an immediate 'context of situation' and from a wider 'context of culture' (a wider experience and knowledge of Latin literature as a whole) will provide them with an adequate apparatus for approaching Latin literary texts with greater confidence and appreciation.

Reference

Halliday, M. A. K. and R. Hasan. *Language, Context and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social Semiotic Perspective*. London: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Rethinking the Role of Performing Arts in the Language Classroom: Creation of a Conversational French Theater Workshop

by *Kristenn Templeman*,

Ph.D. Candidate, Department of French

In the foreign language classroom, we usually think of the arts in general and of drama in particular as a side activity, a bit of fun, something to be taken lightly. This is so even though it is generally acknowledged that the practice of the arts offers students learning experiences that other teaching practices cannot. With regard to the theater arts, it has been established that there are common principles between theater and language studies that should not be given secondary status. With the help of the BLC, my project last fall semester was the creation of a theater workshop in the French department.

I first determined the state of drama pedagogy in the research on language learning. Unfortunately, few scholars who write on the use of drama in the FL classroom are committed to a language class dedicated entirely to drama. Since creating a theater workshop for French language learners was my aim, I made use of the evidence in these articles, but I have applied my own experience and insights to create a working syllabus and develop methods for the class.

My primary objectives in this class are to increase the students' ability to comprehend and use the French language in conversational settings. In order to meet this objective, I decided to fuse two teaching approaches making use of play scripts and improvisation. It has been argued by Eileen Baird in her article "Language through Drama: The Choice of Goals and Control," that the two approaches are in conflict. I have looked for ways to resolve this conflict.

The class that I have created is a special section of French 14 (advanced conversation). The weekly session work, the work in progress so to speak, is the most important aspect in the structure of my syllabus. We will work with literary texts—plays—but also with poetry, narratives, and songs. For instance, we will use Jacques Prévert's poetry for improvisation and students will transform poems into dialogues. I have

also chosen a panorama of contemporary plays because the vocabulary and sentence structure they display are close to the language of everyday life and also because I wanted to take the opportunity to present some recent French plays. I grouped these plays around themes so that we will be able to compare scenes and follow patterns. I will start with what they are most likely to already know: the theater of the absurd, with scenes taken from plays by Ionesco and Becket. We will look at opening and ending scenes and encounter scenes. Of course, we will also be analyzing our performances.

In the realization of this project, an important goal will be the production of a theater performance totally managed by the students, from acting to directing. A performance of their dramatic work is already scheduled for the end of the spring semester 2003. I will be happy to report to the BLC after the accomplishment of the project.

References

Baird, Eileen. "Language through Drama: The Choice of Goals and Controls." *World Language English*, 4, 1, 1984.

Best, David. *The Rationality of Feeling*. London: Falmer Press, 1993.

Cazden, Courtney. "Performing Expository texts in the Foreign Language Classroom." *Texts and Context: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Language Study*. Kramsch, Claire and Sally McConnell-Ginet, eds. D. C. Heath and Company, 1993.

Heathcote, Dorothy. *Collected Writings on Education and Drama*. Northwestern University Press, 1991.

Prodromou, Luke. "Theatrical and Dramatic Techniques in EFL." *World Language English*, 4, 1, 1984.

Sommers, John, ed. *Drama and Theater and Education*. Captus University Publications, 1996.

Via, Richard. "The magic If' of Theater: Enhancing Language Learning through Drama." *Interactive Language Teaching*. Wilga Rivers, ed. Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Competent Metaphors

by Michael Chad Wellmon,
Ph.D. Candidate,
Department of German

Since Dell Hymes first articulated “communicative competence” in opposition to Chomsky’s “linguistic competence,” the term has undergone a series of bankrupting revisions. Hymes argues, in contradistinction to Chomsky’s ideal speaker-listener oriented analysis of language, for the study of actual speech connected to a historically and socially specific language speaker. Through his combination of anthropology and linguistics, Hymes criticizes the abstraction of a pure and universal grammar. The German philosopher Jürgen Habermas enters the debate in his 1970 article on communicative competence (Habermas 1970). Whereas Chomsky understands competence in terms of a “monolingualism,” Habermas proposes a theory of communicative competence based on an “intersubjectivity.” However, by insisting on an “ideal speech situation” and “pure inter-subjectivity,” he ultimately repeats Chomsky’s idealization of competence.

SLA and applied linguistics research seem to follow Habermas’ formalization of communicative competence and relegate Hymes’ work to an often cited but rarely engaged intellectual relic. The key articles on communicative competence (Canale and Swain 1980, Breen and Candlin 1980, Savignon 1983, Pica 1992) may differ in their research goals and disciplinary self-understandings. What they share, however, is a common set of metaphors for language. Two metaphors are particularly common: the target metaphor and the container metaphor. The first appears in terms such as “target repertoire,” “target situation” and “target competence” (Breen). Language and culture rest in the fixed gaze of a language learner. The second metaphor, language as container, characterizes language merely as the communication of ideas and sharing of information (Savignon 1983). Language is the container in which already formed and complete ideas are delivered. These metaphors reveal an increasing tendency to view language as information exchange and management.

My research proposes a reevaluation of communicative competence inspired by the work of Friedrich Schleiermacher, the 19th century German philosopher and pedagogue. His anthropological hermeneutics emphasizes the *Lebensmoment* (life moment), or the particular utterance of an individual meaning maker within a linguistic system (Schleiermacher 1995). Both Schleiermacher and Hymes reject abstract and formal metaphors of language and suggest an ecological model of language where language is an interaction of the parts with the whole and the whole with the parts. Language is only meaningful or possible within a historically and socially situated group of meaning makers. Language study, therefore, considers living speech an actual moment of communication as situated in a particular speech community. As language teachers, who have the opportunity to shape views of language and culture, we should be particularly sensitive to contemporary metaphors of language and their disciplinary genealogies.

Hymes writes that communicative competence “touches upon fundamental understandings of language, conduct and society” (Hymes 1987). If we take Hymes’ comments seriously, the devolution of communicative competence suggests not only the trivialization and co-modification of a key concept in the study of language but also the trivialization of culture, cultural interaction, and the linguistic space in which these events occur. Language itself could become simply another metaphor for the circulation and management of knowledge in a world of globalized interconnections.

References

- Breen, Michael and Christopher Candlin. “The Essentials of a Communicative Curriculum in Language Learning.” *Applied Linguistics* 1:2 (1980), pages 89-112.
- Canale, Michael and Merrill Swain. “Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing.” *Applied Linguistics* 1:2 (1980), pages 1-47.
- Habermas, Jürgen. “Towards a Theory of Communicative Competence.” *Inquiry* 4:13 (1970), pages 360-375.

Hymes, Dell. “Communicative Competence.” *Sociolinguistic /Soziolinguistik*. Ammon, U., D. Dittmar and K. J. Mattheier, eds. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1987, pages 219-229.

Pica, Teresa. “The Textual Outcomes of Native Speaker–Non-Native Speaker Negotiation: What do They Reveal About Second Language Learning?” *Texts and Context: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Language Study*. Kramsch, Claire and Sally McConnell-Ginet, eds. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath and Company, 1993.

Savignon, Sandra J. *Communicative Competence: Theory and Classroom Practice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1983.

Schleiermacher, Friedrich. *Hermeneutik und Kritik*. Manfred Frank, ed. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1995.

Language Learning. Proceedings of the Hawai'i Symposium. Mark Warschauer, ed. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1996.



CONFERENCE REPORTS

Two UC Berkeley lecturers, Lynne Frame from German and Ellen Langer from Slavic Languages and Literatures, were granted BLC Travel funds to make presentations at international conferences this fall. We are delighted to publish the abstracts of their papers.

From ACTFL/AATG in Salt Lake City: (Tele)Collaboration for Culture in Business German

*by Lynne Frame,
Lecturer and Language Coordinator,
Department of German*

At the 2002 ACTFL conference in November, I presented a paper reporting on the intercultural telecollaboration project that I designed in fall 2001 with the support of a BLC fellowship and implemented in a new Business German course this past spring. As detailed in a previous newsletter (Volume 17, No. 2), the project involved a four-week, online partnership between my third-year German course and an intermediate English course for students of political science and public administration at the Universität Potsdam.

We dubbed our project “ILP,” the UC Berkeley/Uni Potsdam *Interkulturelles Lernprojekt* or “Intercultural Learning Project.” Based on the *Cultura* model developed at MIT by Gilberte Furstenberg and her associates, students first completed an online survey of each class in their native languages about their beliefs, values, and emotional or behavioral responses to specific scenarios. Results were then posted anonymously for comparison, grouped only by the class to which they belonged, on the ILP website. Students in both classes were asked to read and analyze the comments of both groups, and then participate in an online threaded discussion forum, posing comments and questions about the similarities and differences that they observed. Following two weeks of this survey discussion phase, groups of four students (a pair on each side of the Atlantic) worked cooperatively to carry out cross-cultural analysis exercises. These cross-cultural projects involved either analyzing German and American magazine advertisements, or writing

a journalistic article on their “native” culture, while taking on the perspective of their “target” culture. The groups collaborated by discussing their initial ideas and offering feedback on successive drafts of the texts to their overseas partners. Finally, all texts were posted to the ILP website and students from both classes contributed comments on the results to a discussion forum.

In my presentation, I shared a number of initial insights about the outcomes of the project and offered a few examples from my data. As evidenced by written comments from the post-project questionnaires, reflective statements from my students’ course portfolios, and interviews, all students in the two courses evaluated their overall experience as either positive (15) or mixed (11), with none reporting that it was a generally negative experience. In terms of pedagogical objectives, I encountered both payoffs and pitfalls. Certainly, students did come to recognize cultural differences—the boundaries—as I had hoped. Some students encountered differences and similarities that came as a surprise to them, challenging their preconceptions about their partners, exemplified by more than one German student who expressed relief at the realization that Americans can be open-minded, critical thinkers. But it seemed that almost as often, students appeared to have found their stereotypes of the other group reinforced. Most importantly, several students voiced suspicions that the very process of intercultural comparison in this form encouraged them to exaggerate cultural differences and reinforce stereotypical generalizations.

Reflecting on these results and discussing them with colleagues at the conference and elsewhere have convinced me that our quest to exploit online communication technologies for purposes of intercultural understanding is really in its infancy. As Kramsch has recently suggested, we know little about the

sociolinguistics and pragmatics of online discourse. The most important challenge we face is not figuring out how to maximize the number of students engaged in such projects, but defining the crucial tasks of intercultural pedagogy in this new, still barely understood context of communication.



The Other as Self: Elements of Suppressed Autobiography in Nadezhda Durova’s *Ugol*

*by Ellen R. Langer, Lecturer,
Department of Slavic Languages
and Literatures*

Russian author Nadezhda Durova (1783-1866) wrote several overtly autobiographical works. The best known of these, *Kavalerist-Devitsa (The Cavalry-Maiden, 1836)*, covers her childhood and the years she served in the Tsarist cavalry disguised as a man. It documents her abysmal relationship with her rejecting mother (who tried to force her into a feminine role), her early love of the military life, and the relative freedom she experienced living with her grandmother. Durova discusses her rejection of the constricted life then open to women and her decision to run away from home to join the cavalry. Mary Zirin, in a well-documented introduction to her own English translation of this work, points to major omissions in what otherwise appears to be a truthful account: Durova presents herself as seven years younger than her actual age of twenty-four when she fled her home and thereby avoids any mention of her marriage, her husband, and her son.¹ In effect, she fictionalizes her life story by hiding the conventionally feminine.

If there is an element of fiction in her autobiography, there is a considerable

element of autobiography in her fiction. The theme of a woman disguised or hidden frequently appears in her stories; witness the veiling of Nurmeka (whose very femininity turns out to be a disguise) or the hiding of Liutgarda in *Pavil'on*. Various facets of a woman's identities are hidden: gender itself, desirability, social origin, even existence. The story examined here, *Ugol* (*The Corner*, 1840)², contains unusually acute character sketches, vivid dialog, and conscious, creative use of language which suggest an importance beyond the somewhat trivial plot.

Several characters in *Ugol* recall major female figures in Durova's own life. The most central and puzzling is the putative heroine, Fetin'ia. A perfect storybook heroine, she is wooed and won by the Count Trevil'skii. The lovers marry in secret, against the express desires of his aristocratic mother and her wealthy father (a merchant of humble origin), both of whom object to the inequality of the match. Fetin'ia then lives a tranquil domestic life, complete with children, *hidden in a separate part of her mother-in-law's apartments*. Though the elder countess eventually discovers the arrangement, she refuses to acknowledge the marriage. However, her awareness of it hastens her death. She is a bad mother, valuing appearances over the happiness of her son. The heroine's own mother is bad in a different way, a vain, grasping social climber, an embarrassment, rather than a role model. The grandmother Fetin'ia accidentally discovers when she seeks out the *ugol* of the title is, however, a loving, compassionate figure and the truly heroic figure in the story.

Indeed, designations appear inherently unstable in this work. Upper-class names shift from Russian to Western European forms in conversation; and Fetin'ia, an aristocrat in all but name, reappears as Fanni (or Fannichka) after her marriage to the count. She is also mockingly called *Ugolino* by a close friend of the Count's during their courtship, evidently a reference to a then very recent translation by Pogodin of Gerstenberg's play of that name (telling the story of Count Ugolino, mentioned in Dante's *Inferno*, who is imprisoned and starved with his sons and eventually feeds on their dead flesh). Various characters remark on the

(in)appropriateness of names, the narrator comments also on the appropriateness of terminology: before her marriage, the heroine is in the nominal charge of a woman her mother refers to as a *guvernantka* (governess) but the narrator calls a *nadziratel'nitsa* (woman who watches over, oversees).

Even the forms of words vary: Durova plays on an existing variation in the instrumental feminine singular ending to emphasize the heroine's lower-class origins and similarly exploits a possible variation in the locative of the title noun *ugol*, which appears as both *v uglu* and *v ugle*, with different emotional weight. The instability of forms recalls Durova's own shift in gender identity, both in her life and in her prose (in her use of pronouns and past tense verbs). *Ugol*, while uneven as a work of art, shows Durova's language at its best, the medium being in part the message: Durova manipulates words to emphasize both the importance and the instability of forms, an instability itself integral to her own life. Indeed, her ability to create credible dialog for men as well as women appears to follow from having grown up as a woman but needing to learn the manners of men to carry out her male impersonation.

Most important to the question of autobiography, Durova creates a gallery of oppressed and confined women and through them meditates on how some women embrace and seek to perpetuate their oppression in their offspring and some construct lives despite it. In *Ugol*, she shows how destructive the role of the suppressor-mother is for the suppressor as well as the suppressed. All women appear to one degree or another trapped, and some of them metaphorically eat their young. In this reading, the outcomes of women's choices govern their fates. The elder Countess Trevil'skaia, incapable of going beyond the bounds of her own prison, is willing to sacrifice her son's happiness to maintain the social order. Durova passes final judgment on her: the discovery that her son is happily married hastens her death, while she maintains to the end that *she has seen nothing*. Fetin'ia's grandmother, having overcome many hardships and able to evaluate her own past, emerges as a generous, accepting human being and lives

to be a hundred, as close as woman can come to immortality.

In the hidden wife and mother of *Ugol*, we see a reverse image of hidden parts of Durova herself. At its broadest, this means simply that she appears in the role of someone who cannot be what in fact she is: an unacceptable self. Moreover, the particular self here hidden from view, the happy upper-class wife and mother, is an unrealized and presumably unrealizable part of Durova. Partially reflective of Durova's own life, *Ugol* recounts the autobiography of Russian woman, the *ugol* of the title reminding the reader well before Virginia Woolf spelled it out that she did not have a room of her own but existed in corners.

¹ Durova, Nadezhda. *The Cavalry Maiden. Journals of a Russian Officer in the Napoleonic Wars*. Translation, Introduction, and Notes by Mary Fleming Zirin. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1988, pages xix-xx.

² The word *ugol* translates directly as *The Corner*. However, given the subtextual commentary on the condition of women, I look forward to Virginia Woolf and am tentatively titling a translation, now in progress, *A Room to Share*. The text used is found in Korovin, V. I., ed. *Russkaia svetskaia povest' pervoi poloviny XIX veka*. Moskva: Sovetskaia Rossiia, 1990.



ANNOUNCEMENT

The UC Consortium for Language Learning and Teaching Grants Program, 2003 Call for Proposals

Under the direction of Professor Robert Blake (UC Davis), the UC Consortium for Language Learning and Teaching is a system-wide initiative designed to make the most effective use of UC's vast linguistic resources and expertise at a time when foreign language enrollments are increasing dramatically. The Consortium fosters collaboration among and across the language programs at the UC campuses with an eye to increasing student access to language study through a combination of the best classroom practices, technological enhancements, and EAP programs.

The Consortium Grants Program seeks proposals offering innovative and, ideally, collaborative approaches that will combine second language acquisition research and practice and will maximize the benefits to students and to programs system-wide. Accordingly, proposals must demonstrate the potential to impact the teaching and learning of language across the UC system or to provide a model replicable across languages or campuses. The Consortium will also support projects committed to outreach (K-12, state/community college systems).

The Consortium is interested in proposals pertaining to any type of curricular innovation. In funding year 2003 the Consortium particularly encourages proposals that focus on one (or more) of the following themes: heritage language acquisition, development and/or integration of technology, or teaching of the less commonly taught languages. Fact-finding meetings to isolate problems of a particular discipline and formulate solutions will also be considered.

The Consortium grants program consists of two categories:

- A) grants up to \$5,000, and
- B) grants up to \$20,000.

The total amount available for this period is up to \$80,000.

Deadline for Receipt of Submissions: March 17, 2003

Notification of Award: April 18, 2003

Tenure of Grant: July 1, 2003 - June 30, 2004

For Guidelines for Submission, go to website at <http://uccllt.ucdavis.edu>
voice mail 530-752-2719
fax 530-754-7152
email uccllt@ucdavis.edu

Deadline for Proposals: March 17, 2003

Recording Studio Services

The studio offers digital and analog recording, playback, reproduction, transfer capabilities; high quality voice recording; equipment for playback of various types of recordings; language and some music mastering and archiving; editing, mixing; production for radio and other uses. Sony Hi-8 video taping available. The studio also has equipment for loan and rental. For more information, contact Gina Hotta, studio supervisor, at 510-642-0767 x 12 or LL-Stu@socrates.berkeley.edu.

Language, Identity, and Change in the Modern Arab World: Implications for the Study of Language and Culture

Friday & Saturday, April 4 & 5, 2003

220 Stephens, Geballe Room, Townsend Center

Friday, April 4

1:30-1:45 pm	Opening Remarks	Claire Kramsch - Berkeley Language Center
1:45-3:00 pm	Session I	Clive Holes - Oxford University <i>Social History, Political History, and Dialect Prestige in the Arab World: The Cases of Bahrain, Jordan, and Iraq</i>
3:00-3:15 pm	Break	
3:15-5:30 pm	Session II	Keith Walters - University of Texas, Austin <i>Gender, Nationalism, and Language Ideology: The Tunisian Case</i> Sonia S'hiri - UC Berkeley <i>Divided Linguistic Loyalties: Tunisians Between Francophonie and "Arabism"</i> Ella Shohat - New York University <i>Reflections of an Arab Jew</i> Chair: Penelope Eckert - Stanford University
6:00 pm	Dinner	

Saturday, April 5

9:00-10:30 am	Session I	Loukia Sarroub - University of Nebraska <i>The Literacy Practices of Yemeni and Iraqi Youth: Life In and Out of School in Dearborn, MI and Lincoln, NE</i> Ibrahim Muhawi - Edinburgh University <i>Negotiating Palestinian Diaspora: Translation and the Language of Exile</i> Chair: Larry Michalak - UC Berkeley
10:30-10:45 am	Break	
10:45-12:30 pm	Session II	Mahmoud Al-Batal - Emory University <i>Identity and Language Tension in Lebanon: The Arabic of Local News on LBC Television</i> John Hayes - UC Berkeley <i>Arabic and Evolving National Identities in the Middle East</i> Chair: Mark Kaiser - UC Berkeley
12:30-2:00 pm	Lunch break	
2:00-3:30 pm	Session III	Mushira Eid - University of Utah <i>Language, Gender, and Egyptian Cinema</i> Michael Cooperson - UCLA <i>Canon-bashing in Early Modern Rhetoric</i> Chair: James Monroe - UC Berkeley
3:30-3:45 pm	Break	
3:45-5:15 pm	Session IV	Panel Discussion: Implications for the Study of the Arabic Language and Culture Mahmoud Al-Batal, Clive Holes, Loukia Sarroub, Sonia S'hiri

CONFERENCE IS FREE AND OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Sponsored by the College of Letters and Science, Berkeley's eight National Resource Centers under a Title VI grant from the U.S. Department of Education, the Center for Middle East Studies, and the Department of Near Eastern Studies.

For information, call 510-642-0767 x 10, email shiri@socrates.berkeley.edu, or visit <http://blc.berkeley.edu>



UC CONSORTIUM FOR LANGUAGE LEARNING & TEACHING

ANNOUNCES

A PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP: DISCOURSE & CULTURE IN LANGUAGE STUDY

As the world becomes more tightly connected through migrations, globalization, and the Internet, the goals of foreign language teaching have to be reconsidered. Linguistic competence, communicative competence, and knowledge of the target culture can no longer be taught only within the standard monolingual context of one given target national culture. Teaching language for the plurilingual and pluricultural world we live in, whether it be a second, a foreign, or a heritage language, means teaching language as discourse in multiple contexts of use. It means placing culture at the center of the language learning enterprise, as shared (or not shared) attitudes, beliefs, memories, and aspirations. This workshop will explore how the relation of language, thought, and culture has been recently theorized in applied linguistics and what its implications are for language teaching. Topics will include language as social semiotic, talking power, classroom discourse as a field of critical practice and analysis; language as text, literacy through literature, subjectivity, and style; intercultural communication, social and cultural identity. Participants will engage in the preparation of individual or group research projects to be submitted later for funding.

June 23 - 27, 2003 at UC Berkeley
220 Stephens, Geballe Room, Townsend Center

Guest Speakers:

Heidi Byrnes - Georgetown University

Teaching Toward Multiple Literacies in Texts, through Genres, with Tasks: A Social-semiotic Perspective

Robin Lakoff - UC Berkeley

*Talking about Yourself: The Social and Political Functions of Third-Person Self-reference and the Inclusive and Exclusive *We**

Anthony Liddicoat - Griffith University, Australia

Teaching Languages for Intercultural Communication

Guest lectures open and free to the public.

Full five-day workshop for UC ONLY; full support for three language faculty from each campus.

Consult the Consortium website for details and online application: <http://uccllt.ucdavis.edu>



F E L L O W S H I P S

**Berkeley Language Center
Instructional Research Fellowships
For 2003-2004**

For Graduate Students

The Berkeley Language Center is pleased to announce the availability of up to six one-semester GSRships (IV) for the academic year 2003-2004 (pending authorization of funding).

These fellowships will enable GSIs to work on special projects both to improve the quality of language instruction in their current department and to enhance their professional development as teachers, which can potentially benefit their future chances of employment at other institutions. Research projects might include research in theoretical aspects of second language acquisition; language learning software and other instructional materials; handbooks on specific aspects of language instruction; innovative activities to teach literature or culture in the language class; drama techniques to teach language; performance based tests to assess linguistic, literary or cultural competence. The fellowship culminates in a presentation to the UC Berkeley language community. Past fellows have also presented their research at conferences, or published their work in established journals.

The projects will be undertaken in collaboration with the BLC Director, Claire Kramersch, and the BLC Associate Director, Mark Kaiser. Regular attendance at the weekly research fellows' meetings is expected. Graduate students teaching any foreign language at UC Berkeley are eligible to apply. Those teaching less commonly taught languages are particularly encouraged to apply. If you are interested, we strongly encourage you to discuss your research project proposal with either Claire Kramersch, ckramersch@socrates.berkeley.edu or Mark Kaiser, mkaiser@socrates.berkeley.edu.

**Berkeley Language Center
Professional Development Fellowships
For 2003-2004**

For Lecturers

The Berkeley Language Center is pleased to announce the availability of two one-semester fellowships for Unit 18 lecturers or language program coordinators for the academic year 2003-2004.

These fellowships will provide lecturers with the equivalent of one-course release time to work on individual projects designed to further their own professional development. Research projects might include design and development of instructional materials of various kinds, including technology; development of new course syllabi or curricular innovations; independent study of an area of relevant literature, including enrolling in a course of relevant interest offered at UC Berkeley; empirical study related to the acquisition of any of the four skills in the language classroom; preparation of a research paper for public presentation or publication in a professional journal. The projects will be undertaken in collaboration with the BLC Director, Claire Kramersch, and the BLC Associate Director, Mark Kaiser, on a schedule adapted to the nature of the project and agreed upon by the parties involved.

If you are interested in applying we strongly encourage you to discuss your research project proposal with either Claire Kramersch, ckramersch@socrates.berkeley.edu or Mark Kaiser, mkaiser@socrates.berkeley.edu.

A fellowship application form is available in the BLC office, B-40 Dwinelle Hall.

Please complete the fellowship application form, a two-page description of your project (see specifications on application form), a current CV, and a letter of recommendation by the chair of your department explaining how your project benefits the teaching and research mission of your department and/or your academic/professional development. Send this documentation to:

**Professor Claire Kramersch • Berkeley Language Center
BLC Fellowship Program • B-40 Dwinelle Hall, MC #2640**

Deadline for Applications: Monday, March 3, 2003

2002 - 2003 CALENDAR

B L C L E C T U R E S

CONFERENCES

Friday, February 7

PORTRAIT OF THE
BILINGUAL CHILD

Fred Genesee

Professor
Department of Psychology
McGill University

4 - 6 pm, 370 Dwinelle Hall



Friday, February 21

BILINGUALISM, EMOTIONS,
AND COGNITION

Dr. Aneta Pavlenko

Assistant Professor of TESOL
College of Education
Temple University

3 - 5 pm, 370 Dwinelle Hall



Monday, March 10

HOW PEOPLE TALK ABOUT MOTION
EVENTS: SOME COGNITIVE AND
COMMUNICATIVE CONSEQUENCES
OF LINGUISTIC TYPOLOGY

Dan I. Slobin

Professor
Department of Psychology
UC Berkeley

3 - 5 pm, 370 Dwinelle Hall

Friday, April 4 &

Saturday, April 5

LANGUAGE, IDENTITY, AND
CHANGE IN THE MODERN
ARAB WORLD: IMPLICATIONS
FOR THE STUDY OF LANGUAGE
AND CULTURE

Townsend Center, 220 Stephens



Monday, April 14

IMAGE BANKS AND THE
SEMANTICS OF
CONTEMPORARY VISUAL
COMMUNICATION

Tim McNamara

Professor
Department of Linguistics
and Applied Linguistics
University of Melbourne

3 - 5 pm, 370 Dwinelle Hall



Friday, May 9

INSTRUCTIONAL
DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH
PROJECTS

BLC Fellows:

Lowry Martin
Luh Hsyng Nelson
Michael Chad Wellmon

3 - 5 pm, 370 Dwinelle Hall

March 20-22, 2003

*DigitalStream 5th Annual Conference:
Emerging Technologies in Teaching
Languages and Culture*
California State University-Monterey
Bay, Seaside, California
Web: [http://iwlc.csumb.edu/
digitalstream](http://iwlc.csumb.edu/digitalstream)

March 22, 2003

*Foreign Language Association of
Northern California (FLANC)
Spring Workshops*
Chabot College, Hayward
Web: <http://www.fla-nc.org>

March 22-25, 2003

*The American Association for Applied
Linguistics, AAAL 2003: The Diversity
of Applied Linguistics*
Arlington, Virginia
Web: <http://www.aal.org>

March 25-29, 2003

*Teachers of English to Speakers of
Other Languages, TESOL 2003:
Hearing Every Voice*
Baltimore, Maryland
Web: <http://tesol.org>

June 17-21, 2003

*The International Association for
Language Learning Technology,
IALLT 2003: Connecting with a
Diverse World*
Ann Arbor, Michigan
Web: <http://iallt.org/>

December 27-30, 2003

*The 2003 Annual Modern
Language Association of America
(MLA) Conference*
San Diego, California
Web: <http://www.mla.org>

The BLC Lecture Series is sponsored by the College of Letters and Science and by Berkeley's eight National Resource Centers under a Title VI grant from the U.S. Department of Education.

THE BERKELEY LANGUAGE CENTER

The Berkeley Language Center (BLC) was established on July 1, 1994. It serves as a resource center for all language teachers on the Berkeley campus.

The mission of the BLC is to improve and strengthen foreign language instruction on the Berkeley campus by keeping teachers informed of new developments in the fields of language pedagogy, second language acquisition, and applied linguistics. The BLC promotes and facilitates the use of new language learning technologies in the classroom.

The BLC is particularly interested in helping lecturers develop new materials, attend conferences and in-service training workshops, and publish their ideas and materials. It has modest funds to help lecturers attend professional meetings and develop new teaching projects.

The BLC also provides audio-video-computerized lesson materials, listening, viewing, recording, duplicating and archiving facilities and related technical and administrative services.

The BLC also administers the Dwinelle Computer Research Facility (DCRF) which supports humanities faculty engaged in computer-based research projects and provides equipment and technical expertise for the development of instructional materials

2002-2003 BLC ADVISORY BOARD

Robert J. Blake
Ralph Hexter
Mark Kaiser
Claire Kramtsch

David Leonard
Christina Maslach
Maria Riasanovsky
Jane Stanley

2002-2003 BLC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Ana Arteaga
Agnes Dimitriou
Lynne Frame
Mark Kaiser
Claire Kramtsch

Vivian Numaguchi
Steve Poulos
Sarah Roberts
Sonia S'hiri
Victoria Williams

2002-2003 EDITORIAL BOARD

Agnes Dimitriou
Victoria Williams

1-19900-12495-40-HBGF6

BERKELEY
LANGUAGE
CENTER

B-40 Dwinelle Hall, MC #2640
University of California, Berkeley
Berkeley, California
94720-2640

*Address Correction
Requested*

Non-Profit Org.
US Postage
PAID
UC Berkeley



SPRING 2003
NEWSLETTER
