



Global Simulation at the Intersection of Theory and Practice in the Intermediate-Level German Classroom

Author(s): Glenn S. Levine, Natalie Eppelsheimer, Franz Kuzay, Simona Moti, Jason Wilby

Source: *Die Unterrichtspraxis / Teaching German*, Vol. 37, No. 2, (Autumn, 2004), pp. 99-116

Published by: Blackwell Publishing on behalf of the American Association of Teachers of German

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3531723>

Accessed: 17/04/2008 11:56

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=black>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We enable the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Curriculum Matters: From Theory to Practice

Global Simulation at the Intersection of Theory and Practice in the Intermediate-Level German Classroom¹

**Glenn S. Levine, Natalie Eppelsheimer, Franz Kuzay,
Simona Moti, and Jason Wilby**

University of California, Irvine

In recent years there has been a noticeable paradigm shift in some areas of applied linguistics and foreign language pedagogy, driven by a desire to both develop a model of adult second-language (L2) acquisition that accounts for, and indeed allows for, the inherent complexity of social, psychological, and linguistic factors as they relate to instructed adult L2 acquisition, and simultaneously (re-)connects L2 scholarship, learning, and teaching with the fields of humanistic inquiry. Yet while studies of classroom interaction based on sociocultural theory, the ethnography of communication, or other constructivist approaches have yielded compelling and important empirical results (e.g., Antón and DiCamilla; Brooks and Donato; Liebscher and Dailey-O’Cain; Swain and Lapkin “Interaction,” “Task-Based”), to date little attention has been paid to the ways in which the para-

digm shift might be applied to a full-fledged language course curriculum. To address this problem, we argue that a course format we call global simulation (henceforth GS; Crookall and Oxford, eds.; Jones; Levine “Global”) represents the intersection of several strands of second-language acquisition (SLA) theory, sociocultural theory, the tenets of the *Standards for Language Learning in the 21st Century* (National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project; henceforth *Standards*), and language classroom practice. By way of example, we describe a course at the University of California, Irvine which has students conceptualize and create a *Museum der deutschen Kultur(en)* [Museum of German Culture(s)] at the intermediate, that is, second-year level.² In the 10-week course, students critically analyze concepts and constructs related to culture, the museum and the genre of inter-

¹ An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Second UC Consortium for Language Learning and Teaching Conference in March 2004. We are grateful to the faculty and students of the Department of German at UC Irvine, whose support and comments have enriched this project at each stage. We thank Judi Franz and Pati Espinoza of UC Irvine’s Humanities Instructional Resource Center for their crucial help and support of the project. Lastly, we are grateful to the anonymous reviewers for *Die Unterrichtspraxis*, and to Ali Moeller, for

their valuable suggestions for improving this article. Any omissions or errors remain our responsibility.

² The course described is the fifth in a six-quarter sequence. We employ a fairly conventional communicative first-year curriculum, integrating elements of task-based approaches (see Lee; Skehan). We also engage students in investigation of more aspects of German culture than are presented in the published materials, such as German film, television, poetry, and music.

view, co-construct classroom norms for code choice in order to maximize target-language use, interact with each other and German-speakers abroad through digital media, create sample exhibits for their museum, plan and host a presentation of their museum and its exhibits, and critically reflect on the simulation and the course itself. In this article we describe how this complex of activities and tasks brings together established interactionist, task-based, learner-centered approaches with the pursuit of optimal conditions for avid scaffolded assistance, non-linear co-construction of language learning situations, and critical, self-reflexive treatment of cultural and social constructs and topics.

In the next section we outline the basic tenets of simulation in the language class in general and GS in particular as developed by Crookall and Oxford and colleagues, Jones, and Levine ("Global"). After describing the progression of events in the *Museum* course, the remainder of this article is divided into two parts. In the first of these we describe the ways in which the critical tenets and methods of humanistic inquiry are employed in the *Museum* course. In the second part we discuss those strands of applied linguistics or SLA theory and *Standards* tenets that have both fueled the development of the GS course and appear to be supported by what happens in it. We end with a consideration of the theory-practice dichotomy and its role in approaching the design of a GS course, and with a brief discussion of directions for empirical study based on the GS format.³

Simulation and Global Simulation

Simulation as a tool or technique for language learning and teaching has been around for some time (Jones; Crookall and Oxford, eds.), though it has not to our knowledge gained widespread popularity in U.S. university-level language classes. In approaching the GS course format, we have generally followed the basic characteristics of simulation in the language classroom prescribed by Jones:

- *Reality of function.* Whereas all class members are aware that the class and the simulation are

the creations of the university and the instructor, all must strive to behave as if the simulation were real. This means that each person must make decisions, express opinions and work as they might in the real world and not in a contrived or artificial manner. Herein lies a fundamental difference to many role-play situations in language classrooms.

- *Simulated environment.* To this point, Jones writes that "although the functions of the participants are real, the world outside the classroom is, paradoxically, imaginary" (5). This means that the simulation, while real for the participants in it, cannot be influenced by the outside world or have an influence on it.
- *Structure.* This feature has to do with the planning and preparation of the simulation. According to Jones, "the structure must be sufficiently explicit to preserve reality of function" (5). The simulation "can be thought of as a case study, but with the participants on the inside, having the power and responsibility to shape the event and tackle the problem" (5).⁴

In recent years we have expanded the format to encompass an entire course and called it global simulation. The first manifestation at the University of California, Irvine, was a course called *techno-mode.de*, which asked students to conceptualize and create a simulated internet retail company. We ran this course successfully for three years and learned a great deal about what works and what doesn't in the GS format. In refining and further developing the format we arrived the current design of our *Museum* course.

The Global Simulation Museum *der deutschen Kultur(en)*

The intermediate-level university German course described here asks participants to create a *Museum der deutschen Kultur(en)*.⁵ It is important to clarify how this museum is to be conceptualized by class participants. The museum that students create is not imagined as a virtual museum, i.e., one that is intended to exist only in cyberspace

³ To facilitate replication of this type of course and illustrate how these theoretical considerations manifest themselves at the course-planning level, we include a sample, abridged syllabus in the Appendix. Additional materials, including the full syllabus,

sample student-authored web pages, and other materials related to simulation in the language classroom, are available at: <http://www.humanities.uci.edu/german/people/glevine/levine.htm>.

(such as the *Lebendiges Virtuelles Museum Online*, or LeMo). Rather, students are asked to imagine that they are conceptualizing and building a real, brick-and-mortar museum, a physical space that people could visit. The thing they create, in terms of Web content, should serve only as a textual and visual representation of that which they have *simulated* in the course. We suggest that proceeding with this imagined-real museum opens possibilities for narration and expression that would not work as well if the museum they created were a “real” *virtual* museum, i.e., a museum that was conceived of to exist only on the Internet. In addition, if students were to create only a virtual museum, then this would in some regards violate the tenet of “simulated environment,” for although the museum would be represented only on the Internet, it would in fact be a real museum, just as the LeMo is a real museum.⁶

Further, the GS course is much more than just a workshop in which students simply craft (in the sense of *basteln*) a museum. In order to facilitate intercultural communicative competence (Byram; Scollon and Scollon) and forge meaningful connections to the humanities, we ask them to engage critically with several key concepts, in particular through segments on the museum, culture, and the interview in more depth and detail than with the other segments of the course. These collaborative, task-based investigations are intended both to facilitate informational learning about aspects of Germans, people of other nationalities living in Germany, and of Germany as a country, and importantly, to nudge students from positivistic, essentialist approaches toward more critical, relativistic ones. In this way, too, it is hoped that the curriculum

will contribute to students’ education beyond the framework of a second-year language course.

The GS course *Museum der deutschen Kultur(en)* is structured around five main phases, and within each phase several tasks are carried out (see the sample syllabus in the Appendix; additional sample course materials are also available at <http://www.humanities.uci.edu/german/people/levine/levine.htm>). The first phase consists of the briefing (see Jones 30–39) and the *Standort* discussion and takes place during the first week of the course. Here we introduce students to the concept and characteristics of simulation and detail the content, critical, and linguistic goals. Briefly, we tell them that at the end of the term we expect each person to have learned about numerous aspects and manifestations of German culture and society and developed as bilingual speakers/users of German and English by moving toward an “intercultural third place” (Kramersch, *Context* 233–59) through engaging in meaningful cross-cultural communication with both native and non-native speakers, and through studying and critically evaluating key concepts mentioned above. We make explicit that we do not expect students to become poor facsimiles of native German speakers, rather multicompetent, intercultural speakers in their own right (Kramersch “Privilege”). In terms of linguistic structures, stylistics, and the like, we also outline several language goals for the course, taught for the most part in a responsive way, that is, in response to perceived or stated needs or desires (see Doughty and Williams, eds.). For this reason, the course incorporates weekly or biweekly *Grammatiktage*, grammar days, when students carry out activities on specific structures or patterns. Immediately follow-

⁴ It is useful to compare GS format to a flight simulator. For a pilot training in a simulator, the student must take off, fly, and land as if the simulator were a real plane and deal with emergencies as they arise. The simulation has no impact on the real-world (and paradoxically, for the student the world outside the simulator becomes imaginary) and is a truly safe environment (if the student crashes the plane she or he will walk away unharmed every time!). Most crucially, the student is provided with a working flight simulator designed and built for that specific purpose; it would be absurd to expect the student to first build the simulator before using it! In this way it is also essential for simulation-language-course designers to build the simulation in which language students are expected to function.

⁵ We omit discussion of assessment. In evaluating

student performance, we attempt to strike a balance between product, or measuring the informational and linguistic knowledge acquired, and process, i.e., measuring the overall improvement of the student’s spoken and written skill and growth in understanding and insight on matters of German culture, ways of living, etc. This latter assessment is facilitated through electronic journals and portfolios of student materials, which includes multiple drafts of student writings (for descriptions of portfolio approaches see Moore; Padilla, Aninao, and Sung).

⁶ We acknowledge the ambiguous and paradoxical nature of this discussion and attempt to incorporate discussion of this problem into the course by asking students to reflect upon and express themselves about the relationships among the real, the imagined, and the virtual.

ing the briefing, we start the students off with a type of activity they are familiar with from previous courses; they are asked to debate and select a location for their *Museum*.

Phase 2, which occurs during the first several weeks, asks students to engage critically with the concepts and constructs the museum and culture, as described in the next section of this article. The students also are put in touch with a German-speaking e-pal in Germany (or elsewhere) in order to engage in meaningful cross-cultural communication on course topics and report periodically on the content of course-related communication.

In phase 3, the class discusses and decides what aspects or manifestations of culture(s) it would like to have represented in the *Museum* and should be able to justify those choices in light of the foregoing segment of the course. Because the group imagines the entire museum, participants may conceive of and list a great number of exhibits or departments. Yet because the simulation is an abstraction of reality, they need only address in detail a few samples of the larger museum. They therefore divide into groups, with each group planning just one of the museum's exhibits.

In the following phase, phase 4, which is the most time-consuming segment, each group discusses, plans, and creates its exhibit. Each first collaboratively designs (i.e., imagines and describes textually) the physical space in which the exhibit will be housed, researches and reads self-selected texts about its aspect of German culture. Throughout this phase, each group also makes regular reports to the class, either in person during class time or through an email list or Internet bulletin board, and receives feedback from it. Lastly, during these weeks each group also critically engages with the genre of the interview and designs and carries out an interview with a German-speaking expert (described below).

The end of the simulation, phase 5, which occurs in the last class week, entails three activities. First, the students wrap up their exhibit projects and present them to their classmates in a sort of dress rehearsal for commentary. Second, they engage in a class discussion to critique the GS course itself, the limitations of the museum project and their learning about German culture(s), and their performance in the class. And lastly, students present their museum and its exhibits to fellow students, invited faculty members, etc., along with a forum discussion of the critical analyses and processes through which it was created.

Critical Investigation of Key Concepts

As mentioned in the introduction, the success of the course depends largely on the extent to which students' activities meaningfully connect language learning to the humanities, where a central component of the educational mission is to develop learners' ability to engage critically with texts of all sorts. For it to be meaningful for students beyond the simple enjoyment of the task, they should be guided through a principled critical exploration of key concepts and assumptions.

Critical Investigation of the Museum

This segment of the course aims to help students develop a critical (in both senses of the word), useful concept of the museum which will serve as part of the foundation for their own *Museum*. They are prompted to investigate and critique numerous real museums (both brick-and-mortar and virtual ones), and ultimately problematize the notion by broadening the traditional view to accommodate aspects they may not have considered before. In the following we detail what we present to and discuss with our students in this four-day segment of the course, a sort of primer in *museology*.

The debate in the field of museology (see Teather; Waidacher) reveals two divergent views on the way museums can be understood. On one side, the object-centered model holds that the museum's main function and purpose is to collect, conserve, and display interpretatively the material remains of the past. According to Hudson (43), traditionally "the museum's prime responsibility was to its collections, not to its visitors." By contrast, the visitor-centered model, coined the New Museology, makes paramount "value, meaning, power, control, interaction with visitors, interpretation, understanding, authenticity and authority" (Stam 267) and it makes the museum "a part of the living culture of our time" (Hudson 49). This postmodern model focuses on the process over the product and conceives of the museum as a place of making and negotiating meanings, of knowledge construction and understanding. As such, it aims to facilitate experience, not deliver it (Teather 12), to develop an instrument of social analysis, identification and active historical awareness.

This conceptual debate in the field of museology is used to raise students' awareness of the multiplicity of conceptualizations, functions, forms, sizes, types, and intents of museums, and it

serves to critically inform students' museum creations. The first and second of four class hours are intended to activate the students' prior knowledge of museums by asking them to describe familiar or famous museums and discuss what they like/don't like about them.⁷ On the third day, the class discusses the two models of the museum with respect to a single museum, the NS-Museum Köln. This museum was chosen in part because it provides an example of how the physical appearance of a real museum can be conveyed in textual form, and because of the interesting ways in which the museum's building itself comprises part of the exhibit.

The last hour of the segment focuses on the conceptualization and design of the students' own *Museum* in light of the tasks and discussions of the previous days. The students brainstorm the possible goals, characteristics, functions, forms, and—of course—content of their museum. As homework, they summarize and respond to this critical discussion on the class electronic bulletin board.

Critical Investigation of Culture(s)

Class participants next move on to consider the fundamental question: What is culture? This segment facilitates the development of a critical notion of culture, which students can then use in deciding which aspects of German culture(s) they want to represent in their simulated museum. The goals here can be grouped into three categories: linguistic, conceptual, and critical. Because the linguistic goals of this segment are the same as for the course as a whole (as described above), only the conceptual and critical goals that pertain directly to the key term "culture" are outlined here.

The critical goal is to help participants move from the more intuitive and conventional definitions of culture in topical, normative, or essentialist terms to an understanding of culture in descriptive, inclusive, and relativistic terms. The students

should also begin to think about the consequences of their notions/definitions of culture both for their project and in terms of their social and political ramifications.⁸ This sequence facilitates an awareness of the interpretive side of the overall project (see Geertz). In helping them see culture as a system of meaning and meaning making, and themselves as social/cultural beings engaging with a foreign culture from the outside, we also strive for students to develop new ways of relating to their own culture(s).

This segment is divided into three parts. In the first part, the students activate prior knowledge and assumptions about culture by exploring their intuitive understandings as well as engaging in a critique of several culture capsules from mainstream German textbooks. Thereafter we assign several English-language excerpts by Geertz; Kramsch (*Context*); and Roberts et al. (or other texts), asking them to consider culture in anthropological terms, as what Geertz calls "outside the skin control mechanisms" (44).

The second part aims to expand students' definition of culture in one more sense by asking them to see culture as a functional and symbolic system, as a lens through which one sees and interprets the world. To facilitate this each person assumes a fictional cultural identity and describes a picture; this of course elicits different interpretations from different cultural groups based on their assumed perspectives. They then debate several meanings of the pictures and hopefully gain an appreciation for the relative legitimacy of each interpretation, and for the power of stereotypes and prejudices.

Once these exacting goals are met, the students move to the third part of the segment, which ties the investigation of culture with that of the museum by asking the questions, Whose culture is it?, and What is at stake in our endeavor to represent a culture not our own in the framework of a museum? This serves to heighten participants' awareness of the sociopolitical implications of their choices re-

⁷ We address the questions: What is the location of the museum? What is its function? Who is its target group? Are exhibitions permanent/temporary? Is it represented on the Internet? In addition to structuring the discussion, the questions introduce new museum-related vocabulary in German. The German-language museum websites we investigate include the Pergamon Museum Berlin, the Jüdisches Museum Berlin, the Bayerischer Platz Memorial Berlin, the Bebelplatz Memorial Berlin, the Schokoladenmuseum Köln, the Beethovenhaus Bonn, the Haus

der Geschichte: Lebendiges virtuelles Museum online (LeMO), the Kunst- und Ausstellungshalle der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, and the Porsche-museum Stuttgart.

⁸ Students are encouraged to address questions such as Whose culture is it? Whose museum is it? What makes German culture German? Can a non-German become part of that culture? How do answers to these questions affect the choices we make of what to house within our museum?

garding *what* they will represent in their museum and *how* they will represent it.

Critical Investigation of the Interview

The interview project begins at a pivotal stage in the course. Students have critically investigated the concepts of both the museum and culture(s), established teams for the various exhibits of the museum, and begun to explore the topics for those exhibits. To facilitate cross-cultural communication—toward the goal of facilitating intercultural communicative competence (Byram; Kramsch “Privilege”)—students are asked to apply critical skills in the ‘real world’ by designing and carrying out an interview with an expert speaker of German.

Yet even in this fairly workshop-like task we ask students to engage with the genre interview itself, to examine and question their assumptions about this ubiquitous medium for conveying authentic information. As with their discussions of the museum and culture(s), one of our aims is to move students from a essentialist or positivistic understanding of the genre to a more critical one. Students begin by viewing, comparing, and discussing example television interviews from the U.S. and Germany. From this each group compiles criteria of the range of goals of an interview, of what characterizes a meaningful and informative interview, and of what sorts of things should be avoided by an interviewer. The students then compare these findings with those of the other groups. Finally, they develop their own interview projects, identify and invite (in writing or by telephone) interview candidates, schedule and conduct (and digitally record) the interview itself. In class they present their interviews, receive feedback on them, and discuss what clips from the interviews should be included in the *Museum* exhibits. At each stage students are asked to exchange opinions and research results in Internet chatrooms, by e-mail, or through the course electronic bulletin board.

Global Simulation at the Intersection of Theory and Practice

We have described global simulation as a viable format for critical language learning at the curricular/course level and presented the characteristics and plan of the intermediate German course *Museum der deutschen Kultur(en)*. In this section we address how the activities and tasks that make

up the simulation represent the intersection of theory and practice that we so often strive for. Specifically, we highlight the ways the GS course format, and the *Museum* course in particular, is intended as a principled instructional forum for interaction and task-based models, Vygotskian sociocultural theory as it pertains to adult L2 acquisition, the development of intercultural communicative competence, and of course, curricular manifestations of the “five C’s” of the *Standards*.

Learner Interaction and Task-Based L2 Acquisition

Despite differing opinions in the fields of applied linguistics about the causal role of interaction in the language classroom, there is general agreement that language learning and language use represent two distinct phenomena (Hall and Verplaetse 1) and that language use, in the form of verbal interaction, likely facilitates successful L2 acquisition (Long). Further, scholarly work by Gass; Gass and Varonis; Pica; Swain (“Collaborative,” “Communicative,” “Output”); and others, has shown that interaction between native speakers and non-native speakers, but particularly among L2 learners, helps drive L2 acquisition by bringing about noticing, hypothesis testing, and reflection (Swain “Communicative”; also cited in Hall and Verplaetse). In response to these findings in the SLA research, exciting advances have been made in ways of thinking about language teaching in order to bring about avid learner-learner interaction (e.g., Kumaravadivelu; Lee; Lee and VanPatten; Richards and Rogers; *Standards*). The GS course format described here takes the interactionist approach to its logical extreme (and this word is used with a grain of salt) by creating a classroom environment in which learners must interact in myriad contexts in order to work within the simulation, and certainly in order to complete it. The essential difference to conventional classroom interaction is twofold. First, interaction in many language classes is often staged (in the sense of *inszeniert*) by the instructor; she or he carefully designs and controls the activity in which learners must interact (see van Lier *Classroom*, chapter 5). By contrast, the participants creating the *Museum* are provided with the scaffold or framework of the project, but they are in control of the discourse within each stage. What is said, and importantly, the conditions and particular outcomes of interaction, are in the hands of the students, or the students in cooperation with their

instructor. In this regard students are guided by the instructor and the curriculum to create what Wenger calls a “community of practice,” a dynamic, negotiated environment that acknowledges the complexity of language learning and social interaction in general (see also Tudor).⁹

Second, in conventional communicative classrooms the subject and content of interactions vary greatly as the class moves through the chapters of a book, or the linear sequence of material, and often the form interactions take is driven by the particular language structures being learned (e.g., “This is chapter 5 and we’re learning dative forms, so now we’ll interact about giving gifts to people”). By contrast, in the GS course the needs and goals of the *Museum* project determine the nature and content of verbal interactions, the course-long project allows interactions to relate to each other over time, and there is seldom a linear approach to the acquisition of language structures or what is generally understood as content.

Out of the research on interaction and task-based approaches also came the assertion that classroom L2 interaction, and indeed classroom-based L2 acquisition, is facilitated not only by interaction, but by *task-based* interaction (see Ellis; Lee; Skehan). In conceptualizing and designing the GS format, we have adopted Lee’s (32) straightforward definition of task.¹⁰ The GS course itself, as comprised of a long-term, large-scale collaborative project, extends the typical scope of task to the level of the curriculum, and almost all communication in and outside the classroom is oriented toward the completion of the simulation-as-task.

Sociocultural Theory and Scaffolded Assistance and the GS Classroom

Sociocultural theory is seen by many scholars in SLA as the natural evolution of interactionist approaches to adult L2 acquisition. Derived in part from concerns that the focus of an interactionist approach is too narrow to account for the complexity

of L2 acquisition (Hall and Verplaetse) or too preoccupied with modeling cognitive development alone, and in part from a desire to investigate language learning in the classroom in a more holistic manner (Ohta), Vygotskian sociocultural theory has greatly enriched our understanding of the adult L2 learning process, particularly as regards the vicissitudes of situated verbal interaction in the classroom. Based on the assumption that all cognitive development (learning) takes place first on what Vygotsky (1978) calls the interpsychological plane, that is, in social interaction, before it is transferred to the intrapsychological plane, knowledge in the mind, Lantolf and colleagues have considered some of the ways in which this might take place among adults in a language classroom. Numerous scholars (e.g., Antón and DiCamilla; Brooks and Donato; Ohta; Pavlenko and Lantolf; Swain “Output”; Swain and Lapkin “Interaction”, “Task-Based”) have shown how language learners in interaction appear to engage quite naturally in “scaffolding,” defined by Ohta as “a process ... through which assistance is provided from person to person such that an interlocutor is enabled to do something she or he might not have been able to do otherwise” (52). Scaffolded assistance in the language class, according to Swain and Lapkin (“Task-Based”), is a tool used by learners to complete tasks as well as to drive acquisition. In terms of grammatical or vocabulary development of German at the intermediate level, the GS format provides rich and varied opportunities for scaffolded assistance, not only between instructor and students, but also among students. In larger terms, sociocultural theory, with its root premise that all development occurs first on the interpsychological plane, serves as the basis for getting things done in the GS classroom: the discourse is continually co-constructed—between instructor and students and between students—as learners plan and prioritize the *Museum* project, create their exhibits, design and carry out interviews, and engage in communication with overseas e-pals.

⁹ Wenger characterizes social participation in all its forms, in and outside the classroom, as a process of learning and of knowing (4–5). He also asserts that learning itself cannot be designed, rather “it can only be designed *for*—that is, facilitated or frustrated” (229). In designing and conducting our GS courses we have tried to keep in mind this important pointer toward student autonomy and building a community of practice.

¹⁰ According to Lee, a task is “(1) a classroom activity or exercise that has (a) an objective attainable only by the interaction among participants, (b) a mechanism for structuring and sequencing interaction, and (c) a focus on meaning exchange; (2) a language learning endeavor that requires learners to comprehend, manipulate, and/or produce the target language as they perform some set of workplans” (32).

Critical Thinking, Intercultural Communicative Competence, and Development of an Intercultural "Third Place"

As students in the GS course engage in study and critical analysis of concepts such as culture and the museum or about genres such as the interview, rich and productive links are forged between the L2 learning endeavor and humanistic inquiry; learning takes place that departs from the more typical internalization of particular facts or ideas related to the German language, Germany, or Germans. By accomplishing this (largely) *in German*, we suggest that students move closer to achieving what numerous scholars have called "intercultural communicative competence" (Byram; Crozet and Liddicoat; Rogers and Steinfatt; Von der Emde and Schneider; Wellmon), the ability to see another language and culture, at least at some level, in similar ways to people living in the target culture, to see their own culture(s) and language in new ways, and to overcome cultural stereotypes, prejudices, and ethnocentrism. In Kramersch's terms, L2 learners strive toward locating themselves in an intercultural "third place" (*Context* 235–36); we hope that they come to discover that both German and U.S. culture are "less monolithic than was originally perceived" (234) and "become conscious of the paramount importance of context and how manipulating contextual frames and perspectives through language can give people power and control, as they try to make themselves at home in a culture 'of a third kind'" (235), i.e., a culture that is neither their original, native culture, nor the target culture as experienced by people living in it. In short, learners discover new modes of interpreting and understanding their own and other cultures. Learners in our GS course engage in cross-cultural communication through several means and media, and in so doing incorporate viewpoints other than those of the learners (or even the instructor). According to Belz ("Identity", "Myth"); Byram; Crozet and Liddicoat; Kramersch (*Context*, "Privilege"); and others, this is crucial in order for students to acquire intercultural communicative competence, to overcome prejudices, stereotypes, and the limitations of a monolingual view of the L1 or the L2 language and culture.

¹¹ This model of managing classroom code choice accords with a body of recent scholarly literature on codeswitching in the classroom, most notably work by Antón and DiCamilla; Blyth; Belz ("Myth");

One component of our pursuit of intercultural communicative competence is our approach to the management of code choice practices, an approach that we believe facilitates the development of what might be called an intercultural linguistic identity, a formal acknowledgment that students should strive to become not poor imitations of native speakers, but good bilingual German-English speakers (Kramersch "Privilege"). And what bilinguals do a great deal in societal bilingual situations is codeswitch. Because L2 learners tend not to engage automatically in codeswitching, students in the GS course receive strategies instruction in ways of using English to support their German discourse, which necessarily contains many lexical gaps relative to the communicative demands of the simulation. Our experience has been that while perhaps reducing the amount of time students spend speaking German relative to English, the approach in fact results in a noticeable *increase* in the absolute amount of time students spend using German (because they're talking more).¹¹

Implications of and for the "Five Cs" of the Standards

The *Standards* have proven to be a welcome and useful document for many language instructors, and the pedagogical literature has moved toward operationalizing these tenets (e.g., Abrams; Arens and Swaffar; Chavez; Gettys). In steering clear of specific technical or programmatic recommendations or identifying itself as an approach, the *Standards* have offered a way for instructors to think about what we do in the classroom using common terminology, and in a broad sense, a common priority list. The *Standards* have also served to move the debate about adult L2 learning from one about skills or structure acquisition to one in which, crucially, the people who speak the target language are at center stage; the language becomes entirely the medium for *communication* among people, for gaining access to other *cultures*, for making *connections* to people via a new language, for making insightful *comparisons* with the others' culture and language, and for allowing learners to become participants in others' *commu-*

Cook; Kramersch ("Privilege"); Levine ("Co-Construction," "Student"); Macaro; and Swain and Lapkin "Task-Based."

nities. These are the so-called “five C’s” (*Standards* 31). With these ideas in mind, we designed the GS course to provide students with “ample opportunities to explore, develop, and use communication strategies, learning strategies, critical thinking skills, and skills in technology, as well as the appropriate elements of the language system and culture” (*Standards* 32). We establish a forum for critical engagement with many aspects of German life and people, some of which are best viewed through the comparative lens of first-language culture/knowledge, and some of which can be accessed only through authentic cross-cultural communication. In creating a *Museum der deutschen Kulture(n)* the students hopefully gain what the authors of the *Standards* intended: “Even if they never speak the language after leaving school, they will for a lifetime retain the crosscultural skills and knowledge, the insight, and the access to a world beyond traditional borders” (31).

Empirical Research and the Global Simulation Format

Research based on the GS format should not serve the simplistic purpose of demonstrating how this particular model is somehow better than other content-based or learner-centered ones; any investigation that set out to do so would surely undermine the very advantages it was trying to demonstrate. Instead, empirical investigation of learners and instructors in the GS classroom can and should serve to explore links between theoretical accounts of SLA and classroom practice, to treat as real what Leo van Lier calls the “essential unity in the process of doing curriculum” whereby theorizing, researching, and practicing are “inseparable ingredients in the professional conduct of a language educator” (pp. 2–3). Put another way, the research done in the GS classroom should of course serve to refine the curriculum and improve what and how we teach, but it must contribute meaningfully to debates on theoretical accounts of L2 acquisition, provide useful description of what happens in the classroom, and generate hypotheses and/or research questions that fuel further study.

We appeal to colleagues to join us in carrying out both qualitative and quantitative studies in GS courses that proceed from van Lier’s “essential unity.” In our program at the University of California, Irvine we are in the process of designing a hybrid, multi-part study that triangulates qualitative and quantitative data. Through comparing and

contrasting classroom observations, learner and instructor journals, interviews, questionnaires, and normed language assessments, at the broadest level our study will

- chronicle learner development of intercultural communicative competence and third-place identities through the vehicle of the GS project;
- record and analyze learning through scaffolded assistance in non-experimental, naturally occurring interactions;
- track learner gains in vocabulary, grammatical knowledge, reading, listening comprehension, verbal interaction skills, etc. as these might relate to the particular context of the GS classroom.

With regard to the crucial issue of the methodological rigorosity, it is important to stress the essential, linear progression from the curriculum-design stage to instruction of the GS course to empirical study. While it was necessary for us to carry out various sorts of classroom assessments and measures—basically in-house action research—in order to develop the GS format with and in response to what works with students (e.g., through questionnaires, learner journals), we felt it was necessary to iron out the kinks in our courses before attempting rigorous data collection and analysis. The main reason for this was to ensure, to the greatest extent possible, that problems with the GS curriculum itself would not confound conclusions we would draw from the research.

Conclusion

In this article we have described the course format we call global simulation, detailed one example of such a course, and pointed out some of the ways we see the GS course format, and the Museum course in particular, as situated in the critical tradition of the humanities, and as a pedagogical and curricular manifestation of several strands of the SLA scholarship and the tenets of the *Standards*. We also sketched some potential directions for empirical research within the GS course format. In closing, we should not neglect turning the same sort of critical eye on this article as we ask students to do in the course. In particular, it is important to question our use of a theory-practice dichotomy, a robust dichotomy to be sure, but one which, we suggest, the nature of our GS course may actually call into question. For at each stage in the develop-

ment of the project we found ourselves unable to disentangle the two terms. At different stages it remained unclear when the focus should be on theory or on practice. And furthermore, on the theory side of the coin the inherent conflicts among competing theoretical models threatened to become an impediment to the creation of the curriculum. At the highest level of analysis, we were pleased to find fundamental common ground between humanistic (critical theory) and sociocultural models in the assertion that knowledge (such as cultural or linguistic knowledge) is always subjective and co-constructed. We chose to locate curricular decisions and priorities at what we believed was the *intersection* of the those models, at the intersection of theory and practice, to regard *theory as practice* by actually integrating it into the language curriculum, and to accept the apparent contradictions at other levels of analysis and among competing models of adult L2 learning and acquisition as one aspect of a complex process. It is our hope that language professionals will be able to make use of the GS course format, to expand it into new areas, and that researchers will join us in empirical investigation.

Works Cited

- Abrams, Zsuzsanna I. "Surfing to Cross-Cultural Awareness: Using Internet-Mediated Projects to Explore Cultural Stereotypes." *Foreign Language Annals* 35.2 (2002): 141-60.
- Antón, Marta, and Frederick J. DiCamilla. "Socio-Cognitive Functions of L1 Collaborative Interaction in the L2 Classroom." *Modern Language Journal* 83.2 (1999): 233-47.
- Arens, Katherine, and Janet Swaffar. "Reading Goals and the Standards of Foreign Language Learning." *Foreign Language Annals* 33.1 (2000): 104-20.
- Belz, Julie A. "The Myth of the Deficient Communicator." *Language Teaching Research* 6.1 (2002): 59-82.
- . "Identity, Deficiency, and L1 Use in Foreign Language Study." *The Sociolinguistics of Foreign Language Classrooms: Contributions of the Native, Near-native and the Non-native Speaker*. Carl Blyth, ed. Boston: Heinle, 2003. 209-50.
- Blyth, Carl. "Redefining the Boundaries of Language Use: The Foreign Language Classroom as a Multilingual Speech Community." *Redefining the Boundaries of Language Study*. Ed. Claire Kramersch, Boston: Heinle, 1995. 145-83.
- Byram, Michael. *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, 1997.
- Brooks, Frank F., and Richard Donato. "Vygotskian Approaches to Understanding Foreign Language Learner Discourse during Communicative Tasks." *Hispania* 77.2 (1994): 262-74.
- Chavez, Monika. "We Say 'Culture' and Students Ask 'What?': University Students' Definition of Foreign Language Culture." *Die Unterrichtspraxis* 35.2 (2002): 129-40.
- Cook, Vivian. "Using the First Language in the Classroom." *Canadian Modern Language Review* 57.3 (2001): 402-23.
- Crookall, David, and Rebecca L. Oxford, eds. *Simulation, Gaming, and Language Learning*. New York: Newbury House, 1990.
- Crozet, Chantal, and Anthony Liddicoat. The Challenge of Intercultural Language Teaching: Engaging with Culture in the Classroom. *Striving for the Third Place: Intercultural Competence through Language Education*. Ed. Joseph Lo Bianco, Chantal Crozet, and Anthony Liddicoat. Melbourne: Language Australia, 1999. 113-25.
- Doughty, Catherine, and Jessica Williams, eds. *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998.
- Ellis, Rod. *Learning a Second Language through Interaction*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1999.
- Gass, Susan. "Apples and Oranges: Or Why Apples Are Not Oranges and Don't Need to Be." *Modern Language Journal* 82.1 (1998): 83-90.
- Gass, Susan, and Evangeline M. Varonis. "Variation in Native Speaker Speech Modification to Non-Native Speakers." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 7.1 (1985): 37-58.
- Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books, 2000.
- Gettys, Serafima. "Incorporating Comparisons Standard 4.1 into Foreign Language Teaching." *Foreign Language Annals* 36.2 (2003): 188-97.
- Hall, Joan Kelly, and Lorrie Stoops Verplaetse. "The Development of Second and Foreign Language Learning through Interaction." *Second and Foreign Language Learning through Classroom Interaction*. Ed. Joan Kelly Hall and Lorrie Stoops Verplaetse. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 2000. 1-22.
- Hudson, Kenneth. "The Museum Refuses to Stand Still." *Museum International* 50.1 (1998): 43-50.
- Jones, Ken. *Simulations in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984.
- Kramersch, Claire. *Context and Culture in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1993.
- . "The Privilege of the Intercultural Speaker." *Language Learning in Intercultural Perspective: Approaches through Drama and Ethnography*. Ed. Michael Byram and Michael Fleming. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998. 16-31.
- Kumaravivelu, B. *Beyond Methods: Macrostrategies for Language Teaching*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2003.
- Lantolf, James P., ed. *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000.
- Lee, James F. *Tasks and Communicating in Language Classrooms*. Boston: McGraw Hill, 2000.
- Lee, James F., and Bill VanPatten. *Making Communicative*

- Language Teaching Happen*. Second edition. Boston: McGraw Hill, 2003.
- Levine, Glenn S. "Student and Instructor Beliefs and Attitudes about Target Language Use, First Language Use, and Anxiety: Report of a Questionnaire Study." *Modern Language Journal* 87.3 (2003): 343–64.
- . "Co-Construction and Articulation of Code-Choice Practices in Foreign Language Classrooms." *AAUSC 2004, Language Program Articulation: Developing a Theoretical Foundation*. Ed. Kate Paesani and Cathy Barrette. Boston: Thomson Heinle, 2004. 110–30.
- . "Global Simulation: A Student-Centered, Task-Based Format for Intermediate Foreign Language Courses." *Foreign Language Annals* 37.1 (2004): 26–36.
- Liebscher, Grit, and Jennifer Dailey O'Cain. "Learner Code-Switching in the Content-Based Foreign Language Classroom." *Canadian Modern Language Review* (forthcoming).
- Long, Michael H. "The Role of the Linguistic Environment in Second Language Acquisition." *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*. Ed. William C. Ritchie and Tej K. Bhatia. San Diego: Academic Press, 1996. 413–68.
- Macaro, Ernesto. "Analyzing Student Teachers' Code-switching in Foreign Language Classrooms: Theories and Decision Making." *Modern Language Journal* 85.4 (2001): 531–48.
- Moore, Zena. "The Portfolio and Testing Culture." *Pathways to Culture: Readings on Teaching Culture in the Foreign Language Classroom*. Ed. Paula R. Heusinkveld. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press, 1997. 617–44.
- National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project. *Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century*. Yonkers, NY: National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project, 1999.
- Ohta, Amy Snyder. "Rethinking Interaction in SLA: Developmentally Appropriate Assistance in the Zone of Proximal Development and the Acquisition of L2 Grammar." *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Acquisition*. Ed. James P. Lantolf. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000. 51–78.
- Padilla, Amado M., Juan C. Aninao, and Hyekyung Sung. "Development and Implementation of Student Portfolios in Foreign Language Programs." *Foreign Language Annals* 29.3 (1996): 429–38.
- Pavlenko, Aneta, and James P. Lantolf. "Second Language Learning as Participation and the (Re-)Construction of Selves." *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Acquisition*. Ed. James P. Lantolf. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000. 155–78.
- Pica, Teresa. "Research on Negotiation: What Does it Reveal about Second-Language Learning Conditions, Processes and Outcomes?" *Language Learning* 44.3 (1994): 493–527.
- Richards, Jack C., and Theodore S. Rogers. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Second Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001.
- Roberts, Celia, Michael Byram, Ana Barro, Shirley Jordan, and Brian Street. *Language Learners as Ethnographers*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, 2001.
- Rogers, Everett M., and Thomas M. Steinfatt. *Intercultural Communication*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, 1999.
- Scollon, Ron, and Suzanne Wong Scollon. *Intercultural Communication*. 2nd Ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001.
- Skehan, Peter. *A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998.
- Stam, Deirdre. "The Informed Muse: The Implications of 'New Museology' for Museum Practice." *Museum Management and Curatorship* 12 (1993): 267–83.
- Swain, Merrill. "Communicative Competence: Some Roles of Comprehensible Input and Comprehensible Output in its Development." *Input in Second Language Acquisition*. Ed. Susan Gass and Carolyn Madden. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1985. 235–47.
- . "Collaborative Dialogue: Its Contribution to Second Language Learning." *American Association of Applied Linguistics Conference*. Long Beach, CA, 1995.
- . "The Output Hypothesis and Beyond: Mediating Acquisition through Collaborative Dialogue." *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Acquisition*. Ed. James P. Lantolf. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000. 97–114.
- Swain, Merrill, and Sharon Lapkin. "Interaction and Second Language Learning: Two Adolescent French Immersion Students Working Together." *Modern Language Journal* 82.3 (1998): 320–37.
- . "Task-Based Second Language Learning: The Uses of the First Language." *Language Teaching Research* 4.3 (2000): 251–74.
- Teather, Lynn. "A Museum Is a Museum...Or Is It?: Exploring Museology and the Web." *Museums and the Web: An International Conference*. Toronto, Ontario. 23 Apr. 1998.
- Tudor, Ian. *The Dynamics of the Language Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001.
- van Lier, Leo. *The Classroom and the Language Learner: Ethnography and Second-Language Classroom Research*. London: Longman, 1988.
- . *Interaction in the Language Curriculum*. London: Longman, 1996.
- Von der Ernde, Silke, and Jeffrey Schneider. "Skills, Methods, Contents: Bringing the Principles of Cultural Studies into the German Language Classroom." 37th Annual Meeting of the American Conference of Foreign Languages. San Diego, CA. 23 Apr 2004.
- Vygotsky, Lev S. *Mind in Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1978.
- Waidacher, Friedrich. "Vom Wert der Museen." *Museologie Online* 2 (2000): 1–20. 19 Jan. 2004 <http://www.vl-museen.de/m-online/00/00-1.pdf>.
- Wellmon, Chad. "Rethinking 'Communicative Competence': The Problem of Language and Culture Dichotomies in German Departments." 37th Annual Meeting of the American Conference of Foreign Languages. San Diego, CA. 23 Apr 2004.
- Wenger, Etienne. *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998.

Appendix. Sample Syllabus “Creating the *Museum der deutschen Kultur(en)*”: Course Description, Goals, and Policies

“*Das Museum der deutschen Kultur(en)*” is exciting and new in every regard. Where can you visit this fantastic place? You can’t, because it doesn’t exist yet! Your mission in German 2B, should you choose to accept it, is to conceptualize and create this interesting and innovative museum with your classmates! Join us for this exciting, engaging German course.

Goals

This is a very special, and somewhat new, type of course, yet it is one that contributes well to the goals of our overall lower-division curriculum. We have two main goals for this course. First, the “language goal” for the course is to help you transition with German from the beginning to the intermediate level. Thus, we will focus equally throughout the quarter on listening comprehension, speaking, reading, writing, and cultural literacy. As with the first year-courses and 2A, we orient the course toward a simple, long-term language goal: If you were to land in a German-speaking country after six quarters of UCI German, we would want you to be able to interact and communicate in German in an easy (yet sophisticated), enjoyable, culturally appropriate, and of course stress-free manner. Additionally, we want you to have strong intermediate level reading and writing skills. Lastly, the program should serve as the solid foundation for advanced study of German.

Our second main goal for the course is to contribute to your education in ways not directly related to German. Specifically, we want to help you develop critical thinking and discourse skills. We regard language learning as a valuable humanistic endeavor in its own right, one that should contribute meaningfully to your personal and professional development. To this end, we will learn the rudiments of museology (What’s that? We’ll find out together...) and cultural theory in order to look critically at German culture(s). We have set up this course as a ten-week, rather sophisticated *simulation*. We call it “Creating the Virtual Museum of German Culture(s).”

Defining a Simulation

Essentially, a simulation is a classroom experience that has two very important features:

- **Each participant plays her or himself** (you don’t have to be an actor) **but takes on a functional or professional role of some kind** (i.e., as a journalist, a product designer, a customer, a judge...). As a group you work together in your respective roles to achieve a variety of goals.

- In order for the participants to succeed in their functional or professional roles, sufficient information must be provided so that each person can succeed at each stage of the project. You must have access to, be exposed to, and actively work with materials and issues dealing with the simulation (i.e. maps, readings, documents, newspaper items, ethical dilemmas...). The important thing is that **you and your classmates should never make up or invent key facts about the simulated project**. My job as instructor will be to either provide you with such materials, or else guide you in obtaining and working with them.

Characteristics of a Simulation

Simulations differ from traditional “role-playing” activities in that they are not improvised dramas or isolated, episodic dramatic events in which you play other people and act out situations (as you have done in your previous German courses). For example, in this particular simulation, you, as a professional researcher, must first research and discuss pertinent information in collaboration with classmates, as you would in the “real” world, before carrying out a task or project.

This does not mean, however, that a simulation aims to reproduce “reality.” It is an abstraction of reality. If it were not, you would have difficulty completing it in the few days and weeks we have. Hence, our simulation involves characters (you and your classmates) and situations that are plausible and consistent with the real world, but you should accept the idea that we will limit the level of real-life complexity (e.g., we likely won’t be dealing with fund-raising issues in our fictional museum... Hurray!). But our simulation will involve real world issues and ethics and include, and real world dilemmas and problems.

As you can imagine, such an environment gives you a greater responsibility for learning than in many other types of courses. It also provides you with more autonomy in the classroom. As professionals, you have primary power and authority over your experiences, not the instructor. You determine largely how to proceed. You cope with developments and problems that arise. You are in charge of gathering information, discussing what to do with that information, and deciding how best to proceed toward accomplishing the group goals.

Frankly speaking, a simulation is “owned” by its participants. This is precisely why I, as the instructor, will not view myself as the director of the simulated events. I will participate as a “facilitator” of the events in the simulation, and as an organizer of the authentic materials and real life issues, designer of certain activities, etc. But it is important for you to seize the reigns of your course early on, so that you may obtain the maximum benefit and enjoyment from it. *Viel Spass!*

Evaluation, Policies, and Study Tips

Evaluation of your performance in the course will take several forms. You'll take two tests, one comprehensive final exam, and several quizzes based on the course project, and on our grammar textbook. You will also be evaluated on your development in spoken German and turn in homework assignments related to the simulation and grammar topics. Lastly, you'll be evaluated in some detail based on how, and how well, you participate in class.

Exams (10% each; 30% Total)
3 Tests (10% each = 30%)

There will be three 50-minute exams (see *Stundenplan* below), covering the simulation's *Themen* as well as the grammar topics we'll be working through.

Oral Performance (7.5% + 7.5% = 15%)

During the quarter you will receive two grades for your oral performance in German. In the process I will ask you to self-assess your development in this area.

Participation (20%)

Because a great deal of what you will learn will depend on doing (speaking, writing etc.), active, enthusiastic class participation is essential to a successful course. As with oral skills, I will ask you to participate in your evaluation.

Video Interview (10%)

Beginning around the midterm, you will begin work on a short video clip to be included in your final project/presentation. The genre of the clip will be an interview; you will be asked to interview a native speaker of German who can contribute something to your group's work on the museum. We will spend class time preparing your interview questions and practicing interview techniques. Your video clips will be digitized by the HIRC so you can include them on the museum's website.

Portfolio (30%)

During the 5th or 6th week of the quarter and then again in the 9th or 10th week I will collect your "portfolio." This is a folder containing the sum of your work in the course. This portfolio is a good way to give you some credit not only for the product or result of your work, but

also for the process, i.e., to take into account the development you undergo as you engage in course tasks and activities and improve your German. The folder should contain your writing texts, your video clip, homework assignments and quizzes (preferably with self-corrections evident), lists (or cards, or pictures) of vocabulary items you have been learning, and notes from group activities in our class.

The portfolio is made up of the following components:

Extensives schreiben (10%)

Each week of the course, you will be asked to turn in a written text (1-2 pages; double-spaced; must be typed; see instructions and guidelines page for further information). For the assignments in the 2nd through the 4th weeks I will either assign a specific topic to the entire class, or else you may choose a topic of interest to you, provided it is related to course themes/projects.

Notizen, Vokabular, Bilder, andere Materialien (5%)

In addition to your written assignments, other homework assignments, you collect *everything* that you create that is related to this course in your portfolio. These include especially your notes and vocabulary work.

Quizzes, Audio Exercises, Other Homework (15%)

Quizzes

During the course of the quarter, at intervals between exams, there will be occasional short (15–20 minute) quizzes based on current material and vocabulary.

Audio Exercises

These are exercises that accompany the *Handbuch zur Deutschen Grammatik* audio tapes. Although you are expected to do these a few at a time over the course of a chapter, the sheets (found in the *Übungsbuch*) are due at the beginning of each exam hour (except for the last one, which is due in the last class week).

Homework

Written homework is an important part of this course. Assignments will either be activities in the *Handbuch zur deutschen Grammatik*, or else short assignments related to the simulation.

German 2B. Das Museum der deutschen Kultur(en)		
Woche 0		
Tag	In der Klasse	Zu Hause
	Einführung in den Kurs Kursplan diskutieren	
Woche 1. Einstieg in das Projekt und Landeskunde Ziele: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Das Kursprojekt verstehen; Lesestrategien lernen und diskutieren. • Deutsche Landeskunde untersuchen, über Regionen und Städte lernen und den Standort des Museums wählen 		
Montag	Wir treffen uns heute im Computerraum! <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Den Standort des Museums untersuchen und festlegen. • Bildung von Arbeitsgruppen. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesen Sie bis Montag den ganzen Syllabus durch. • Lesen Sie sich die Anweisungen für die Standortaktivität durch und machen Sie sich Gedanken über einen möglichen Standort für das Museum.
Dienstag	Gruppenarbeit: Diskussion der Vor- und Nachteile des Standortes. Vorbereitung einer kurzen Präsentation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was finden Sie interessant und wichtig bezüglich des Standortes? • Welche Argumente für oder gegen den Standort finden Sie relevant? • Kurze Präsentation und Diskussion der Gruppenresultate im Plenum. 	Erstellen Sie eine Liste von den Vorteilen und Nachteilen Ihres Standortes.
Donnerstag	Präsentationen der Arbeitsgruppen <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Debatte und Abstimmung im Plenum über den Standort. • Abstimmung über das Thema für den ersten Grammatiktag. 	Vorbereitung der Präsentation
Freitag	Grammatiktag <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flussdiagramm über den Verlauf des gesamten Kurses von Woche 2 bis 10. 	Grammatik Hausaufgaben: TBA
Woche 2. Was ist ein Museum? Ziele: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Das Ziel für diese Woche ist es, den Begriff Museum kritisch zu betrachten und ein eigenes Konzept für unser Virtuelles Museum der deutschen Kulturen zu entwerfen. • Die Leitfragen sind: Was ist ein Museum? Wer wird durch ein Museum repräsentiert? Wozu brauchen wir überhaupt ein Museum? 		
Dienstag	Gruppenarbeit: (selbe Gruppen wie bei der Standortwahlaktivität) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Diskutieren / präsentieren Sie Ihre Museums Essays, inklusive der Kommentare der anderen Teilnehmer. 2. Erarbeiten Sie eine Liste von Kategorien, nach denen Sie ein Museum entweder gut/interessant oder schlecht/langweilig finden 3. Gruppenpräsentation, Diskussion und Brainstorming im Plenum: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was finden wir in einem Museum interessant? • Was finden wir in einem Museum langweilig? • Was ist ein gutes Museum? 	Schreibaufgabe (1) 50%: Denken Sie an ein Museum, das Sie gut kennen. Was wird in dem Museum gezeigt? Wie werden die Objekte dargestellt? Werden andere Sachen (außer Objekten) dargestellt? z.B. Geschichte, Kultur, Musik? Schreiben Sie bitte eine Seite. (doppelter Zeilenabstand) Gehen Sie zum Kurs Noteboard "Mein Museum" und posten Sie Ihren Essay. Abgabetermin: Samstag, 17. Januar um 21 Uhr.

<p>Donnerstag</p>	<p>Gruppenarbeit: 1. Diskussion über die Museen, die Sie für Ihre Hausaufgabe besucht haben. 2. Eine kurze Poster- oder Overhead Präsentation erstellen 3. Die Ergebnisse der Gruppenarbeit im Plenum präsentieren. 4. Video vom jüdischen Museum in Berlin anschauen und kritisch betrachten.</p>	<p>Gehen Sie zu den Museen. Besuchen Sie drei der aufgeführten Museen und beantworten Sie die dort gestellten Fragen. Lesen Sie das Handout zum Thema Museologie</p>
<p>Freitag</p>	<p>Wir treffen uns heute im Computerraum</p>	
<p>Woche 3. Was ist Kultur? Ziele</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Das Ziel für diese Woche ist es, den Begriff "Kultur" kritisch zu betrachten und ein eigenes Konzept zum aktuellen "Kulturbegriff" zu entwickeln. • Die Leitfragen sind: Was ist Kultur? Wer macht Kultur? Wer bestimmt, was Kultur ist? Welche Konsequenzen hat dies für unser Projekt? 		
<p>Dienstag</p>	<p>1. Gruppenarbeit: Diskutieren Sie einige "Brennpunkt Kultur" Artikel im "Vorsprung" Textbuch und erstellen Sie zusammen eine Liste der kulturellen Themen, die in dem Buch genannt werden. 2. Plenumdiskussion: Noch einmal: Was ist Kultur? 3. Gruppen- und Plenumdiskussion über den Artikel (siehe Link in Hausaufgaben für Dienstag):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kultur und Perspektiven (kulturelle Identität): Nehmen Sie eine andere kulturelle Identität an und interpretieren Sie ein Bild (oder Kunstwerk) aus dieser Perspektive. Vergleichen Sie Ihre Eindrücke mit den Eindrücken eines anderen Kursteilnehmers. Die Bilder und Fragen zur Identität finden Sie unter dieser URL. 	<p>1. Schauen Sie noch einmal in Ihr altes <i>Vorsprung</i> Textbuch und überfliegen Sie eine Auswahl von "Brennpunkt Kultur"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was wird im Buch als Kultur dargestellt? • Machen Sie eine Liste der Kulturthemen <p>2. Lesen Sie den folgenden Artikel zum Thema "Kultur und Perspektiven" und beantworten Sie die Fragen zum Text.</p>
<p>Donnerstag</p>	<p>1. Gruppendiskussion / Brainstorming</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was für Kulturen gibt es in den USA? • Anschließend: Ergebnisse in Plenumdiskussion zusammentragen. <p>2. <i>Im Plenum oder in Gruppen:</i> Wie wertvoll sind diese Kulturen? Gibt es gute und schlechte Kulturen? Relevante und irrelevante Kulturen?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bilder • Musik • Alltagskultur <p>Was passiert, wenn wir Kultur klassifizieren?</p>	<p>1. Lesen Sie den folgenden Artikel zum Thema "Interpretationen zum Thema Kultur"</p> <p>2. und beantworten Sie die Fragen zum Text.</p> <p>3. Gehen Sie zum Noteboard "Interpretationen zum Thema Kultur" und schreiben Sie auf dem Noteboard Ihre persönliche Antwort an den Artikel.</p> <p>Die Leitfragen sind:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welche Konsequenzen ergeben sich daraus für den Inhalt unseres Museums? • Was betrachten wir als Kultur?

Freitag	<p>1. Gruppendiskussion / Brainstorming</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welche Kultur Kategorien wurden im <i>Vorsprung</i> Textbuch verwendet? • Reflektieren diese Kategorien eine vielseitige Perspektive zur Frage der deutschen Kulturen? <p>2. Im Plenum oder in Gruppen: Nach welchen Prinzipien sollen wir den kulturellen Inhalt unseres Museums bestimmen? Was sollen wir aufnehmen und warum? Welche Rolle nehmen wir bei dieser Entscheidung ein? Was finden wir wichtig?</p>	<p>Schauen Sie noch einmal die "Brennpunkt Artikel" im <i>Vorsprung</i> Textbuch an und bedenken Sie dabei die folgenden Fragen:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Inwiefern repräsentieren sie die Vielfalt der deutschen Kulturen? 2. Nach welchen Kriterien wurden Ihrer Meinung nach die kulturelle Themen für das Buch ausgewählt?
<p>Woche 4. Einstieg in Aktivitäten der Arbeitsgruppe</p> <p>Ziele:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Umsetzung der Erkenntnisse über Kultur und Museen in konkrete Konzepte. • Zu diesem Zeitpunkt haben sich bereits Arbeitsgruppen gebildet. Die Gruppen sollten nun einer allgemeinen Vorstellung ihres Themas gefunden haben. <p>Das Ziel für diese ersten Tage ist daher: Definition eines Arbeitsschwerpunkts innerhalb des Themas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eine <i>online</i> Selbstdarstellung der Arbeitsgruppenmitglieder und eine detaillierte Präsentation der geplanten Projekte. • Übung von <i>Peer Editing</i> anhand erster Texte (Selbstdarstellungen und Themen Definition). 		
<p>Woche 5. Erste Ergebnisse der Arbeitsgruppen, erster Internet Auftritt</p> <p>Ziele:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fortsetzung in Arbeitsgruppen: Inhalte weiter entwickeln. • Gemeinsame Erarbeitung eines Arbeitsgruppenprofils für die erste Sitzung des Kuratoriums. • Erste Ergebnisse aufs Internet hinaufladen. • Arbeitsgruppenübergreifende Kommunikation in der Sitzung des Kuratoriums. 		
<p>Woche 6. Das Interview Projekt</p> <p>Ziele</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kritische Analyse authentischer Interviews • Erstellung von Kriterien und Richtlinien zur Entwicklung des Interview 		
<p>Woche 7. Vom Interview zurück zu den Projekten der Abteilungen</p> <p>Ziele:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interview Projekte fortführen • In den Abteilungen (Arbeitsgruppen) die Gestaltungen des Museumsraums diskutieren. • Brainstorming für die Web-Seite. • Arbeitsplan für die nächsten 3 Wochen entwerfen. 		
<p>Woche 8. Intensive Projektarbeit (a)</p> <p>Ziele:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews durchführen, redigieren und für die Präsentation am Freitag vorbereiten. • Focus auf inhaltliche Arbeit der Abteilung. Was wird dargestellt? Wie? Welche Medien werden eingesetzt? Etc. • Update der Web-Site Posterboards und Gestaltung der eigentlichen Internet Web-Site 		

<p>Montag</p>	<p>Wir treffen uns heute im Computerraum!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ist das Interview durchgeführt worden? Wenn nicht, warum nicht? • Wie soll das Interview am Freitag präsentiert werden? Was sollen die Handouts enthalten? • <i>Inhaltliche Arbeit am Projekt:</i> Was haben die Mitglieder der Arbeitsgruppe über das Wochenende produziert? Wie kann es verbessert werden? etc. • Neugestaltung der Web-Site gestützt auf: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. die Ergebnisse der Sitzung am Freitag 2. Diskussion der mitgebrachten Arbeiten 	<p><i>50% Essay (eine Seite):</i> Konsequenzen aus der Sitzung vom Freitag. Waren Sie mit dem Verlauf der Sitzung zufrieden? Was könnte man verbessern? etc. Wie haben die Kommentare der anderen Seminarteilnehmer die Gestaltung ihres Projektes beeinflusst?</p> <p><i>50% Arbeit am Projekt (1):</i> Konkrete Arbeit am Projekt. Was Sie hier machen entscheidet Ihre Arbeitsgruppe am Freitag nach der Sitzung. Alle Seminarteilnehmer bereiten weiteres Material über das Wochenende vor und diskutieren es am Montag in ihrer Arbeitsgruppe. Als Hausaufgabe reichen Sie bitte eine Kopie ihrer bisherigen Arbeit am Projekt ein.</p>
<p>Dienstag</p>	<p>Fortführung der Arbeit von Montag</p>	<p><i>Arbeit am Projekt (2):</i> Konkrete Arbeit am Projekt. Was Sie hier machen entscheidet Ihre Arbeitsgruppe am Montag am Ende des Seminars. Alle Seminarteilnehmer arbeiten weiter an ihrem Material und diskutieren es am Dienstag in ihrer Arbeitsgruppe. Als Hausaufgabe reichen Sie bitte eine Kopie ihrer Arbeit am bisherigen Projekt ein.</p>
<p>Donnerstag</p>	<p>Grammatiktag</p>	<p><i>Arbeit am Projekt (3):</i> Konkrete Arbeit am Projekt. Was Sie hier machen entscheidet Ihre Arbeitsgruppe am Dienstag am Ende des Seminars. Alle Seminarteilnehmer arbeiten weiter an ihrem Material und diskutieren es am Dienstag in ihrer Arbeitsgruppe. Als Hausaufgabe reichen Sie bitte eine Kopie ihrer Arbeit am bisherigen Projekt ein.</p>
<p>Freitag</p>	<p><i>Vierte Sitzung des Kuratoriums:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Präsentation der fertigen Video Interviews mit Kommentar? • Berichte aus den Abteilungen 	<p><i>Gruppenhausaufgabe (B):</i> Vorbereitung der Vierten Sitzung des Kuratoriums: Koordinieren Sie mit ihren Kollegen, wie sie Ihr bisheriges Material kurz und informativ präsentieren können. Ein(e) Student(in) sollte seine/ihre Ideen auf dem Noteboard zusammenfassen.</p>
<p>Woche 9. Intensive Projektarbeit (b) Ziele:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus auf inhaltliche Arbeit der Abteilung. Was wird dargestellt? Wie? Welche Medien werden eingesetzt? Etc. • Weitere Gestaltung der Internet Web-Seite 		
<p>Woche 10. Intensive Projektarbeit (c) "Präsentationen" Feedback Ziele:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abschluss des Gesamtprojekts • Zeitlich streng terminiertes "Take-Home Final" • Feedback von den Studenten • Präsentation 		

Montag	Wir treffen uns heute im Computerraum! Kursbewertungen! Abschluss der Projektarbeiten: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vorbereitung auf die Präsentationen am Donnerstag. • Diskussion des Take-Home Finals Das Take-Home Final (3) wird am Nachmittag auf dem Seminar Noteboard gepostet.	Kommentieren Sie die Präsentationen der anderen Gruppen: Gehen Sie zum Noteboard Die Abteilungen / Projekte des Museums. Klicken Sie auf Ihre "Vierte Sitzung des Kuratoriums, 5.März." Im "Subjekt" Feld finden Sie den Namen der Abteilungen. Klicken Sie auf jede Abteilung und geben Sie Ihren Kollegen konstruktives Feedback. Am besten machen Sie diese Hausaufgabe Freitag Nachmittag, wenn Sie sich noch an alle Präsentationen erinnern können. Absolute Deadline: Montag, 8.März, 8 Uhr morgens.
Dienstag	Feedback Diskussion über den Verlauf des gesamten Projektes (auf Englisch)	Take Home Final ist heute fällig! Gehen Sie zum Noteboard "Take Home Final". Laden Sie das Final herunter (=download the final), schreiben Sie dann Ihr Final auf Ihrem Computer und schicken Sie es per E-Mail an Ihren Lehrer.
Donnerstag	Präsentationen aller Abteilungen des Virtuellen Museums der deutschen Kultur(en)	
Freitag	Letzte Sitzung des Kuratoriums: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informelle Gespräche über das Projekt • (mit Essen und Getränken) 	

TIPP: Kings and Peasants

Students practice: Formal and Informal forms of address.

(Sie, du, Ihr, dein, mein)

Level: Beginning through Intermediate Levels

Preparation Time: None.

As students walk into the classroom they receive an index card indicating whether they are a king/queen or a peasant. The king/queen receives a Burger King crown to indicate his/her status. So in Game #1 (Hast du meinen Hut), students would have to say "Haben

Sie meinen Hut?" to a king or queen, but "Hast du meinen Hut?" to a mere peasant. Likewise the reply would be "Ja, ich habe Ihren Hut" to a king or queen, and "Ja, ich habe deinen Hut" to a peasant. This works very well and is a lot of fun because students pretend to be really insulted if someone mistakenly addresses them with "du."

*Catherine Theresa Johnson
Georgia Southern University*