Joachim Grzega

Learning By Teaching
The Didactic Model LdL in University Classes[1]

Within the European Union's "Bologna Process" all university study programs in Europe are to be given parallel structures. The basic goals that are associated with this process have always appealed to me as the principles of my own seminars even before "Bologna" were similar to them. These principles are:

- teaching a core knowledge
- teaching key qualifications ("soft skills") and methodological competence
- encouraging students to delve more thoroughly into specific aspects of a topic and to carry out their own research; supporting students in their own projects
- teaching students the skills to transfer information and knowledge and to present knowledge in a way that is also intelligible to a general public ("intelligible arts and science").

What we need in today's world are generalists who, thanks to their broad general knowledge, are capable, if need be, of familiarizing themselves rapidly with different disciplines, jobs and tasks. For this, teachers must offer their students orientation, give them freedom, and demand account from them about their work.

Since I started as a university teacher I have been using *LdL* as my didactic concept. *LdL* stands for the German label "Lernen durch Lehren", which means "Learning by Teaching". The fundamental principle is to hand over as much teaching responsibility to the learner as possible and to encourage as many students as possible to engage in the highest possible degree of activity. The team of students placed in charge of the lesson must think of appropriate teaching methods to convey their topic (i.e. chalk and talk, ex-cathedra teaching, working in pairs, group work, discussion, etc.). The role of the teacher consists in preparing, supporting, moderating and supervising.

The following article is intended to introduce the basic ideas of LdL and give some advice for the design of university courses according to LdL.

1. The Concept of *LdL*

LdL's "father" is Jean-Pol Martin, Professor of the didactics of French language and literature, at the University of Eichstätt-Ingolstadt, Germany. Martin has been developing the concept of "Learning by Teaching" since the 1980's, continuously improving this method and extending it from pure language classes to other areas of learning and living; this is shown by a comparison of his publications over the last two decades (e.g. Martin 1985, 1994, 1998, 2001, 2002). Many of his works and further information are provided on Martin's homepage http://www.ldl.de. Martin used the method "Learning by Teaching" for the first time in his French lessons at high-schools. He had found out that the dilemma that had been caused by the so-called "communicative turn" in foreign-language teaching could be solved with the help of LdL. With the "communicative turn" educators finally realized that students participate much more in class when they are allowed to talk about themselves and their own life; but as a result there was not enough focus on grammatical competence. Martin's solution was to have the students teach grammar chapters themselves. With this, the students were enabled to train grammatical as well as communicative competence and to acquire "hard skills" as well as "soft skills".

[1] I thank my colleague, the Rev. Susan Johnson, for linguistic and stylistic advice.

But LdL means much more: LdL encourages and demands creativity, independence, self-confidence and fundamental key qualifications (i.e. the ability to work in a team, complex thinking, the competence to seek and find information, explorative behavior, presentation skills, project competence, internet competence, generating knowledge as well as disciplinary virtues like punctuality, reliability, patience). With LdL you give up the unrealistic linearity of classroom teaching. Rather, LdL confronts students with the realistic uncertainties in life (which have even been increasing with the spread of the internet); students have to cope with the uncertainties of life and learn to make complex topics more and more linear and thus to develop quantitatively and qualitatively improved cognitive maps. Martin shows that human beings strive for (systematically) increasing of their competence of being in (mental) control of various walks of life and fields of study ("control competence"). The achievement of this "control", according to Martin, leads to "flow effects", i.e. great intrinsic satisfaction and feelings of happiness. This also means that the results should give pleasure even if the route to achieving them is arduous.

Martin runs his classes like a company and sees himself in the role of an executive manager (cf. Martin 1999). Another metaphor Martin uses is the mind metaphor, in which the members of the class are seen as neurons with their different responsibilities and competences. Readers who want to gain further insight into the anthropological basis of LdL should also study some of the new findings from learning psychology and management (Martin's metaphor of the class as a company can be transferred to university classes as well). With this concept the expectations from classroom sessions gradually increase: the students strive to improve the quality of their presentation. LdL also takes into consideration the current development from an information society to a knowledge society. A momentous quality in a knowledge is to attract people's attention; we could say that an important "currency" of knowledge societies is attention (cf. e.g. Franck 1998, Davis/Meyer 1998). But already since Pestalozzi it has been claimed that the teacher does not have to feel responsible only for the education of mind and hand, but also for the education of the heart. Martin regards the teaching of "world improvement" competence (cf. Martin 2002) through passing on knowledge as a main duty of teachers.

2. *LdL* as a Didactic Model for University Classes

After Martin and others had tested LdL successfully in foreign-language classes, it became obvious that LdL could be used in any subject, in any kind of school and with all age groups. The effectivity of LdL was so evident that I was surprised that, apart from Martin, I was the only teacher at my university in the late 1990's to use this method in class (there were some who thought they used LdL, but what they did was ask the student to give oral presentations every lesson which they briefly commented on at the end). I was therefore very happy to be able to try out LdL myself as an instructor of English and General Linguistics in different kinds of courses—to different degrees, in different variations, with methodological modifications, with groups of various sizes. LdL is unfortunately still not very common at the university level[2], although the competence that students can achieve in LdL classes are illustrated by the "knowledge containers" that some of them have created and presented on Martin's homepage (www.ldl.de) or the project homepages and papers that some of my students present on my website "Sprachwissenschaft für die Öffentlichkeit" ("Linguistics for

[2] LdL was made a subject of discussion for language courses at university (cf. Pfeiffer/Rusam 1992, Skinner 1994); concerning the use of LdL in other, "academic" university courses there are, apart from my own articles (Grzega 2003, 2005) only two introductory, general essays by Meyer (1994a, 1994b) and only one concrete study on the use of LdL namely that by Robert Luff (2001) for a basic seminar on Middle High German.

the General Public", www1.ku-eichstaett.de/SLF/EngluVglSW/schule.htm or via www.grzega.de). In the projects on my internet site students show that they have already acquired a comparatively high competence in academic research, which is why I would like to expand the formula "Learning by Teaching" by the formula "Learning by Teaching and Doing Research" (= "Lernen durch Lehren und Forschen" = "LdL&F"). I myself have already written two reports (in German) on my experiences for Martin's homepage (Grzega 2003, 2005). This present contribution is a combined version of these articles and is aimed at an international audience. Although my experience and the examples presented here are all based on linguistics classes, the principles can be applied to classes in any other discipline as well.

2.1. Preliminary Considerations for a Course

Before the start of the course the instructor should have a well-worked-out concept for the course. This concept should be based on the following considerations, which I consider of paramount importance:

(a) Are the course contents and learning targets fixed by any inofficial or official regulations (e.g. in introductory courses) or does the instructor have choices?

In the latter case this freedom should be taken advantage of. Then the slogan should be: less is more. There are two basic types of courses: (1) students are predominantly to acquire important information and knowledge, nevertheless with some degree of choice as regards questions, problems and topics, (2) students are to do research. For the first type a reasonable basis for grading (apart from leading one of the sessions) is a final exam, covering tasks of "the reproduction of facts/contents", "the reorganization of facts/contents", "transfer" and "free association". For the second type of course, the first part (about one fourth) of the seminar should be reserved for providing the students with a basic core knowledge on methodology and contents (always according to the LdL method, of course); the rest of the seminar is dedicated to projects that students have to select and work on on their own.

(b) Should the course be based on a particular textbook or not?

If there is no particular textbook used in the course, the instructor must be especially careful to make clear to the students what the learning targets and the important contents are. The instructor has to explain the "central theme" of the course, how students can prepare and how they can go over the contents again. Having teams not only for leading the session but also for summarizing it has proven very effective. This procedure has several advantages: one, students have the chance to concentrate better on the actual content of the session because they know that they will get the most important points in written form at the end; two, each participant is forced to go deeper not only into one but into two topics; three, students have a greater chance to practice their ability to work in a team. This also makes sense in courses which do have a particular textbook as a basis. If there are no written summaries, the team that leads the session should at least give references to the relevant paragraphs in the textbook. Ideally, the instructor or the team in charge should point out the most important passages or terms in the textbook so that the students can prepare well for a session.

(c) How should the instructor grade students' performances?

Term papers, websites, oral exams or written tests can basically all serve as a means to check the achievement of the learning targets. With all these methods – but especially in the written test – students should show their abilities in "reproduction", "reorganization", "transfer" and "free-association" tasks. According to my personal experience, it is good and fair to give the students a certain amount of choice (e.g. "Answer 5 of the following 8 questions."). Regarding term papers and homepages it is a good idea to hand out an explanatory sheet regarding the requirements as far as the content and the formal aspects are concerned (style sheet). The grading should be done by way of a commentary (review) that explains to students their strong as well as their weak points. The students should get the chance to revise their work and hand it in a second time. Teamwork should also be allowed (or required).

(d) Is it a course in which the students are familiar with the technical terminology or will they have to learn a "new language"?

In the latter case, the course seems more efficient if the technical terminology is first introduced by the instructor. This does not mean that there has to be ex-cathedra teaching. I usually present a problem and ask the students to describe their observations in "everyday language" (first in pairs or groups of three to four[3], then the findings are discussed in class). Afterwards, I explain how the expert would describe the problem, writing the technical terms on the blackboard or on a transparency. In the next session the students can be in charge of the revision part of the session. For some topics it might make sense to have students read an introductory chapter as preparation for the following lesson. Depending on the course, several teams of experts could be formed for different subject areas; after the first half of the term, the group topics can be changed.

(e) Should LdL be introduced step by step or should the students be thrown in at the deep end?

Students not yet familiar with LdL should get the chance to simply watch an LdL lesson first. They should only be asked to do small tasks according to the LdL method. For example, they can be given a text to work on in pairs or groups and two students will be asked to lead the discussion afterwards. While the rest of the class is working in pairs or groups, the two students selected as moderators will be given important advice on the content and the methodological conception by the instructor (the important points concerning the content are written down or marked in the text; the most important points regarding the method can be given orally or on an index card: "Ask for an explanation and examples to illustrate an answer. Ask your fellow students to paraphrase the answer if necessary. Ask your fellow students to give their opinions. Summarize the most important answers at the end."). Another possibility to familiarize students with LdL gradually is to have them prepare the revision part of a session. Revision parts have proven successful if they consist of three elements: first, a task to check students' knowledge ("contents reproduction"); second, a transfer task; and third, a task for free association or discussion.

(f) Will the class be a fairly small or a fairly big group?

The ideal number of participants for an LdL course is 20 to 30. If the group is bigger, the sessions have to be led by teams of three or more members rather than by a pair. If necessary, one session can be organized by several teams. There could be revision teams and "new topic" teams. If there are more than 50 students in a course, we should ask whether such courses make any sense at all (and whether the students can learn anything from them). I have managed to teach 65 students, but new difficulties have arisen, e.g. a certain lack of class discipline, which has meant that the teams and I have also had to make sure that the students really were doing what they were supposed to be doing.

(g) Will the class be a homogeneous or a heterogeneous group?

A very important element of LdL is checking the inventory of resources (in modern societies the most important resources are human resources). Therefore it is part and parcel of LdL to find out what knowledge and abilities the participants in the course have both at the beginning and as the term progresses. If there are students who want to impress the others by using (advanced) technical terms, this should be appreciated first. But the instructor then also has to

[3] If there are more than four people in a group, the effectivity diminishes to a considerable extent.

take care that the others can follow the discussion. If this is not the case, the more experienced students should be asked to reformulate their thoughts in a way that less experienced students, too, can follow the discussion. If long-term group work is planned, it is advisable to have at least one “more experienced” and one “less experienced” student in each group.

2.2. The Course

How should the course itself be structured? I usually already distribute some basic materials via e-mail before the first lesson:
- a one-page description of LdL (cf. Appendix I)
- a syllabus with the planned course structure, the requirements for credits, homework assignments, my e-mail address, deadlines, etc. (cf. Appendix II)
- an introductory paper which gives an overview of the objectives of the course, including a select bibliography (cf. Appendix III)
- examples of project designs (cf. Appendix IV)
- a style sheet for research projects (e.g. term papers, websites) (cf. Appendix V)

In addition, I put these materials on my office homepage.

The first session of a semester should be strongly focussed on meta-discussion. I refer to the materials just mentioned. I tell my students which learning targets they are supposed to achieve in the course, namely the acquisition of academic contents as well as key qualifications plus, in some classes, the completion of their own academic research (formula “LdL&F” = “Learning by Teaching and Doing Research”). It should never just be “arts and science for the sake of arts and science”; rather, I want to show that academic problems and topics have relevance for life. Ideas like “resources to attract attention” and “world improvement competence” (i.e. how can we contribute to make the world a better place) will also be touched upon. In a few words I present the basic principle of LdL. Afterwards I explain to my students how I conceive the course of a session and we discuss this together. I point out that the main goal is to activate as many students’ synapses as possible, but that otherwise there is a free choice of the manner of presentation (however, the manner of presentation should serve the content and not vice versa). It is important to be entertaining, to be somehow “different”, to offer not only facts and figures but also little stories, and to discuss the central statements with the entire group. Moreover, in the first session the instructor should attempt to find out about the students’ resources in order to guarantee a sensible formation of teams. Under 2.1. I have said that we can distinguish two course types, which affects the design of the first session.

Course type (1): acquisition of core information and core knowledge. For the preparation of a lesson the team(s) responsible—if necessary, all students—get a handout (or index cards) on the most important points that should be covered in one session. When getting the material or bibliographical references, the students should be told which material or bibliographical reference is important for which session.

Course type (2): doing research. As I’ve already said, in this type of course, the first part of the seminar (about one fourth) should be reserved for providing students with a core knowledge of the topic and basic methodological skills. During this first phase, students already think about a specific question or hypothesis that they would like to deal with more thoroughly, familiarize themselves with the relevant literature and (at least in larger classes) I try to find partners to form a team (e.g. via an internet discussion forum that the instructor opens for the class). Especially with empirical studies the instructor needs to give information on the necessary size of a corpus and the relevant empirical methods. To avoid students going down the wrong track after they have already invested a lot of time and effort, I have them hand in project designs (Appendix I is given to them as a guideline). In addition, I reserve one session to analyze extracts or summaries of projects where things went wrong (the projects are made up, but the mistakes are based on my own error-frequency analysis). The project designs thus contribute to a more economic(al) development of the seminar for both the students and the instructor. Furthermore, I have my students participate in a discussion thread on an internet forum at least once week to give updates on their projects and to assist other teams in their projects. I comment on the entries. Although this constraint is often criticized by my students, this method has proven to be very valuable since more valuable ideas are placed on the forum than if the participation were voluntary. This method has worked very well in my "Eurolinguistics" seminars where all discussion threads were united on my own internet forum *EuroLinguistiX* (www.eurolinguistix.com)[4]. For sources of information, students should be encouraged to use the university library, the internet and interviews. However, with the latter two the instructor should give a few hints as to how students can distinguish between valuable sources and useless sources. Despite the extensive recommendations that I give my students, I let them know—and this seems to be very important to me as well—that they can come and see me and ask for advice at (almost) any time. I also try to answer all e-mails within 24 hours (except over weekends and vacation periods).

For the individual groups I pay special attention to the aspects mentioned in Point 2.1. Furthermore, the leaders of the session should formulate clear tasks and be available as contact persons during team-work. The participants in the course should behave toward each other in a polite and respectful way. There may be some humorous phases as well. Basically, we want to ensure a pleasant atmosphere in the course. As a supervisor, I try to stay in the background. If the leaders of a session give wrong information or if I think that the presentation is misleading, I intervene—if possible, first in the form of questions that allow students to realize the problems and correct themselves. Hypotheses or answers which are inappropriate or incorrect should not be rejected in a disrespectful way, but in a critically supportive one. I also intervene when the moderator ignores a student's remark or question, considers it to be offensive or when the remark or question indeed sounds depreciatory. I comment on the method only at the end or after the session. The student team should also get the chance to evaluate "their session" themselves.

Nevertheless, however much care is taken, it can happen that the atmosphere in the course deteriorates for some reason. Here a phase of meta-discussion should be inserted. The reason for the deterioration in the atmosphere should be determined in a calm dialog and, if possible, be smoothed out. Even without noticeable problems, I always insert a phase of evaluation in mid-term: while I am outside the classroom, the students collect and discuss positive and negative aspects for about five to ten minutes. Then I enter the classroom again and one student summarizes all the aspects voiced, without mentioning names. I listen carefully and ask for clarification when there is something I don't understand. Afterwards I tell the studens what I myself have experienced as positive in the course so far and then respond to their points of criticism. If necessary, I have to remind them of the fundamental ideas of LdL. We might also take up some of their ideas for the rest of the semester.

Confusion that may have arisen due to a lack of linearity must definitely be straightened out into linearity *a posteriori*. I summarize everything that is important at the end of a session (if necessary, I additionally draw attention to "issues of a broader, societal relevance") or I make sure that this is also done by the leaders of the session. In courses without a particular textbook there is occasionally not only a team for leading the session but also a team that writes a summary which is corrected by me and then disseminated to everybody (via e-mail).

[4] Otherwise I use www.zum.de, the central forum for teaching materials for German teachers.

Thus, it is ensured that every participant in the course explores two topics instead of only one. Knowing that there will be a written summary, the students will be more willing to concentrate on the content. They discuss and criticize, form theses and antitheses, discover uncertainties, want more information, apply new terms and cognitive patterns to unfamiliar cases as if they had been au fait with them forever, are proud to be in mental control of more and more fields – and in this way they become young “researchers”.

2.3. Examining Learning Targets at the End of a Course

In Point 2.1 above I described under question (c) which facets should be tested in a seminar project or in an exam in order to support the students in their preparation for a knowledge society. These are essentially the traditional exercise types of reproduction of facts/contents, reorganisation of facts/contents, transfer and creative discussion.

If there is a written exam, I usually offer the students an optional mock exam halfway through the semester; many participants even want a “real” exam in the middle that counts toward the final grade. I made the interesting observation in courses with students from the first and second semesters that they complete the transfer exercise better in the final than in the mid-term exam and that they have the impression that the final exam is easier (although I make sure, of course, that both exams are well-balanced). This seems to be a clear indicator that they have improved—thanks to LdL—in handling information and knowledge during the course of the semester.

Many students show great commitment and explorative behavior when writing their term papers (as long as they do not have too many other things to do during vacation). Of course, the instructor has to give the students topics which allow them to act as “explorative researchers.” These could, for example, be empirical studies, contrastive studies, “fiddly” tasks, or research overviews (though not of the dimensions of an M.A. thesis). Again, I would like to stress the importance of giving the students guidance on how to carry out their projects. This should comprise recommendations for the research of literature (research of information), for the familiarization and evaluation of literature, for the method and the form. It can happen that students’ first drafts are not very successful; then the students must get the chance to improve their work based on well-explained critique. Well written papers could be published on the internet. Some may be useful for the instructor’s own work, which s/he should acknowledge then (in a footnote, for instance)—again, the keyword is “attention as a modern currency”.

2.4. The Instructor’s Time Management

LdL classes have been fruitful not only for my students, but also for myself. Since students have to come up with ideas, carry out research and talk about themselves and their experiences, I also observe and get to know a lot of things I would otherwise not have had the chance to. However, as already pointed out, LdL requires more (and constant) preparation and tutoring on the part of the instructor. Consequently, I would like to offer some advice for better time management:

- Some student questions can be dubbed “frequently asked questions.” For these I’ve prepared standard e-mails, which I’ve saved in a separate text file and copy into e-mails (text examples cf. Appendix VI).
- In my early terms as a university teacher, when correcting exams, I noted down a lot of comments and corrections directly on the students’ papers. Due to the increased size of student groups this is no longer possible, so that now my comments are fairly few and a master solution is sent out to everyone via e-mail.

- While in my early terms as a university teacher I gave every student in my introductory classes individual advice on their further studies, based on their performance in class and in the exam, I now hand out general recommendations. In these recommendations I ask students to compare their exam in my course with their results in other exams and to check themselves whether they have recurrent problems with specific types of tasks: (a) reproduction tasks, (b) reorganization tasks, (c) transfer tasks or (d) essay tasks. For problems with types (a) and (b) I advise them to reflect on their study techniques and to keep in mind that they shouldn't simply learn things by heart, but that they must also really understand them; one aid may be to look for books that include exercises with solutions. In the case of problems with types (c) and (d) I tell them that they either need to train systematic thinking (especially if I've written remarks such as "Illogical!" or "No connection!") or to improve their style (especially if I've written "Unclear!"). In the first instance, I advise students to actively deal with grammar rules, philosophical topics, mathematical problems, political problems, economic problems, the analysis of pieces of music, the classification of buildings and paintings; in the second instance, I advise students to consciously pay attention to the style of quality papers or specific authors. Of course, the students can always come and talk about their problems with me personally.
- I still write reports, or reviews, on student papers as individual, fleshed out texts, but, of course, a more formalized procedure is also possible (e.g. a table where different aspects can be marked or commented on, cf. Appendix VII as an example). (In addition, I also add remarks directly on the manuscripts that the students hand in). Occasionally, it might also make sense to have the students comment on their performances by their peers (cf. Appendix VIII as an example, which I use when I cannot be present at a session and the students have to manage everything by themselves).
- Instead of separate library tours (which cost me a session or extra time), one of the homework assignments for the students is a "library quiz". In order to answer questions on this "library work" students must at least once have had relevant books in their hands, stood in front of the most important library shelves, consulted the most important bibliographical sources and familiarized themselves with the library system.

3. Frequently Raised Criticism Against LdL

In this paragraph I want to comment on a few points of criticism frequently articulated by students and, especially by colleagues, against LdL.

(a) With LdL one can get through less material because not everything is offered in a linear way.

This might be true (although Martin's classes show us something else). But who wants to get through as much material as possible if then the students may have presented a lot of information, but are in fact unable to understand the information or use it correctly? Less is more. Quality must be valued more than quantity! Students need knowledge but they must also know how to use it. Therefore, examples should be collected (as a corpus to be examined); then the students, as young scholars, should identify and formulate rules by way of an inductive approach. This way they learn to control new fields (key word "cognitive map").

(b) Students cannot cope with the presentation of academic material because they do not have the necessary overall knowledge.

To begin with, it must be pointed out that instructors do not have the right to confront their students with unchallenging tasks. Moreover, they must not lead their students into passiveness, nonage, and intellectual impoverishment. Instructors should not suppress their students' natural curiosity and destroy it through demotivation. Therefore, research and teaching must not be seen as separate entities but must be combined. Again, the formula LdL could actually be enlarged as *LdL&F = Lernen durch Lehren und Forschen = Learning by Teching and Doing Research*. The university has to be turned into a big laboratory and should offer students a platform for self-fulfillment. Students are very often underestimated, not overtaxed. There are many studies in learning and motivation psychology that show that the cognitive effects are much greater when students are a little overtaxed than when students are underestimated. Only in this way is the acquisition of key qualifications possible. Only if the students get the chance to "play" with academic problems and ideas in different ways, only if they can try out in what ways academic contents can be presented, only if they can "grasp" a problem physically, only then will they also "grasp" it cognitively.

(c) Courses held by students often do not show enough depth and have a rather unacademic character – this might sometimes have to do with the source of information (e.g. internet sources).

Actually, there is bound to be much more in-depth treatment in LdL courses because students have to delve into the academic problem much more deeply. Moreover, they can contribute their own experiences and ideas, which an instructor can never provide. Regarding the source of information, the main criticism is directed at the increased use of the internet as a source of information. This does not mean that one has to be skeptical about the internet in general. A lot of nonsense can be found in printed form as well. The students need guidance in evaluating the information from the internet. It must rather be pointed out that the internet can serve very well for the acquisition of resources (via search engines, databases, thematic homepages, e-mail distributors, discussion platforms, chat rooms, etc.). Additionally, the attempt to be orientated toward societal and practical relevance is often mistaken for being not thorough enough or for being unacademic, or unscientific. It is often forgotten that the aim of academic research is to serve society and not just academic research itself. Of course, the instructor must not ignore the official regulations of the study program, but s/he can try to make the best of these constraints.

(d) Presentations by students can never be perfect.

This might be true. But are presentations by instructors perfect (at least "always")? Moreover, "not being perfect" triggers discussion and reflection. The students deal more intensively with the material; they learn to "be in better control" of it and give their cognitive maps sharper contours.

(e) Due to the open style of teaching and the high level of activity of students there is often a time problem, i.e. the problem of not getting everything done that was planned for the session.

Indeed, this has remained a problem in my courses to date. But time pressure should not be the reason to stop lively discussions or further questions. If not everything that was planned for the session can be completed, the remaining information can be distributed in written form (via e-mail) or be supplemented in the following session. Generally, I ask my students to plan "their" sessions in a way that the last 10-15 minutes are reserved for me. I particularly point out to them that, if a group-work task lasts x minutes, then at least 1½ x minutes must be reserved for the discussion of the results. I can make use of the last 10-15 minutes for different purposes: summaries, revisions and completions of topics, information on specialized literature, meta-discussion, etc.

(f) LdL courses are disproportionately more work-intensive than "traditional" courses.

This observation that many students make in LdL courses must be taken seriously. LdL is not only associated with a relatively great cognitive effort but also with an expenditure of time students do not have to invest in many traditional courses. I try to make sure that the additional time for the organization of sessions and research (e.g. in term papers) is compensated for by less time having to be spent on homework (e.g. reading preparation) and research tasks.

(g) LdL courses often give the impression of being unstructured.
This is understandable and natural due to the open character of LdL. Therefore, it has to be guaranteed to the students that they will be offered summaries of the most important points to remember at the end of every session or every thematic unit (keyword: linearity *a posteriori*). In Point 2.2 above I elaborated different possibilities of achieving linearity *a posteriori*. On the other hand, it has to be made clear to the students that an LdL course cannot be taken successfully without preparation and revision sessions. New data, information and technical terms may already have to be dealt with for the preparation of a session. "Stabilized" knowledge may nevertheless only be achieved in going over the session again at home or in the library.

4. Summary and Outlook

I hope that the observations and thoughts I have presented here are concrete enough to demonstrate the advantages of LdL. At the same time, I hope they are general enough to show that LdL can be used in all kinds of disciplines. With LdL, students get the chance to practice complex thinking in order to generate knowledge. With LdL, research and teaching can be connected harmoniously. The most important thing is to realize that LdL is a method that allows students both to gain something for their personal development and to prepare for professional life. Students can regard participation in LdL courses as an investment for their futures.

Eichstätt and Münster, Germany, September 2005

Joachim Grzega
Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaftliche Fakultät
Katholische Universität Eichstätt-Ingolstadt
85071 Eichstätt, Germany
joachim.grzega@ku-eichstaett.de
or:
Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität
48143 Münster, Germany
grzega@uni-muenster.de
http://www.grzega.de

References

(entries marked with an asterisk are available at www.ldl.de)

Csikszentmihalyi, Mihalyi (1990), *Flow = The Psychology of Optimal Experience*, New York: Harper & Row.
Davis, Stan / Meyer, Christopher (1998), *Blur: The Speed of Change in the Connected Economy*, Reading: Addison-Wesley.
Dörner, Dietrich / Kreuzig, Heinz W. / Reither Franz (1983), *Lohhausen: Vom Umgang mit Unbestimmtheit und Komplexität*, Bern etc.: Hans Huber.
Franck, Georg (1998), *Ökonomie der Aufmerksamkeit: Ein Entwurf*, München/Wien: Hanser.
*Grzega, Joachim (2003), "LdL in universitären Kursen: Ein hochschuldidaktischer Weg zur Vorbereitung auf die Wissensgesellschaft", http://www.ldl.material/berichte/uni/uni.html

*Grzega, Joachim (2005), “Lernen durch Lehren und Forschen: Bildungs-, lehr- und lernökonomischen Hinweise und Materialien”, http://www.ldl.material/berichte/uni/uni.html

Händeler, Erik (2003), *Die Geschichte der Zukunft: Sozialverhalten heute und der Wohlstand von morgen (Kondratieffs Globalsicht)*, Moers: Brendow.

Malik, Fredmund (2000), *Führen Leisten Leben: Wirksames Management für eine neue Zeit*, Stuttgart/München: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt.

Martin, Jean-Pol (1985), *Zum Aufbau didaktischer Teilkompetenzen beim Schüler: Fremdsprachenunterricht auf der lerntheoretischen Basis des Informationsverarbeitungsansatzes*, Tübingen: Narr.

Martin, Jean-Pol (1994), *Vorschlag eines anthropologisch begründeten Curriculums für den Fremdsprachenunterricht*, Tübingen: Narr.

*Martin, Jean-Pol (1998), “‘Lernen durch Lehren’ – eine Unterrichtsmethode zur Vorbereitung auf die Arbeitswelt”, Internet-Ms. http://www.ldl.de/material/aufsatz/arbeitswelt.pdf

*Martin, Jean-Pol (1999), “Schulklasse als Betrieb: Zur Vorbereitung auf die Arbeitswelt in der gymnasialen Oberstufe”, in: Hemmer, Ingrid / Selzer, Helmut M. (eds.), *Für eine Schule der Zukunft: Fachdidaktische Beiträge*, 63-83, Dettelbach: Röll.

*Martin, Jean-Pol (2001), “‘Lernen durch Lehren’ – Vorbereitung auf die Wissensgesellschaft”, Internet-Ms. http://www.ldl.de/material/aufsatz/tuebingen.pdf

*Martin, Jean-Pol (2002), “‘Weltverbesserungskompetenz’ als Lernziel?”, *Pädagogisches Handeln: Wissenschaft und Praxis im Dialog* 6,1: 71-76.

Martin, Jean-Pol (2003), “Individuell fördern – zu Höchstleistungen führen”, Internet-Ms. http://home.arcor.de/jean-polmartin/Vortraege/tuebingen.htm

Meyer, Michael (1994a), “Praxisorientierter Seminarunterricht mit der Methode ‘Lernen durch Lehren’, in: Häberle, Dieter / Schmirber, Gisela (eds.), *Zur Zukunft der Hochschullehre – Möglichkeiten zu ihrer Verbesserung*, 82-84, München: Hanns-Seidel-Stiftung.

Meyer, Michael (1994b), “Praxis- und Persönlichkeitsbezug in der Literaturwissenschaft: Eine harte Nuß für eine brotlose Kunst?”, in: Meyer, Michael (ed.), *Vom Hörsaal zum Tat-Ort: Neue Spuren vom Hochschulunterricht?*, 41-53, Bamberg: Zentrum für Wissenschaftliche Weiterbildung der Otto-von-Freising-Universität Bamberg.

*Pfeiffer, Joachim / Rusam, Anne Margret (1992), “Der Student als Dozent: Die Methode ‘Lernen durch Lehren’ an der Universität”, in: Jung, Udo O.H. (ed.), *Praktische Handreichung für Fremdsprachenlehrer*, 425-433, Frankfurt (Main): Lang.

*Skinner, Jody Daniel (1994), “Learning by Teaching”, *Zielsprache Englisch* 1994,2: 38-39.

Stock, Johannes et al. (1998), *Delphi-Befragung 1996/1998 “Potenziale und Dimensionen der Wissensgesellschaft – Auswirkungen auf Bildungsprozesse und Bildungsstrukturen”*, Basel: Bundesministerium für Bildung, Wissenschaft, Forschung und Technologie.

Appendix I: The didactic concept of my classes

The main method applied my classes is *Lernen durch Lehren* (*LdL* = "Learning by Teaching"), which was developed in the 1980's by Jean-Pol Martin, professor of didactics at the University of Eichstätt-Ingolstadt, Germany. The fundamental idea is to encourage as many learners as possible to engage in as much activity as possible by **transferring as many teaching functions as possible to the learners themselves**. The student team responsible for the session has to come up with appropriate methods for the goals they associate with their topics (e.g. ex-cathedra lecturing, work in pairs or groups up to four, mind mapping, discussion of primary texts, text analysis, "experiments", quizzes and games in the broadest sense of the term, discussion of questions, problems that have occurred in class, etc.). The role of the teacher is that of a preparing, accompanying and supporting supervisor. LdL promotes **creativity, independence, self-confidence** and, last but not least, the highly demanded **soft skills, or key qualifications,** such as the ability to work in teams, the ability to communicate, complex thinking, the competence to seek and find information, explorative behavior, presentation skills, project competence, internet skills, **structuring information and generating knowledge**; moreover, this includes virtues such as punctuality, reliability, patience.

LdL does away with *a priori* linearity induced by ex-cathedra teaching. LdL at first confornts learners with realistic uncertainty (which has nowadays been increasing with the internet). They have to **endure uncertainties** and learn how to produce **linearity *a posteriori*** out of unordered and complex topics on their own, in teams, together with the whole class or with the supervising teacher. Thus, they create more and more refined **cognitive maps**. Pure ex-cathedra teaching (only enriched by easy question-answer games) often gives instructors the impression that many topics are being studied in a short amount of time. But only if the participation of many people is guaranteed, only if the unpredictable is enabled, can you experience situations in which you may say to yourself "I thought that was clear to everyone", maybe even "I thought that was clear to me". Often interesting questions, aspects, and experiences come up—things that someone could not have come up with themselves in the first place. Such remarks may be linked to a general problem that can be solved through joint effort. In this case, unclear situations should first be reduced. Then, via dialogue (or rather "polylogue"), impulses in the form of thesis and antithesis should lead to syntheses by way of which we can improve our ability to structure, link, and expand our cognitive maps. Preferably, all learners should be activated in order to activate as many of their synapses as possible. This is the starting point of **academic research**. Only if you work on a certain subject yourself, **only if you virtually "grasp" it, can you cognitively grasp it and understand it**. In doing so, you have to approach the subject step by step and, if possible, from different new perspectives, make your own observations, collect information and acquire comprehensive knowledge. Ideally, the cognitive map of the team in charge is palpably larger than that of the other class participants—the teams in charge should anticipate possible problems when they prepare for their session. Of course, not all possible questions and problems can be anticipated. At this point, I have to stress the importance of dialogues, or "polylogues" in class: the more participants participate in the effort to solve a problem, the more helpful and the more diverse the scraps of knowledge will be that help find solutions. In this process, the teams in charge have to pave the way for other students' aha experiences (Martin refers to this as part of the **"world improvement competence"**). The happy feeling we have when we have been allowed and able to solve a problem on our own is called **flow effect** in psychology. In our sessions, there should be as many opportunities as possible to enjoy such flow effects.

Some remarks on the form of our sessions: general, far-reaching questions can be chosen as a first starting point but also as a final point. Definitions may well be introduced ex cathedra, either *a priori* or *a posteriori*. In revisions, we should abstain from asking for definitions, but rather ask transfer or application questions, repeating a definition only if secondary problems occur. We should make sure that there is an **enjoyable and friendly atmosphere** in class. Teams should try to include elements that will be remembered "forever" (e.g. once a team drew cartoons dealing with the topics "active voice:passive voice" and "topic:comment", another team created a crossword puzzle dealing with loanwords). **Being able to attract other people's attention** is said to be one of the most important "currencies" of our time. At the end of each session, the most important points have to be summed up in order to create **linearity *a posteriori*** (e.g. by session minutes written by another team). This is vital especially if the participants let themselves in for a somewhat "unordered" form of tuition. The greatest problem in all my classes is the problem of time, because one tends to overestimate the amount of time available for the session. In general, 10 to 15 minutes are to be reserved for the "teacher". If a group or partner work assignment takes x minutes (e.g. 10 minutes), at least x + ½ x minutes (e.g. 10 + 5 = 15 minutes) have to be reserved for the discussion of it. In revision sequences, transfer questions and one discussion question (collection of ideas concerning an advanced question) should be incorporated. I am always available if questions come up during session preparation—in fact, the session should be discussed with me in advance.

Appendix IIa: First example of a syllabus

HS Applied Historical Linguistics: Explaining Modern English

Summer Semester 2005

Instructor:	Joachim GRZEGA
Office:	323 (Johannisstraße 12-20)
Phone:	(0251) xxx (Secretary: xxx, Room xxx, Phone xxx)
E-Mail:	xxx
Office Hours:	Tuesdays, 11:00-12:00 a.m.
Class Time:	Mondays, 9:15-10:45 p.m.
Room:	H19 (Johannisstraße 12-20)
Overview:	Cf. the introductory paper on my course website under http://www.anglistik.uni-muenster.de/Materialien/Grzega.
Seminar Field:	A.2-4/I.1-3, II.4-6, III.7-9
Grading:	70% test, 30% class participation (including homework assignments and presentation in class) (both parts must be passed) (You’re not allowed to be absent more than twice.)

SYLLABUS

Apr 18	organizational issues, general introduction and overview; Reading Assignment: intro paper (cf. my course website)
Apr 25	Shakespeare and Mark Twain and some of their linguistic characteristics
May 02	phonology and spelling
May 09	morphology and syntax: nouns and adjectives
May 23	morphology and syntax: pronouns
May 30	morphology: verbal system
Jun 06	syntax: verb system
Jun 13	syntax: finite and non-finite clauses (relative + other subord. clauses, -*ing* + inf. constructions)
Jun 20	lexicology: creating new words (borrowings and word-formation patterns)
Jun 27	lexicology: re-applying old words (semantic changes)
Jul 04	pragmatics (greeting, thanking, begging, etc.) and text linguistics (sermons, treaties etc.)
Jul 11	dialectology/sociolinguistics (AmE : BrE : AusE ..., Cockney, AAVE)
Jul 18	exam (90 min.)

N.B.:
permanent homework assignment = preparation of questions; there will also be additional homework assignments
Summaries of sessions must be handed by the Friday following each session.

Appendix IIa: Second example of a syllabus

HS Eurolinguistics:
European Language Culture (With Special Focus on English)

Summer Semester 2005

Instructor:	Joachim GRZEGA
Office:	323 (Johannisstraße 12-20)
Phone:	(xxx) xxx (Secretary: xxx, Room xxx, Phone xxx)
E-Mail:	xxx
Office Hours:	Tuesdays, 11:00-12:00 a.m.
Class Time:	Tuesdays, 9:15-10:45 p.m.
Room:	H17 (Johannisstraße 12-20)
Overview:	Cf. the introductory paper on my course website under http://www.anglistik.uni-muenster.de/Materialien/Grzega.
Grading:	50% seminar paper, 30% test, 20% class participation (including homework assignments and presentation in class) (all parts must be passed) (You are not allowed to be absent more than twice.)

SYLLABUS

Apr 19	organizational issues, general introduction and overview; RA: intro paper (cf. my course website)
Apr 26	linguae francae and language contacts in Europe's history; RA: cf. my course website
May 03	comparison of European language systems; RA: cf. my course website
May 10	intercultural and intracultural communication; RA: cf. my course website
May 24	Europe's linguistic future; RA: cf. my course website
May 31	projects
Jun 07	projects
Jun 14	projects
Jun 21	projects
Jun 28	projects
Jul 05	projects
Jul 12	projects
Jul 19	test (20-30 min.)

<u>N.B.:</u>
RA = reading assignment; there will also be additional homework assignments
A first draft of the project design must be handed in via e-mail by April 30, 2004 at the latest (design must include: short project name, team members, question/topic, brief description of already existing information/literature and justification of project as "new", research methods, intended form of publication)
Final versions of projects are due on September 15, 2005.

Appendix IIIa: First example of an introductory paper

Joachim Grzega, *Applied Historical Linguistics – Introductory Paper*

(Münster, 2 Feb 2005)

1. The General Idea of the Course

Historical linguistics is frequently criticized—especially by *Lehramt* students—as useless or too far away from future professional life. However, an important element of self-characterization and self-definition of every nation is always language and its history—and everybody teaching the language and the culture should also know something about its history. Moreover, I have been experiencing for many years that outside the university people are mostly interested in the *why*'s of linguistic phenomena. And this may also occur if the teacher has to deal with curious students: Why does English spelling seem so catastrophic? Why do we say *wives*, not *wifes*? Why do we say *went*, not *goed*? And what does *good-by* mean? A brief "It's just that way" is unsatisfactory to both the students and the teacher. In this seminar we shall therefore see how the knowledge of English language history helps to answer many questions on the present-day language system. The seminar will delve into all areas of language: spelling, sounds, grammar, vocabulary and communication strategies.

2. Structure of the Course

A catalog of questions will be given to the class at the beginning of the seminar. There will be specific questions for each session. Everybody is expected to have prepared these questions with the help of the books from the literature list below. Each session will be led by an expert team of 5-6 students. In addition to the questions from the catalog, each expert team is expected to come up with additional questions and tasks relevant to the topic of the session.

Each expert student team will get 80 minutes of a session for their topic. In these 80 minutes, the team should thus

(a) discuss the results of the relevant questions handed out at the beginning of the course (ca. 25 min.)
(b) give out tasks they themselves have come up with and have them discussed in class (ca. 45 min.)
(c) be open for additional questions that may come up (ca. 10 min.)

From time to time it will be necessary to illustrate or revise the structure of earlier stages of the English language in order to revise and deepen the overall knowledge. Expert teams are thus advised to be well prepared to give an outline of relevant linguistic structures with a few basic examples (e.g. on transparencies).

It is important that the lesson is structured not (at least not as a major element) in the form of a lecture up front, but in the form of activities of all participants (i.e. *Lernen durch Lehren* method as described by Grzega [2003]) (e.g. x min. group work and 1½x min. plenary discussion of results and production of *linearity a posteriori*). During group work each member of the expert team should feel responsible for two or three groups. The expert group of the preceding lesson will have to hand in a summary of the basic results by the Friday after the corresponding session. This way everybody has to deal with two topics in a more detailed way.

Despite the generally parallel structure of the lessons, the teams should nevertheless seek to give their session a personal stamp.

3. Some Recommendations for a General Revision and the Specific Topics

Here are a few literature recommendations:

- general (overview) revision: Bammesberger 1989, (Pyles 1993)
- overall treatment: Brunner 1960-62, CHEL, Faiss 1989
- Old English: CHEL, Fichte/Kemmler 1994, Mitchell/Robinson 1982, Obst/Schleburg 2004, OEC, BoTo, TOE
- Middle English: CHEL, Fichte/Kemmler 1994, Mossé 1969 & 1974, Obst/Schleburg 1999, MED
- Early Middle English: CHEL, Görlach 1994
- Shakespeare and Twain: Görlach 1994, Barber 2001, Kermode 2000, Blake 2002, CHEL VI, Mencken 1923
- phonology and spelling: Faiss 1989, Scragg 1974
- morphology and syntax: Brunner 1960-62, Visser 1969-73
- lexicology: Baugh/Cable 1978, Jespersen 1948, OED
- pragmatics/text linguistics: Jucker 1995 & 2000, Crystal 1995
- dialectology/sociology: Barnickel 1982, CHEL, Fennell 2001, Hansen/Carls/Lucko 1996, Mossé 1969 & 1974, Crystal 1995

4. Quoted and Recommended Literature, Dictionaries

[in MB = stored in the so-called *Musterbibliothek* of the Englische Seminar]

Bammesberger, Alfred (1989), *English Linguistics*, Heidelberg: Winter.

Barber, Charles (2001), *Early Modern English*, new ed., Edinburg: Edinburgh University Press.

Barnickel, Klaus-Dieter (1982), *Sprachliche Varianten des Englischen*, 2 vols., [Hueber Hochschulreihe 45], München: Hueber.

Baugh, Albert C. / Cable, Thomas (1978), *A History of the English Language*, 3rd ed., London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. [in MB]

Blake, Norman F. (2002), *A Grammar of Shakespeare's Language*, Basingstoke etc.: Palgrave.

Brunner, Karl (1960-62), *Die englische Sprache*, 2 vols., 2nd rev. ed., Tübingen: Niemeyer.

CHEL = Hogg, Richard M. (ed.) (1992-2002), *The Cambridge History of the English Language*, 6 vols., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, David (1995), *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Faiss, Klaus (1989), *Englische Sprachgeschichte*, Tübingen: Francke.

Fennell, Barbara A. (2001), *A History of English: A Sociolinguistic Approach*, Oxford: Blackwell. [in MB]

Fichte, Joerg O. / Kemmler, Fritz (1994), *Alt- und Mittelenglische Literatur: Eine Einführung*, 2nd completely and rev. ed.., [Literaturwissenschaft im Grundstudium 6], Tübingen: Narr.

Görlach, Manfred (1994), *Einführung ins Frühneuenglische*, 2., erw. Aufl., Heidelberg: Winter. [in MB]

Grzega, Joachim (2003), "LdL in universitären Kursen: Ein hochschuldidaktischer Weg zur Vorbereitung auf die Wissensgesellschaft", http://www.ldl.de/material/berichte/uni/ldl.pdf

Grzega, Joachim (2004), *Bezeichnungswandel: Wie, Warum, Wozu? Ein Beitrag zur englischen und allgemeinen Onomasiologie*, Heidelberg: Winter.

Hansen, Klaus / Carls, Uwe / Lucko, Peter (1996), *Die Differenzierung des Englischen in nationale Varianten*, Berlin: Schmidt.

Jespersen, Otto (1948), *Growth and Structure of the English Language*, 9th ed., Oxford: Blackwell.

Jucker, Andreas (ed.) (1995), *Historical Pragmatics: Pragmatic Developments in the History of English*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Jucker, Andreas (2000), *History of English and English Historical Linguistics*, Stuttgart: Klett.

Kermode, Frank (2000), *Shakespeare's Language*, New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux.

Mencken, Henry L. (1923), *The American Language: An Inquiry into the Development of English in the US*, New York: Knopf.

Mitchell, Bruce / Robinson, Fred C. (1982/1994), *A Guide to Old English*, revised with texts and glossary, Oxford: Blackwell.

Mossé, Fernand (1969), *Handbuch des Mittelenglischen*, [Hueber Hochschulreihe 11], München: Hueber.

Mossé, Fernand (1974), *Mittelenglische Kurzgrammatik*, Ismaning: Hueber. [in MB]

Obst, Wolfgang / Schleburg, Florian (1999), *Die Sprache Chaucers: Ein Lehrbuch des Mittelenglischen auf der Grundlage von* Troilus and Criseyde, Heidelberg: Winter.

Obst, Wolfgang / Schleburg, Florian (2004), *Lehrbuch des Altenglischen*, Heidelberg: Winter.
Pyles, Thomas / Algeo, John (1993), *The Origins and Developments of the English Language*, 4th ed., Fortworth etc.: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
Scragg, D. G. (1974), *A History of English Spelling*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Viereck, Wolfgang / Viereck, Karin / Ramisch, Heinrich (2002), *dtv-Atlas Englische Sprache*, München: dtv.
Visser, Fredericus T. (1969-73), *An Historical Syntax of the English Language*, 3 vols., Leiden: Brill.

DICTIONARIES

BoTo = Bosworth, Joseph / Toller, Thomas N. (1973-1976), *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, 2 vols., reprinted and enlarged ed., Oxford: Oxford University Press.
MED = Kurath, Hans / Kuhn, Sherman M. (eds.) (1956-), *Middle English Dictionary*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. [also available via the ULB website under the name "Middle English Compendium"]
OED = Murray, James A.H. et al. (19...-), *Oxford English Dictionary*, Oxford: Clarendon. [also available via the ULB website]
TOE = Roberts, Jane / Kay, Christian / Grundy, Lynne (1995), *A Thesaurus of Old English*, 2 vols., London: King's College.

Also look through the books in the library of the *Englisches Seminar* under call numbers "S FA ..." through "S KC ...".

Appendix IIIb: Second example of an introductory paper

Joachim Grzega, *Eurolinguistics – Introductory Paper*

(Münster, 2 Feb 2005)

1. The General Idea of the Course

Last year I founded a specialized internet platform to offer a venue for discussing issues on European language culture, *EurolinguistiX* (*ELiX*) (http://www.eurolinguistix.com). *European* shall be used in the same sense as defined by cultural anthropologists (cf., e.g., Huntington 1996). This refers to those nations that are characterized by a minor Greek and a major Latin heritage (including the rules of law), the (West) Roman variant of Christian religion (and its developments during the Reformation and Counter Reformation), the use of the Latin alphabet, the separation of spiritual and secular power, societal pluralism and individualism, a common history of the arts (in their broadest sense) as well as a common history of education and formation (see, for example, the development of the universities in the Middle Ages or the relatively recent introduction of compulsory education). This course is aimed at analyzing, describing and defining various aspects of European language culture (or "linguaculture"). Furthermore, it offers participants the chance to delve into one topic in a more profound way.

2. Structure of the Course

The first sessions are reserved for working on a core knowledge of European language culture. They will give an overview of the main important aspects of European language culture and language cultures in general: the writing system, the lingae francae, language contacts, communicative/politeness strategies (within the frame of intercultural communication) and the sociology of languages. The basis for these first sessions shall be first drafts of chapters for a popular book that I am currently writing on. The following sessions shall be dedicated to student projects. Based on these ideas as well as my introductory article for the *Journal for EuroLinguistiX* (*JELiX*) (http://www.eurolinguistix.com), teams of 3 to 5 students should formulate a specific still unanswered, European-oriented question that they want to deal with in a seminar paper, an internet project, a radio or TV program etc. (at least five languages should be respected, one of them should be English). It is also possible to compare Europe with other civilizations.

In order to find relevant studies on the topics chosen students are referred to the *ELiX* Bibliography. Student teams should then agree on a project design, i.e. how they want to answer their questions. Topics may be of qualitative nature (e.g. historical questions) or of quantitative nature (e.g. the use of specific language forms in different speech (sub-) communities). In the latter instance, empirical analyses are required (cf. Albert/Koster 2002); empirical data can be gathered—depending on the topic—through text analyses (i.e. "text" in a broad sense), questionnaires, interviews, discussions (you are expected to use especially the *ELiX* discussion forum), language guides (e.g. the series *Kauderwelsch* and the relatively new series *PONS Reisewörterbuch und Sprachführer mit interkulturellen Tipps*). Each team must hand in their project design at the latest by the date indicated in the syllabus; team members are expected to initiate and lead a thread or participate in another way on the ELiX discussion forum. You may find team members on the corresponding discussion thread for our seminar on www.zum.de (> "Foren" > "sprachliche Fächer").

Each student team will get 40 minutes of a session for their topic. In these 40 minutes, the team should

(a) impart the basic knowledge of their research field, i.e. not (at least not as a major element) in the form of a lecture up front, but in the form of activities of all participants (i.e. *Lernen durch Lehren* method as described by Grzega [2003]) (e.g. x min. group work and 1½x min. plenary discussion of results and production of *linearity a posteriori*) (cf. also my course website),

(b) present their own project design and first results (5-10 min.),

(c) be open for discussing their results in class (5-10 min.). A one-page summary of the most important points will have to be written by another team and will be distributed via e-mail within four days.

The final version of the project (which should approximately equal a 20-page seminar paper, no matter what the form may be) will have to be handed in by the date indicated in the syllabus. Contents and form of the project should be based on the style sheet included in the Reader. The projects can be presented in an academic or a non-academic language, but the method must always be academic.

3. Some Ideas for Special Projects

Apart from the ideas mentioned in my *JELiX* introductory article (Grzega 2004), here are some more ideas for student projects:

- European culture assimilator (explanation of intercultural communicative breakdowns, so-called "critical incidents"): evaluation of critical incidents by people from different European countries (each country chosen should be represented by ca. 15 informants)
- <u>intra</u>national difference in politeness strategies (can also be written as a state-of-the-art article, in case there are enough publications)
- the influence of a specific European language on the other European languages
- the influence of a specific non-European language (e.g. Arabic) on European languages
- the phenomenon of wanderwords
- how North America and Latin America split from European language civilization
- analysis of historical (European) communication guides
- the use of comics in teaching intercultural communication (e.g. Asterix)
- European national stereotypes reflected in the figurative use of ethnic names
- statistics on Anglicisms (and/or pseudo-Anglicisms) in European languages (cf. Bhatti 1998)
- internationalisms in European languages
- the teaching and acquiring of semicommunicative competence (semicommunication) (cf. Kischel 2002 or the projects under www.eurocomcenter.com)
- loan influence on idiomatic expressions
- (Euro-)Latin as EU lingua franca
- English as a non-native language (cf. Jenkins/Modiano/Seidlhofer 2001, Harris 2002, Seidlhofer 2004)
- what kind of linguistic knowledge do people consider part of a "Euro-Competence"?

4. Quoted and Recommended Literature

Albert, Ruth / Koster, Cor J. (2002), *Empirie in Linguistik und Sprachlehrforschung: Ein methodologisches Arbeitsbuch*, Tübingen: Narr Studienbücher. (for chi-square tests, including Yates correction, cf. also http://www.unc.edu/~preacher/chisq/chisq.htm)

Asher, R. E. (ed.) (1994), *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, 10 vol., Oxford etc.: Pergamon.

Bhatti, Karin Iqbal (1998), "Comics und interkulturelle Kommunikation", in: Jonach, Ingrid (ed.), *Interkulturelle Kommunikation*, [Sprache und Sprechen 24], 219-228, München/Basel: Reinhardt.

Bußmann, Hadumod (1996), *Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics*, London et al.: Routledge.

CHEL = Hogg, Richard M. et al. (eds.) (1992-2001), *Cambridge History of the English Language*, 6 vol., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, David (1997), *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*, 2nd ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fleischer, Wolfgang / Helbig, Gerhard / Lerchner, Gotthard (eds.) (2001), *Kleine Enzyklopädie Deutsche Sprache*, Frankfurt (Main) etc.: Lang.
Grzega, Joachim (2003), "LdL in universitären Kursen: Ein hochschuldidaktischer Weg zur Vorbereitung auf die Wissensgesellschaft", http://www.ldl.de/material/berichte/uni/ldl.pdf
Grzega, Joachim (2004), "Why We Need an Internet Venue for Studying European Language Culture", *Journal for EuroLinguistiX* 1: 1-8.
Harris, Roy (2002), "English: How Not to Teach It", *The European English Messenger* 11,2: 57-61.
Huntington, Samuel (1996), *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, New York: Simon & Schuster.
Jenkins, Jennifer / Modiano, Marko / Seidlhofer, Barbara (2001), "Euro-English", *English Today* 17,4: 13-19.
Kischel, Gerhard (2002), *EuroCom: Mehrsprachiges Europa durch Interkomprehension in Sprachfamilien*, Hagen: FernUniversität.
LRL = Holtus, Günter / Metzelin, Michael / Schmitt, Christian (eds.) (1988ff.), *Lexikon der romanistischen Linguistik*, Tübingen: Niemeyer.
Seidlhofer, Barbara (2004), "Research Perspectives on Teaching English as a Lingua Franca", *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 24: 209-239.
Wendt, Heinz F. (1987), *Sprachen*, corr. ed., Frankfurt (Main): Fischer.

Introduction to various disciplines of linguistics with rich bibliographies are offered by the following book series:
- *Narr Studienbücher* (Tübingen: Narr)
- *Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft* (Berlin etc.: de Gruyter)
- *Anglistische Arbeitsbücher* (Tübingen: Niemeyer)
- *Germanistische Arbeitsbücher* (Tübingen: Niemeyer)
- *Studium Kompakt* (Berlin: Cornelsen)

Cf. also the thematic surveys on http://www.linguistlist.org and the brief overview chapters in Crystal (1997).

For many languages there are good encyclopedias of overview and state-of-the-art articles. On English cf. the CHEL, on German Fleischer/Helbig/Lerchner (2001), on the Romanic languages cf. the LRL. Good dictionaries of language(s) and linguistics are Bußmann (1996) and Asher (1994) (for language descriptions cf. also Wendt 1987).

Information on specialized literature can be found in the most encompassing linguistic bibliography, the MLA bibliography, available via the university library's website. Don't forget to search the internet for valuable information, but don't forget either that there more and less trustworthy and more and less academic websites. Concerning international communication see also the first basic projects that I started with my students under http://www1.ku-eichstaett.de/SLF/EngluVglSW/schule.htm). And don't forget http://www.eurolinguistix.com.

Appendix IV: Examples of project designs

Example 1 (qualitative research)

Project Name: Non-verbal Communication in Malta
Team Members: Adam Schwarz, Eva Weiss, Abel Grau
Hypothesis: "Non-verbal communication in Malta shows elements of both Arabic and British culture."
Description: There are already a number of descriptions of British and Arabic gestures (cf., e.g., Miller 1999 and Ben Nemsi 1998). However, it hasn't been analyzed so far whether the British occupation of the originally Arabic nation of Malta has had any effect on the use of gestures. We will carry out a qualitative study with three exchange students from Malta. On the basis of two language guides, for English (UK) and for Arabic (no subclassification), we will select ten typically British and ten typically Arabic gestures. We will then interview the three informants separately and ask whether they know each of the gestures and what they mean to them (i.e. we will check their passive knowledge, not their active usage). We will also give the informants the chance to comment on the use of the gestures (When is the gesture used? Who uses the gesture? Etc.). (In addition, we will look for informants on various discussion forums on the internet and send the scanned pictures out to the volunteers). We will then determine to what degree Maltese non-verbal communication is a mixture of British and Arabic communicative habits. We will discuss our results with the three informants together and might thus get some more information.
Form of Publication: brief video contribution for the local university TV station

Example 2 (non-experimental research)

Project Name: Address Form in English Letters
Team Members: Adam Schwarz, Eva Weiss, Abel Grau
Hypothesis: "The use of *Dear sir(s)* as an address form in American, British and Irish letters has by now died out."
Description: In 1985 Baker et al. analyzed letters to three university administrations (one in the US, one in the UK and one in Ireland), which showed that apart from gender-sensitive address forms (e.g. *Dear madam or sir*) and neutral address forms (e.g. *To whom it may concern*) the purely male address forms *Dear sir(s)* were still used not infrequently (especially in Ireland). We will use the same method that Baker et al. used and check whether the purely male and politically incorrect forms have died out now after 20 years.
Form of Publication: internet website

Example 3 (experimental research)

Project Name: American and British Greetings
Team Members: Adam Schwarz, Eva Weiss, Abel Grau
Questions: "Do American and English students differ in their choice of greeting forms in formal situations?"
Description: The difference between national varieties is hardly shed light on as far as pragmatic differences are concerned. Although there are some studies on American greeting habits and some studies on British greeting habits (e.g. the bibliography by Brown 2000), there are no comparable data because the studies are from different decades, pursue different methods or observe different situations. This void shall be filled by the following study. The study wants to check whether Americans and English students choose different forms of salutations in a specific situation. We will carry out the following experiment. Eva Weiß and Abel Grau will look for 20 American exchange students and 20 British exchange students and claim that our "professor" needs help in a sociological study on American/British culture. We will then give each of them a specific time when they should show up in the "professor's" "office". The "professor" will be played by Adam Schwarz, who has gray hair and is already in his 8th year as a student, the "office" shall be one of the professors' offices. When the American or English volunteer enters after the "professor's" *Come in* we will note each form of salutation and introduction. We will not only look for exclusive differences between AmE and EnglE, but also for statistical differences (a phenomenon often forgotten in works on national varieties).
Form of Publication: seminar paper

Appendix V: My style sheet

The grade you get will depend on the **structure and contents** of your seminar paper. The paper is to show
— that you have understood the relevant literature
— that you are able to evaluate the relevant literature
— that you are able to carry out studies/analyses by yourself
The paper should basically consist of three parts: an introductory part (where you say what the topic/question of your paper is, why you have chosen it, what the research literature says on the topic and what it doesn't, what is new in your paper and what the method will be that you are going to apply to get the new data/information/knowledge you are aiming for), a main part (where you carry out your own research, always respecting the relevant literature and trying to present your research in a readable, illustrative way), some sort of conclusion (where you summarize the main points of your research and/or where you may open new questions that could be answered with your results and/or where you relate your results to a more general question). In addition, you will have to write an abstract (i.e. summary, overview) of your paper (not longer than 1 p.).
Make sure that your style reflects the goal and addressee of your paper (e.g. don't use a journalistic style if you're writing an empirical study).

Manuscript Form

I do not force you to use a specific system of manuscript form as long as you are consistent and use one of the usual systems. The following directions are mainly just one suggestion.

Language. Your paper can be in English or German (British English, American English, German German, Austrian German). But be consistent. If your paper is in English, your abstract has to be in German; if your paper is in German, the abstract has to be in English–**this is obligatory!**

Quotations/Citations. Brief quotations appear in "..." within the normal flow of the text; longer quoations should appear as a separate, indented block (possibly in "..."). The wording of quotations **must** be given as in the original; if you add or omit passages, these must be put in square brackets, e.g. "Frank [...] Sinatra" or "F[rancis] A[lbert] Sinatra."

Fonts and General Format. In recent years it has become common to indent the first line of a paragraph. Single inverted commas are normally reserved for sememes, italics for linguistic material (object language), e.g. "The Italian word *ragazza* means 'young female human,' but it is not entirely identical with our *girl*." Italics are also used for book-titles and titles of periodicals. Capitalization in English is used with headings and titles; here everything is capitalized save form words not longer than 7 letters. Leave a sufficiently wide margin for corrections on the right and on the bottom. Spacing: 1.5 or 2.

References. References in the text can be given in short form (cf. "Bammesberger 1996: 230"), either in the text or in a footnote (use consecutive numbers, no stars etc.). All passages that do not show your own thoughts, no matter whether quoted or just summarized, **must** be marked that way. Full citation of literature referred to should appear in a bibliography at the end of your paper (with the heading *References*, or *Bibliography*). The following examples show one possible format:

Bammesberger, Alfred (1996), "Gotisch *ansis* und urgermanisch **ans(u)-*", *Namenforschung* 31: 231-240.
Bammesberger, Alfred (1998a), "Anmerkungen zum Baseler Epigramm", in: Bammesberger 1998c: 121-126.
Bammesberger, Alfred (1998b), "Etymologie: Litauisches", in: Bammesberger 1998c: 297-304.
Bammesberger, Alfred (ed.) (1998c), *Baltistik: Aufgaben und Methoden*, Heidelberg: Winter.
Fill, Alwin (1995), "Contrastive Ecolinguistics: A New Field for Linguistic Ploughshares?", in: Riehle, Wolfgang / Keiper, Hugo (eds.), *Anglistentag 1994 Graz*, [Proceedings of the Conference of the German Association of University Teachers of English 16], 501-512, Tübingen: Niemeyer.
Grzega, Joachim (2003), ""LdL in universitären Kursen: Ein hochschuldidaktischer Weg zur Vorbereitung auf die Wissensgesellschaft", internet ms. http://www.ldl.de/material/berichte/uni/uni.html
Grzega, Joachim (2004), "A Qualitative and Quantitative Presentation of the Forces for Lexemic Change in the History of English", *Onomasiology Online* 5: 15-55. (http://www.onomasiology.de)
Schwarz, Monika / Chur, Jeannette (1998), *Semantik: Ein Arbeitsbuch*, 2nd rev. ed., Tübingen: Narr.

Scholarly internet books and journal articles can be listed the same way (with URL in brackets); other websites should additionally include the date you last saw the page. Sometimes it might not always be possible to give all the usual information; you should at least give the URL and the date you saw the page (short websites should preferably be attached to your paper as an appendix).

Appendix VI: Examples of automatic e-mails

- If you don't find any helpful literature in the books listed in the bibliography of my introductory paper, you should consult the MLA bibliography, available on-line at our library (via www.ku-eichstaett.de/Library > ELib). Try the following keywords, for example:

- You'll find all restrictions concerning the layout of the seminar paper on my style sheet (cf. www1.ku-eichstaett/SLF/EngluVglSW/jg-web.htm).

- The compulsory courses for your intermediate exam are (a) Phonetics and Phonology (BrE or AmE), (b) English-German I, (c) Seminar Literature (British oder American), (d) Seminar Linguistics. The exam itself consists in a written exam (90 min. translation German-English + 60 min. grammar) and an oral exam (30 min. Linguistics or Literature--here you need to talk with the examiner that you want to have). You can find more detailled information under http://www1.ku-eichstaett.de/SLF/EngluVglSW/euvsw.htm > Varia).

- If you can't come to my regular office hours (Tuesdays, 2-3 p.m.), suggest three alternative appointments and I will select one.

- Yes, I can write a letter of recommendation for you. For this I will need an overview of the grades of your compulsory courses, of all additional courses with good grades and a list of your extracurricular activities. Please note down your exact major and your minors and when you started studying them. Which language does the letter of recommendation have to be in? If there is a specific form, I will need it as well. Please allow me two weeks to write the letter of recommendation.

- Thanks for your interest. Unfortunately my classes are already full. But you can add your name on the waiting list in my secretary's office (Room 104). In case I'm able to let you attend the class, I will send you an e-mail.

Appendix VII: Review on Seminar Papers

Class	
Title of Project	
Author(s)	
Layout	
Bibliography	
Citations	
Structure and Contents	question/hypothesis clear?
	logic of structure, presentation style
	conclusion (summary, prospects)
	quality of information
	quality of argumentation
	choice of method
	inclusion of research literature
Originality of Project	
Style	
Abstract	
Other Comments	(cf. also manuscript)
Overall Evaluation	

Further recommendations

Appendix VIII: Peer-reviewing

Course ....

Topic of the session ....

Team in charge ....

1. What was your general impression of the session?

2. Which presentation techniques were chosen?

3. What was the percentage of group work?

4. Were the tasks clear?

5. Did the leading team address students' questions to a satisfying degree?

7. Did the leading team appear to be well prepared?

8. Was it clear to you at the end of the session what the most important points were?

9. What was positively special about the session and the leading team?

10. Which aspects would you consider particularly worth improving?