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#### Abstract

Much of the focus of research on gains in language acquisition in a study abroad setting has been on oral proficiency. This paper reports on a study designed to measure gains in reading and writing skills by American students enrolled in two different programs at Freiburg University, one lasting a semester, one a year. Pre- and post-tests were administered to both groups of students, one test focused on reading proficiency, demonstrated by the ability to link anaphora with their referents. The other was a cloze passage requiring precision in word level accuracy. Students who followed less traditional study plans, including joining a football team, playing with an orchestra and serving as intern in a theatre made impressive progress compared with their peers enrolled in regular university courses. These findings suggest that while experiential learning can offer students a wealth of personal, cultural and social benefits, many of which not easily measured by quantitative tests, the more traditional (and measurable) skills of reading and writing are not necessarily shortchanged.


## INTRODUCTION

The data to be reported was first presented at the annual conference of the American Association of Teachers of German in the fall of 2000 in a session on the benefits of a study abroad experience. A disclaimer seemed appropriate then and now. Obviously, not all benefits can be quantifiably measured and measured gains or quantitative research does not predominate in the literature on students' study abroad experiences. In his excellent overview of the research on language learning and study abroad from the European perspective, Coleman (1998a: 197) warns that to "limit residence abroad research to the linguistic outcomes is to distort the experience. Language skills are not merely mechanical: sociocultural and intercultural competence are essential elements of the true linguistic proficiency which residence abroad is intended to enhance." Perhaps it is the less tangible benefits, of increased cultural sensitivity and awareness, which are the more valuable. Talburt and Stewart, for example, wrote in 1999 about how the experience of one black female student in Spain helped her peers think about being outsiders in a culture.

This particular outcome was neither planned nor predicted. In writing on the differences between quantitative and qualitative research, Rankin (1999: 111) claims that:

Quantitative study begins with a hypothesis, controls the variables so that a cause and effect relation can be traced (if indeed there is one) and waits until the data are in to confirm or disconfirm the original hypothesis. Qualitative study, by contrast, observes the phenomena in question with no initial explanation necessarily in mind, reflects on those observations, and begins to form hypotheses as patterns emerge.

To this one might well respond that quantifiable data on gains in language proficiency can provide a solid foundation from which to reflect on other components of a study abroad experience. The data may confirm observable but immeasurable phenomena and the results of gain may help in identifying the cause.

Much of the literature, however, both in the US and in Europe, focuses on self-assessed language proficiency, which, as Coleman points out "limits the value of the data" (1998a: 180). Narrowing the focus to Americans studying German in a German-speaking country, this tendency to rely on subjective measures becomes even more pronounced. One exception is Archangeli, (1999) reporting on a program in Salzburg in which Oral Proficiency Interviews (OPIs) were administered, but by non-certified testers and not as pre- and post-tests. In 1994, King and Young's main thesis was that language departments need to borrow strategies from business and marketing as "the benefits of our product (study abroad) have to be made clear to potential customers (students) so that they will choose the product." (1994: 77) They also relied on students' own assessment of improved language ability as one of the named benefits. No proficiency tests/interviews were involved, but in a footnote, the authors refer to the study by Carlson et al. from 1991- that most learners progress from an Intermediate High to an Advanced on the ACTFL scale with a study abroad experience. King and Young also state that learning about the culture of a country is more important for the majority of American students than language learning. Figures compiled by Open Doors (2000) confirm that there has been a decline in the number of North American students studying foreign languages overseas since 1985. On the one hand, a lack of adequate proficiency in a second language is a handicap for many who might otherwise study overseas. On the other, the fact that more fields of study (taught in English) have become available to American students on overseas programs in recent years has made the choice broader and the need for such proficiency less important.

At Indiana University, a large Midwestern state institution, scholarships for overseas study are given exclusively to those students who opt for programs with a language requirement
to combat this trend. Colgate University, a small private liberal arts college, reports similar problems ${ }^{1}$. There, the only overseas study groups that have difficulty recruiting students are those with a language requirement. The joint Engineering and German program at the University of Rhode Island is an example of one highly successful program that bridges the gap between language study and another field of study and has boosted enrollments in both areas (Grandin 1993).

Those students at Indiana University who do have some command of a foreign language even if their major is in another field - write in their applications for the program in Germany, however, that their goal in studying abroad is to increase language proficiency. If they refer to a particular skill, they will usually state that they wish to become fluent speakers. The broad range of motivations of European students as reported by Coleman (1998b) may reflect the advantages of living on a mulit-lingual continent and greater exposure to foreign languages in everyday life.

King and Young (1994) consider the involvement of language department faculty to be a crucial factor in recruiting students for overseas study programs in which language proficiency (generally specified by the number of courses taken rather than a definable level) is a prime requirement. Strange as this may seem to some outside the United States, they point out that the faculty may need to be convinced of the value of overseas study. Chieffo and Zipser (2001) begin a description of their successful program at the University of Delaware with the sweeping statement that "Foreign language educators have always known the value of study abroad, both to the individual students and to the sending and receiving institutions" (79). However, the fact that the Delaware program - for which they have developed an impressive network of recruitment, publicity, and integration into the home curriculum - sends $30 \%$ of its students overseas compared to a national average of $10 \%$ indicates that their program is unique. Not all members of US language departments consider themselves "foreign language educators" and this is particularly true of larger research institutions where literature and culture studies are seen as the central focus of the department. Coleman points out a similar situation in Europe (1998a: 180).

[^0]These literature and culture studies specialists are the faculty in need of the sales pitch King and Young describe. For some, this means evidence of better reading proficiency and grammatical accuracy in writing-those skills in which European students did not believe they had made as much progress as in speaking. Coleman cites this information based on three studies from 1977, 1988 and 1994, but it should be pointed out that these are self assessments (1998a: 186). It is easier to observe one's own increased ease in participating in conversations or understanding television programs or movies than it is to register an improvement in reading. A heightened awareness of nuances in a second language can actually lead to a greater level of insecurity when writing.

Literature and culture studies faculty, whose prime criterion of students' academic progress is not that of second language acquisition tend to be suspicious of the facile fluency many students acquire and are eager to display once they return to the US, often to be dismissed as being "fliessend falsch." Shresta's 1998 article entitled "Instruction and Exposure: How do they contribute to Second Language Acquisition?" on English as a Second Language concluded that both help, with instruction promoting accuracy and exposure fluency. This is not the venue to debate the merits of fluency and mastery of colloquial language over precision and formality. However, the findings of this study show that the two are not as mutually exclusive as some might believe.

Perhaps the best known and most widely cited studies of language gain in U.S. study abroad programs are those done by Brecht et al. on students learning Russian in the former Soviet Union (Brecht 1991, Brecht et al. 1995). Rivers (1998) summarizes the findings of Brecht and his colleagues and offers a comprehensive survey of that literature, much of which is based on OPIs administered at various stages during the students' progress. The data led Rivers to the conclusion that regular language instruction is not enough-that students need training in "the management of linguistic input" and "linguistic risk management" (1998: 497), but unfortunately, he offers no guidelines for such training.

Barbara Freed (1995 and 1998) has noted that OPIs lack the precision to measure relatively short gains (1995: 16) that much of the observed gain is in fluency, though this is hard to define or even measure. Freed (1995) had native speakers rate excerpts of OPIs of two groups of students for fluency. One group had studied in France while the other stayed in
the United States and continued with classroom instruction. Only at the Intermediate level did the native speakers detect a gain by the group that had studied in France. The main finding was that the perception/impression of fluency relies on a range of factors, such as vocabulary control, pause filling, speed of speech, correction and grammatical repair and repetition and is very subjective. In the same volume, Gunterman (1995) reports on impressive progress in language proficiency by Peace Corps volunteers as established by interviews conducted at the end of training and after a year of field service, in other words, a mix of intensive language training followed by immersion in the culture.

Freed, in her introduction to the 1995 volume she edited on second language acquisition in a study abroad context, offered a list of theoretical questions to be addressed regarding language acquisition in a study abroad context (17), noting that little has been done on measuring increased proficiency in reading skills. This was remedied to a degree by Kline (1998) though her focus is on literacy as a social practice. She distinguishes this from reading "from the classroom or researcher perspective." (139) and supports her emphasis by citing Ginsberg (1992) to the effect that "study abroad is not oriented toward reading." (Kline 1998: 143). Those who send students to enroll in mainstream university courses at the host institutions will no doubt argue with this - students are expected to read texts in the target language for all of their courses. However, it is also hoped that they will read in the target language for pleasure, for practical purposes such as gaining information on rules and regulations, reading contracts, directions and instructions, advertisements, etc. and thereby acquire a form of literacy not as easily acquired in the home country.

## RATIONALE AND BACKGROUND FOR THE STUDY

In light of King and Young's point about convincing skeptical colleagues of the value of overseas study, the skills of reading and writing accuracy offered both a focus and a challenge. The study to be described focuses on reading skills as demonstrated by an ability to match anaphora and cataphora to their referents plus precision in writing demonstrated through completion of a cloze passage, both of which were measured through pre and post tests. It was conducted while the author was Resident Director of a program based at the Albert Ludwigs University in Freiburg in which students from three large Midwestern

Universities in the United States participated for two full semesters. To add another dimension, the study was expanded to include a second group of students, this time from a private college in upstate New York and involving just one semester of coursework in Germany.

Students participating in the full year program generally had 6 college semesters (or the equivalent, with a mix of high school and college preparation) of German, though one had just four semesters at the college level. For the one semester program, preparation ranged from a combination of high school and college study (usually not more than 4 semesters) with one student (identified as C7 in the data) only having had one semester of formal instruction in German. His progress is among the most interesting of the two groups, indicating that formal study at the University level is not the only path to rapid development of proficiency in reading and writing.

However, there were other differences in the characteristics of the programs that must be taken into consideration as variables. A compilation of data on eligibility requirements, course loads, credits granted for courses taken, grading translations, etc. from five North American institutions running programs at the University in Freiburg that year indicates a wide range of differences ${ }^{2}$. It would, therefore, be inappropriate to draw conclusions from the data as to the ideal length of duration for a study abroad experience or the ideal situation. Rather, the data indicates that students' non-academic experiences may be equally as valuable in producing language gain, confirming some of the findings reported by Brecht (1991) and Rivers (1998).

Berkemeyer's (1994) findings on the strong correlation between overall reading ability and successful linking of anaphora and cataphora with their referents prompted earlier actionbased research on assessment of reading skills (Fraser, 1999). This project offered insights into students' reading difficulties, confirmed observations of oral proficiency, and demonstrated that anaphoric resolution is an efficient and quantifiable - as well as valid way to test reading skills.

[^1]
## TEST FORMAT

A text from the 1999, 2, issue of Kulturchronik was selected for use in the pre- and posttests in the Freiburg study. The journal is sent on a regular basis to German Departments in the United States by InterNationes and contains texts of the complexity and sophistication students would be likely to read during their period of study in Germany. The subject matter is of a sufficiently general nature that background knowledge would not offer students from any particular field of study a distinct advantage. The texts are also of a length that make it possible to use a complete text rather than an excerpt or edited version. The article selected was about recent German movies and in particular "The Comedian Harmonists". The background knowledge that would help a student decode this text more easily is a general familiarity with German culture -something one might expect from an otherwise somewhat heterogeneous group. The test, in which candidates were required to link anaphoric and cataphoric references within the text is attached as Appendix A. Appendix B is a list of the responses considered acceptable. Because candidates were given the option of writing in the referent or circling the appropriate passage in the text, absolute precision was not required. Rather, a notation was made if a student offered an imprecise but essentially correct response - including an unnecessary genitive " s ", for example, or not offering a full list of the issues referred to (see items 1 and 11 in Appendices A and B).

Students were also required to complete a cloze passage from a past German Advanced Placement (AP) examination. These passages, referred to in Educational Testing Service's (ETS) literature as the "paragraph completion" are developed by a Test Development Committee, composed of teachers at the school and university levels. Over the years, they have been shown to have a high correlation with overall performance on other parts of the examination, which includes reading and listening comprehension, a composition, and two types of oral production. One of these is a response to a series of questions on a variety of topics and tests creativity as well as control of vocabulary and form. The other elicits a narrative sequence as candidates tell a story suggested by a series of pictures. The paragraph completion is the one part of the AP exam requiring production of isolated forms that must be accurate for any points to be awarded-as opposed to the multiple choice
sections where a student selects the correct form or on the composition where features such as complexity of language, control of vocabulary and idioms, and accuracy are all considered in the grading process.

The cloze passage used in this study was from the 1999 AP exam, considered by the graders (and later confirmed by the ETS statisticians) to be of a higher level of difficulty than in earlier years, partly as more advanced reading comprehension ability was needed to complete the task.

Appendix C contains the passage given to candidates and Appendix $D$ the range of responses deemed by the faculty consultants reading the exams that year to be acceptable. The list was compiled on the basis of over 3000 examinations and discussion among more than twenty graders from both college and high school backgrounds.

Thus the testing instruments designed for the Freiburg study addressed areas of language gain that are often considered of prime importance for further formal study. They could also offer a quantifiable dimension to observations of fluency.

## TEST RESULTS

The following tables show scores for the two groups of students. Table I illustrates the pre and post test scores and gains for the students on the one semester program and Table 2 the scores and gains for the students on the full year (two semester) program. No significance should be attached to the order in which candidates are listed.

Table 1 Results of Pre and Post Tests of Students on the One semester Program
Perfect Scores are indicated by PS

| Student Identifi- | Total <br> Score | Cloze Passage Scores 20 pts |  |  | Reading Text Scores 15 pts |  |  |  |  | Total Points |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pretest | Posttest | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Gain/ } \\ & \text { Loss } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { Pre- } \\ \text { test } \end{array}$ | Imprecisions* | Posttest | Imprecisions* | Gain <br> / <br> Loss |  |
| C1 | 42 | 10 | 12 | +2 | 8 | 1 | 12 | 11 | +4 | +6 |
| C2 | 43 | 10 | 11 | +1 | 8 |  | 14 | 1,11 | +6 | +7 |
| C3 | 24 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 5 |  | 8 | 11 | +3 | +3 |
| C4 | 43 | 9 | 14 | +5 | 9 | 1 | 11 | 1 | +2 | +7 |
| C5 | $\begin{aligned} & 65 \quad \text { (top } \\ & \text { scorer) } \end{aligned}$ | 18 | 20 PS | +3 | 12 |  | 15 PS | 1 | +3 | +6 |
| C6 | 33 | 7 | 8 | +1 | 7 | 11 | 11 |  | +4 | +5 |
| C7 | 37 | 6 | 12 | +6 | 7 | 1 | 11 |  | +4 | +10 |
| C8 | 39 | 9 | 10 | +1 | 8 |  | 12 |  | +4 | +5 |
| C9 | 51 | 14 | 15 | +1 | 10 | 1 | 12 | 11 | +2 | +3 |
| C10 | 35 | 6 | 12 | +6 | 7 |  | 10 | 11 | +3 | +9 |
| C11 | 40 | 4 | 15 | +9 | 10 |  | 11 |  | +1 | +10 |
| C12 | 24 | 7 | 5 | -2 | 5 |  | 7 |  | +2 | 0 |
| C13 | 43 | 11 | 15 | +4 | 11 | 11 | 12 | 1 | +1 | +5 |
| C14 | 58 | 17 | 18 | +1 | 10 |  | 13 | 1 | +3 | +4 |
| C15 | 36 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 1,11 | 9 | 1,11 | 0 | 0 |
| Totals | 613 | 1143 | 182 | 38 | 120 |  | 168 |  | 42 | +80 |
| Averages | 40.8 | 9.5 | 12.1 | 2.5 | 8 |  | 11.2 |  | 3.2 | +5.3 |

Table 2 Results of Pre and Post Tests of Students on the 2 semester Program
Perfect Scores are indicated by PS

| Students in one year program | Total <br> Points <br> (out of <br> 70) | Cloze Passage Scores (20 Points) |  |  | Reading Text Score (15 Points) |  |  |  |  | Total <br> Points <br> Gained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pretest | Post- <br> test | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Gain/ } \\ & \text { Loss } \end{aligned}$ | Pretest | Imprecisions | Posttest | Imprecisions | Gain/ <br> Loss |  |
| U1 | 59 | 15 | 17 | +2 | 13 | 1,11 | 15 PS | 11 | +2 | +4 |
| U2 | 56 | 12 | 16 | +4 | 13 | 1 | 15 PS |  | +2 | +6 |
| U3 | 52 | 7 | 16 | +9 | 14 |  | 15 PS |  | +1 | +10 |
| U4 | 59 | 14 | 19 | +5 | 12 | 1 | 14 | 11 | +2 | +7 |
| U5 | 62 | 16 | 19 | +3 | 12 | 11 | 15 PS |  | +3 | +6 |
| U6 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 66 \quad \text { (top } \\ \text { scorer) } \end{array}$ | 19 | 20 PS | +1 | 13 | 11 | 14 |  | +1 | +2 |
| U7 | 61 | 17 | 17 | 0 | 12 |  | 15 PS | 1 | +3 | +3 |
| U8 | 24 | 3 | 7 | +4 | 4 |  | 10 | 11 | +6 | +10 |
| U9 | 38 | 9 | 13 | +4 | 8 |  | 8 |  | 0 | +4 |
| U10 | 64 | 16 | 19 | +3 | 14 |  | 15 PS |  | +1 | +4 |
| U11 | 54 | 16 | 17 | +1 | 7 | 1 | 14 | 1,11 | +7 | +8 |
| U12 | 37 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 10 | 1, 11 | 13 | 11 | +3 | +3 |
| U13 | 60 | 15 | 18 | +3 | 12 |  | 15 PS |  | +3 | +6 |
| U14 | 55 | 15 | 19 | +4 | 10 | 11 | 13 | 11 | +3 | +7 |
| U15 | 43 | 7 | 13 | +6 | 10 |  | 13 | 1 | +3 | +9 |
| Totals | 792 | 188 | 237 | +49 | 164 |  | 204 |  | +40 | +89 |
| Averages | 52.8 | 12.5 | 15.8 | 3.3 | 10.9 |  | 13.6 |  | +2.6 | +5.9 |

As is apparent from a comparison of the two tables, the average combined pre and post test score of the one semester program students ( 40.8 out of a total of 70 ) was lower than that for the full year students ( 52.8 out of 70 ). This can be explained by both the more extensive preparation of the full year students as well as the longer period of study in Germany. What is not as simply explained is the discrepancy in gains across the two programs.

Of the two students with no measurable language gain ( $\mathrm{C} 12, \mathrm{C} 15$ ), one had to return to the US for emergency surgery ( C 15 ) and thus reduced the length of exposure to the language. The other (C12) was perhaps too intent on "doing" all of Europe during her free time,
constantly travelling to another major city on the weekend, and usually meeting up with Americans.

The reasons for the minimal gains vary-in one or two cases (U6, U7 and U10), students scored highly on the pre-tests and the instrument could not calibrate their gain. They illustrate the "ceiling effect" against which Freed cautions with the warning "To the extent that assessment instruments are unable to capture the progress made by more advanced students we will always have the impression that it is the lower-level students who have made the greatest gains, at home or abroad." (1998: 43). The two students with high scores at the outset (U7 and U10), but who failed to attain perfect scores on the post-test followed the unfortunate pattern of some North American students of socializing primarily with other Americans. One had a very strong American accent and reported on several occasions that she experienced discrimination because of her nationality. One student (U12) was just the opposite-she had spent part of her childhood in Germany, had managed to get by with almost pidgin German, and made progress in reading ability, but not in production skills where accuracy was required. A more detailed examination of this individual's progress could offer insights into the phenomenon of fossilization.

The students with the highest gains are not easily typecast either. Of the full year students, two were individuals one might be tempted to clone-highly motivated, personable, and great team players. One (U15) did her best to mix with Germans though with no antagonism towards other members of the group. Another (U8) with less preparation and with more room for improvement on the tests mixed with everyone, was motivated and easily made personal contacts. Yet another, (U3) was a college senior and had more coursework in German than his peers. He finally overcame his hesitation to use the language, selected very challenging courses in which there were few Americans enrolled, socialized both with peers on the program and German students and surmounted some of the hurdles that had prevented him from scoring higher on the pre-test.

On the one semester program, there were three students who followed non-traditional study plans, (C11, C7 and C4). Two of these achieved the highest gains of the group study, an increase of 10 points between pre and post tests and the third tied for third highest gain. C7 was a music major with one semester of German who began the semester four weeks ahead
of his cohorts with an intensive course of study at a Volkshochschule while living in an apartment with a teacher of German as a foreign language. He played with two university orchestras, traveled with them to concerts and acquired the language through a combination of natural interaction and focused instruction. C11 was a football player with a combination three years of college German-though not with stellar grades - who played on Freiburg's American football team and also attended the Volkshochschule. He pursued an interest in butchery at the local Gewerbeschule while also meeting regularly with his program director for more traditional language development. He later reported to in a casual e-mail to the director: "Ich lerne bei Erfahrungen und nicht von Büchern." ${ }^{3} \mathrm{He}$ continued in English: "I know something by feeling it. So unless I experience something and can relate a certain feeling to it than I have trouble retaining or understanding it." C 4 worked as an intern at the Freiburg City Theatre on a production of a German version of Arthur Miller's Death of a Salesman. The combination of interaction and focused instruction appears to have been optimal in all three situations.

## CONCLUSIONS

The gains measured in the pre and post tests confirmed observations of improved vocabulary access and ease of expression-features which often contribute to perceptions of fluency. Unlike the study Freed conducted, there was no attempt to measure this aspect of language gain. One can in retrospect explain the quantifiable gains and identify the attitudes and behaviors needed to achieve them. However, as Rivers implies, these cannot easily be prescribed or explicitly taught. Training in "the management of linguistic input" (Rivers 1998) might be construed as listening comprehension activities with dependent tasks. Rivers' term "linguistic risk management" is a more nebulous term. Students living and studying in an L2 environment are more likely to be stretched as they negotiate meaning. While some will rise to the occasion, others may develop strategies for avoiding such situations.

[^2]Students on the one-year program were required to keep journals of their experiences for the first two months of their stay in Freiburg. These were written in German and were one of the requirements for a course on travel literature taught by the Resident Director specifically for the group. The journals were submitted on a regular basis and students were given the option of receiving feedback on content only or content and language forms. Most opted for the latter but no grade was assigned specifically for the journals. Some students demonstrated in these journals that they were comparing cultures, making connections, and communicating with other communities as the Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the $21^{\text {st }}$ Century prescribe, but exactly how this came about is less easily shown. Though all received equal encouragement to do so, the uptake was predictably varied.

The study indicates that while it has traditionally been considered better for students to enroll in regular University courses rather than be sheltered in Deutsch als Fremdsprache ( DaF ) courses for foreign students, this assumption may be incorrect. Two students on the one-year program who had higher initial scores (U7 and U10) were exempted from focused language instruction yet failed to achieve perfect scores on the cloze passage in the post test. It cannot be argued on the basis of this study alone that this is solely because of their course selections. Other factors, such as the social attitudes noted above, may bear more weight, but the findings cannot be overlooked. Explicit feedback on written language can be valuable at all levels and areas of proficiency development.

The findings might support a reassessment of strict guidelines that do not allow students to receive credit for (and thereby tend not to encourage) experiential learning. Clearly, students who become involved in a new language community, such as the football player (C11) and music major (C7) can acquire impressive amounts of language beyond oral proficiency. The results of this study indicate that internships and non-traditional overseas study can improve students' reading and writing skills as much as traditional coursework, but there is no guarantee of this either.

Many would argue that a full year, two semesters, of overseas study is far superior to one, yet it is evident that impressive gains can be made over a 5 month period. The intangible
benefits of study abroad may still be the most valuable but perhaps they are more closely linked to quantifiable data than is immediately apparent.
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## Appendix A

## BERLIN AND BEYOND

Das deutschsprachige Filmfestival in San Francisco (Kulturchronik 2 1999, 32-34)



## Appendix B

## Key of Acceptable Referents in Reading Passage

| Underlined word | acceptable referents |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. Die Klagen | Deutsche Filme hätten in den USA gegen die Obermacht der einheimischen Produktionen aus Hollywood keine Chance; das amerikanische Publikum interessiere sich nicht für Bilder und Geschichten aus dem fernen Europa; fremdsprachige Filme mit Untertiteln seien jenseits des Atlantiks absolutes Kassengift (parts of the list accepted as correct, but marked as imprecise) |
| 2. das | das Filmfestival, das Filmfestival "Berlin and Beyond", Berlin and Beyond |
| 3. das ehrwürdige <br> Lichtspieltheater | das Castro-Kino |
| 4. die | Besucher, Zuschauer |
| 5. sie | Nische, (many students got this item wrong during the pre-test) |
| 6. einer wichtigen Neuerung | zwei Preise |
| 7. das | das finnische Roadmovie, Zugvögel |
| 8. die | Birgit Doll, die beeindruckende BD |
| 9. er | der deutsche Film |
| 10. die | die kompetenten Vermittler, Vermittler |
| 11. Die Regisseurin | Nina Grosse (with genitive /s/ or with "Epos" considered as part of the name, accepted but noted as imprecise) |
| 12. „Veronika, der Lenz ist da" | ein Erfolgslied |
| 13. das beliebteste Sextett der dreißiger Jahre | Comedian Harmonists--often wrong |
| 14. ein besonderer Glanzpunkt des dichten Filmprogramms | die Vorführung der vollständig restaurierten Kopie des Bergfilms „Die weiße Hölle vom Piz Palü", die Vorführung, „Die weiße Hölle vom Piz Palü" |
| 15. deren | die Wurlitzer-Orgel, Wurlitzer-Orgel |

## Appendix C

## Lückentext--Man ist, was man isst

The following passage contains 20 numbered blanks. In the margin, each of the numbers is followed by a blank. First read the entire passage. Then, on the line after each number, write only one answer, consisting of one or more words that are correct in BOTH meaning and form according to the context. In order to receive full credit, you must spell the word or phrase correctly, use capitalization where appropriate, and fill in every blank.


| die Schule nehmen sollte $\qquad$ (15) $\qquad$ in der Pause nur Schokolade und Bonbons zu naschen. <br> Trotzdem ist das $\qquad$ (16) $\qquad$ von Gudrun Dalla Via interessant zu lesen--mir persönlich $\qquad$ (17) $\qquad$ besonders der Tipp, dass scharf gewürzte Nudeln helfen, wenn man $\qquad$ (18) $\qquad$ Laune hat. Angeblich ist man $\qquad$ (19) $\qquad$ so einem Essen sofort wieder "gut drauf". Das werde $\qquad$ (20) $\qquad$ bestimmt demnächst ausprobieren, wenn meine Stimmung wieder einmal auf dem Nullpunkt ist. | 15. $\qquad$ <br> 16. $\qquad$ <br> 17. $\qquad$ <br> 18. $\qquad$ <br> 19. $\qquad$ <br> 20. $\qquad$ |
| :---: | :---: |

## Appendix D—Responses accepted as correct on the cloze passage. These were compiled at the 1999 reading of the Advanced Placement exam and based on over 3,000 responses.

| Item | Acceptable responses |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1. | uns |
| 2. | werden, sind, erscheinen |
| 3. | die, welche |
| 4. | sondern, nur |
| 5. | Je |
| 6. | hat |
| 7. | man, frau, sie, einer, eine, jeder, jede |
| 8. | in, mit |
| 9. | gibt, hat, schreibt, sammelt, präsentiert, liefert, bringt, vermittelt |
| 10. | sich, seinen Körper, den Körper, sich selbst, sich selber, das Gehirn |
| 11. | welche, was für, dass, daß, wann, wieso, warum, weshalb, aus welchen Gründen, <br> aus was für Gründen, auf welche Weise, inwiefern, wie, wie viele, dass die, daß <br> die, ob, ob die, wie die, wie diese, ob diese |
| 12. | es, das, dies |
| 13. | zu |
| 14. | einen, den |
| 15. | als, statt, anstatt, um nicht |
| 16. | Buch, Büchlein, Werk, Pamphlet, Informationsmaterial, Blatt, Oeuvre, Bändchen, <br> Traktat, Manifest, Schriftstück, alles, meiste |
| 17. | gefiel, gefält, nützte, nützt, half, hilft, imponierte, imponiert, behagte, behagt, <br> passte, passt, paßte, paßt, lag, liegt |
| 18. | Schlechte, miese, üble, miserable, doofe, schlimme, blöde, keine, schreckliche, <br> keine gute |
| 19. | nach, mit, von, bei |
| 20. | ich |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Personal correspondence.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ The programs surveyed were the University of Massachsetts program, the Academic Year Program, the Trent-Brock Program, Colgate University's program, and the Indiana-Purdue-Ohio State Program, all of which are based in Freiburg im Breisgau.

[^2]:    ${ }^{3}$ Personal correspondence. The error in the choice of preposition is interesting, but more so is the correct mastery of the dative plural.

