Term Information

Effective Term   Spring 2017

General Information

Course Bulletin Listing/Subject Area   Slavic Languages & Literatures
Fiscal Unit/Academic Org   Slavic/East European Lang&Cul - D0593
College/Academic Group   Arts and Sciences
Level/Career   Undergraduate
Course Number/Catalog   3760
Course Title   Slavic Words/Slavic Worlds
Transcript Abbreviation   Slavic Word/World
Course Description   This introductory course examines the Slavic world through its languages. It will focus on the social cultural contexts for the Slavic languages – in particular, how interactions among Slavic individuals and groups (and with non-Slavic neighbors) have shaped groups' cultures and languages, and how the cultural and linguistic history of the Slavs has influenced their world views.
Semester Credit Hours/Units   Fixed: 3

Offering Information

Length Of Course   14 Week, 12 Week
Flexibly Scheduled Course   Never
Does any section of this course have a distance education component?   No
Grading Basis   Letter Grade
Repeatable   No
Course Components   Lecture
Grade Roster Component   Lecture
Credit Available by Exam   No
Admission Condition Course   No
Off Campus   Never
Campus of Offering   Columbus

Prerequisites and Exclusions

Prerequisites/Corequisites
Exclusions

Cross-Listings

Cross-Listings

Subject/CIP Code

Subject/CIP Code   16.0400
Subsidy Level   General Studies Course
Intended Rank   Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior

Requirement/Elective Designation

General Education course:
  Individual and Groups

Course Details

Course goals or learning objectives/outcomes

- Students will apply the theories and methods of linguistic inquiry to the relationship between the Slavic languages (comparative method, genetic/tree model, contact/wave model, sociolinguistic principles of language change).
- Students will develop an understanding of how interactions between individuals and groups have shaped the various Slavic languages, as important elements of their corresponding cultures.
- Students will investigate the cultural and identity functions of language at different levels of analysis (individual and group), the relationship between these two levels, and similarities and differences within and across groups.
- Students will assess the importance of language as a factor in social policy in Slavic countries, and explore how language policies reflect societal values.
- Students will critically examine their own preconceptions, and those of other people, about language and its relationship to social structures.

Content Topic List

- How the Slavic languages and peoples are related
- Scientific methods for tracing language relatedness and contact-based linguistic-cultural influence
- Linguistic relativity and linguistic-cultural elements of social interaction
- The status of Slavic minority languages

Attachments

- S3760_Linguistics_concurrence.pdf: Linguistics Concurrence

  (Concurrence. Owner: Peterson,Derek)
- S3760_assessment_plan.pdf

  (GEC Course Assessment Plan. Owner: Peterson,Derek)
- S3760_syllabus_proposed.pdf

  (Syllabus. Owner: Peterson,Derek)
- S3760_rationale.pdf

  (Other Supporting Documentation. Owner: Peterson,Derek)

Comments

Workflow Information

Status	User(s)	Date/Time	Step
Submitted	Peterson,Derek	02/16/2016 02:55 PM	Submitted for Approval
Approved	Brintlinger,Angela Kay	02/16/2016 03:21 PM	Unit Approval
Approved	Heysel,Garett Robert	02/22/2016 02:23 PM	College Approval
Pending Approval	Nolen,Dawn Vankeerbergen,Bernadette Chantal Hanlin,Deborah Kay Jenkins,Mary Ellen Bigler Hogle,Danielle Nicole	02/22/2016 02:23 PM	ASCCAO Approval

Slavic 3760: Slavic Words – Slavic Worlds

Syllabus

Instructor: **Office**:
Email: **Office Hours**:
Phone: **Mailbox**:

Class meeting time: **Instructional format**: Lecture
Class meeting location: **Contact hours per week**: 3 hours

Course Information

Course Description: The Slavic languages are spoken in Central and Eastern Europe, the Balkans, and Northern Asia, and in diaspora communities around the world. They form an important language family within Indo-European, comprising over a dozen living languages and more than 400 million speakers. This introductory course examines the Slavic world through its languages. It will focus on the social-cultural contexts for the Slavic languages – in particular, how interactions among Slavic individuals and groups (and with non-Slavic neighbors) have shaped groups' cultures and languages, and how the cultural and linguistic history of the Slavs has influenced their worldviews. Topics include how the Slavic languages and peoples are related, scientific methods for tracing language relatedness and contact-based linguistic-cultural influence, linguistic relativity and linguistic-cultural elements of social interaction, and the status of Slavic minority languages.

Course Objectives:
1. Students will apply the theories and methods of linguistic inquiry to the relationship between the Slavic languages (comparative method, genetic/tree model, contact/wave model, sociolinguistic principles of language change).
2. Students will develop an understanding of how interactions between individuals and groups have shaped the various Slavic languages, as important elements of their corresponding cultures.
3. Students will investigate the cultural and identity functions of language at different levels of analysis (individual and group), the relationship between these two levels, and similarities and differences within and across groups.
4. Students will assess the importance of language as a factor in social policy in Slavic countries, and explore how language policies reflect societal values.
5. Students will critically examine their own preconceptions, and those of other people, about language and its relationship to social structures.

Prerequisites: There are no prerequisites for this class. The course is taught in English with readings in English. No previous experience with Slavic languages or cultures is required, although a healthy curiosity for how languages function and how people use them will prove beneficial.

GE Information: This course fulfills the *Social Science: Individuals and Groups* General Education Requirement.

Goals: Students understand the systematic study of human behavior and cognition; the structure of human societies, cultures, and institutions; and the processes by which individuals, groups, and societies interact, communicate, and use human, natural, and economic resources.

Expected Learning Outcomes:
1. Students understand the theories and methods of social scientific inquiry as they apply to the study of individuals and groups.
2. Students understand the behavior of individuals, differences and similarities in social and cultural contexts of human existence, and the processes by which groups function.
3. Students comprehend and assess individual and group values and their importance in social problem solving and policy making.

This course will fulfill these learning outcomes by having students apply the theories and methods of linguistic inquiry to the study of Slavic languages, and the people/cultures that speak them. Students will also examine Slavic languages, as cultural elements, at the level of the group and at the level of the individual. Finally, the course will familiarize students with how language is used for social policy in Slavic countries.

Texts

There is no textbook for this class. Required readings will be available from this course's Carmen page.

Course Requirements

Attendance and Participation: Lectures and class discussions will cover material which is not necessarily in the readings and which you will be responsible for. It is therefore important that you attend every class, ask questions and participate in discussions and activities. You will receive a weekly participation grade. Note that attendance by itself is not sufficient. I expect you to actively engage with your classmates and with me.

Reading: There is a reading assignment for most classes. You should do the reading *before* the date listed on the schedule. You are encouraged to write notes about the readings. The class will be much more informative, substantive, and even fun if every person arrives having read and ready to discuss. Please bring a copy of the assigned reading to class with you.

Analytic Problem Sets: There will be four (4) problem sets that ask you to apply the theories and methodologies introduced in the class to new data, and to consider challenges that arise in the process of analysis. These assignments are designed to help you improve your analytic abilities and extend your understanding of the course material through hands-on, data-driven exploration.

Mini-tests: There will be three (3) mini-tests of about 30 minutes each, which are designed to solidify and test your knowledge of the course's major topics, questions, and analytic paradigms.

Final Exam: There will be a final exam at the time and location assigned by the Registrar. The exam will be comprehensive. Like the mini-tests it will probe your knowledge of the course material. However, like the problem sets, it may also ask you to apply concepts and methods from the course to previously unseen data, thus testing patterns of reasoning and analytic principles.

Handouts with details about the assignments will be forthcoming. We will also discuss expectations for these assignments during class.

Grading

Grading will be by the following criteria.

Participation	14%
Problem Sets (4 x 8% each)	32%
Mini-tests (3 x 8% each)	24%
Final exam	30%
Total	100%

Grading Scale

A	93-100	B+	87-89	C+	77-79	D+	67-69
A-	90-92	B	83-86	C	73-76	D	60-66
		B-	80-82	C-	70-72	E	0-59

Important Policies

Academic Integrity (Academic Misconduct): It is the responsibility of the Committee on Academic Misconduct to investigate or establish procedures for the investigation of all reported cases of student academic misconduct. The term "academic misconduct" includes all forms of student academic misconduct wherever committed; illustrated by, but not limited to, cases of plagiarism and dishonest practices in connection with examinations. Instructors shall report all instances of alleged academic misconduct to the committee (Faculty Rule 3335-5-487). For additional information, see the Code of Student Conduct http://studentlife.osu.edu/csc/.

If you have any questions about the above policy or what constitutes academic misconduct in this course, please contact me.

Other sources of information on academic misconduct (integrity) to which you can refer include:

The Committee on Academic Misconduct web pages (oaa.osu.edu/coam/home.html)

Ten Suggestions for Preserving Academic Integrity
(oaa.osu.edu/coam/ten-suggestions.html)

Eight Cardinal Rules of Academic Integrity (www.northwestern.edu/uacc/8cards.html)

Students with Special Needs: Students with disabilities that have been certified by the Office for Disability Services will be appropriately accommodated and should inform the instructor as soon as possible of their needs. The Office for Disability Services is located in 150 Pomerene Hall, 1760 Neil Avenue; telephone 292-3307, TDD 292-0901; **http://www.ods.ohio-state.edu/**.

Late Assignments: I reserve the right to not accept work that is turned in late. An assignment is late if not turned in by the beginning of the class in which it is due. If I choose to accept a late assignment, I will reduce the grade by 10 points for each class session that it is late. If you have a legitimate excuse for not turning in work on time, you must request an extension before the assignment is due, and the earlier you ask, the more likely it is that you will receive an extension.

Classroom Etiquette: While robust debate is good, you are expected to respect you classmates' rights to their opinions and beliefs. This includes not interrupting people, dominating the floor, raising your voice, insulting, threatening, etc.

Phones and Laptops: Under no circumstances should you be texting, playing games, checking social media, checking your email, surfing the internet, talking on the phone, or otherwise engaging in any activities that are unrelated to what is happening in class. Please turn off your phone when you enter the classroom. You may bring a laptop to class, but please restrict your use to class-related activities.

Course Schedule

PS = Analytic Problem Set

Date	Topics	Readings	Assignments
UNIT 1: INTRODUCTION TO THE SLAVIC PEOPLES AND THEIR LANGUAGES			
WEEK 1			
We	Course information Intro to the Slavic languages		
Fr	Language families and language relatedness	Hamp (1994) [7 pp.] Sussex and Cubberley (2006): 0.1-0.6 [13 pp.]	
WEEK 2			
We	The sounds of Slavic	Ladefoged (1993), Ch. 1: Articulatory phonetics [15 pp.]	
Fr	Investigating language relatedness: The comparative method and tree model	Fox (1995), Ch. 1: Introduction [16 pp.] Fox (1995), Ch. 4: The comparative method [35 pp.]	
WEEK 3			
We	Prehistory and migrations Creation of Slavic Europe	Heather (2010), pp. 386-411 [26 pp.]	PS 1 due
Fr	Creation of Slavic Europe	Heather (2010), pp. 412-451 [40 pp.] Maher (1977), Ch. 6: The ethnonyms of the Slavs [14 pp.]	
UNIT 2: SLAVIC WORLDVIEWS THROUGH LANGUAGE			
WEEK 4			
We	Intro to linguistic relativity 'Blue' in English, Russian, Polish	Foley (1997), Ch. 8: On relativist understanding [10 pp.] Spradley (1979), pp. 3-13	Mini-test 1
Fr	Traditional family, kinship, and community structure	Vucinich (1976) [26 pp.] Matossian (1992[1968]) [30 pp.]	
WEEK 5			
We	Kinship terms (and taboos)	Friedrich (1966) [27 pp.] Stankiewicz (1958) [8 pp.]	
Fr	Diminutives Ways of addressing each other	Kryk-Kastovsky (2000) [10 pp.] Mladenova (2001) [36 pp.]	
WEEK 6			
We	Politeness and address: Different kinds of 'you'	Stone (1977) [15 pp.] Kess and Juričić (1978) [15 pp.]	
Fr	Politeness and the cultural context for speech acts	Wierzbicka (1985) [34 pp.] Mills (1992) [14 pp.]	PS 2 due
WEEK 7			
We	Impoliteness: Swearing, obscenities, and taboo language	Ďurovič (1992) [11 pp.] Dreizin and Priestly (1982) [17 pp.]	

	**UNIT 3: WORLDS IN CONTACT - SLAVS AND THEIR NEIGHBORS**		
Fr	Intro to models of social-linguistic contact	Thomason (2001), Ch. 1: Introduction [14 pp.]	Mini-test 2
	**WEEK 8**		
We	Investigating language relatedness: Contact and the wave model	Thomason (2001), Ch. 6: Contact-induced language change: Mechanisms [29 pp.]	
Fr	NO CLASS – Autumn break		
	**WEEK 9**		
We	Casual contact zones: Russenorsk as a barter language	Peterson (1980) [8 pp.] Jahr (1996) [16 pp.]	
Fr	Intensive contact zones: The Balkans	Friedman (2006) [16 pp.] Čolović (2002) [23 pp.]	PS 3 due
	**WEEK 10**		
We	Intensive contact zones: The Balkans	Friedman (1995) [10 pp.] Adamou (2010) [25 pp.]	
Fr	Siblings in contact: Russian and (Old) Church Slavonic	Lunt (1995) [7 pp.] Comrie (1991) [13 pp.]	
	**WEEK 11**		
We	Siblings in contact: Russian and Ukrainian	Taranenko (2007) [22 pp.] Bilaniuk (1997) [25 pp.]	
	**UNIT 4: WORLDS INSIDE WORLDS –** **LANGUAGE, POLITICS, AND IDENTITY AMONG SLAVIC MINORITIES**		
Fr	Intro to nationalism, identity, and national language policy	Hornberger (2006) [18 pp.] Grenoble (2003), Ch. 2: An overview of Soviet language policy [30 pp.]	Mini-test 3
	**WEEK 12**		
We	NO CLASS – Veterans Day		
Fr	Slavic minorities and the negotiation of identity	Voss (2007) [16 pp.] Fraenkel (1995) [11 pp.]	
	**WEEK 13**		
We	Minority languages: Identity and social policy	O'Reilly (2001) [19 pp.] Majewicz (1996) [15 pp.]	
Fr	Minority languages: Identity and social policy	Norberg (1994) [10 pp.] Priestly (1996) [20 pp.]	PS 4 due
	**WEEK 14**		
We	NO CLASS – Thanksgiving break		
Fr	NO CLASS – Thanksgiving break		
	**WEEK 15**		
We	Slavs in the U.S.	Perkowski (1970) [7 pp.] Dutkova-Cope (2000) [31 pp.]	
Fr	Slavs in the U.S.	Ward (1980) [10 pp.] Kramer (1993) [27 pp.]	
	**WEEK 16**		
We	Wrap up and catch up		
	Final exam at the date and time assigned by the Registrar		

Readings

Adamou, Evangelia. 2010. "Bilingual speech and language ecology in Greek Thrace: Romani and Pomak in contact with Turkish." *Language in Society* no. 39 (2):147-171.

Bilaniuk, Laada. 1997. "Speaking of 'Surzhyk': Ideologies and mixed languages." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* no. 21 (1/2):93-117.

Čolović, Ivan. 2002. "Who owns the gusle? A contribution to research on the political history of a Balkan instrument." In *The balkans in focus: Cultural boundaries in Europe*, edited by Sanimir Resic and Barbara Törnquist-Plewa, 59-81. Nordic Academic Press.

Comrie, Bernard. 1991. "Diglossia in the Old Russian period." *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* no. 10:160-172.

Dreizin, Felix, and Tom Priestly. 1982. "A systematic approach to Russian obscene language." *Russian Linguistics* no. 6 (2):233-249.

Ďurovič, L'ubomír. 1992. "Typology of swearing in Slavonic and some adjacent languages." In *Le mot, les mots, les bons mots: hommage à Igor A. Mel'čuk par ses amis, collègues et élèves à l'occasion de son soixantième anniversaire*, edited by d'André Clas, 39-49. Montréal: Presses de l'Université de Montréal.

Dutkova-Cope, Lida. 2000. "Texas Czech folk music and ethnic identity." *Pragmatics* no. 10 (1):7-37.

Foley, William A. 1997. *Anthropological linguistics: An introduction*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Fox, Anthony. 1995. *Linguistic reconstruction: An introduction to theory and method*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fraenkel, Eran. 1995. "Turning a donkey into a horse: paradox and conflict in the identity of *makedonci muslimani*." *Balkan forum* no. 3 (4):153-163.

Friedman, Victor A. 1995. "Persistence and change in Ottoman patterns of code-switching in the republic of Macedonia: Nostalgia, duress and language shift in contemporary Southeastern Europe." In *Papers from the summer school code-switching and language contact, Ljouwest/Leeuwarden, 14-17 September 1994*, 58-67. Frske Akademy.

Friedman, Victor A. 2006. "The Balkans as a linguistic area." In *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, edited by Keith Brown, 657-672. Oxford: Elsevier.

Friedrich, Paul. 1966. "The linguistic reflex of social change: From Tsarist to Soviet Russian kinship." *Sociological Inquiry* no. 36 (2):159-185.

Grenoble, Lenore. 2003. *Language policy in the Soviet Union*: Springer.

Hamp, Eric P. 1994. "Indo-European." In *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, edited by R.E. Asher, 1661-1667. Oxford: Pergamon.

Heather, Peter. 2010. *Empires and barbarians: The fall of Rome and the birth of Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hornberger, Nancy H. 2006. "Frameworks and models in language policy and planning." In *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method*, edited by Thomas Ricento, 24-41. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Jahr, Ernst Håkon. 1996. "On the pidgin status of Russenorsk." In *Language contact in the Arctic: Northern pidgins and contact languages*, edited by Ernst Håkon Jahr and Ingvild Broch, 107-122. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kess, Joseph, and Želimir Juričić. 1978. "Slovene pronominal address forms: Rural vs. urban sociolinguistic strategies." *Anthropological Linguistics* no. 20:297-311.

Kramer, Christina. 1993. "Language in exile: the Macedonians of Toronto." In *Language contact - language conflict*, edited by Eran Fraenkel and Christina Kramer, 157-183. New York: P. Lang.

Kryk-Kastovsky, Barbara. 2000. "Diminutives: An interface of word formation, semantics, and pragmatics." In *Words: Structure, meaning, function: A festschrift for Dieter Kastovsky*, edited by Christiane Dalton-Puffer and Nikolaus Ritt, 165-174. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Ladefoged, Peter. 1993. *A course in phonetics, 3ed*. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace & Company.

Lunt, Horace G. 1995. "How close is Russian to OCS?" In *The language and verse of Russia*, edited by Henrik Birnbaum and Michael S. Flier, 198-204. Moscow: Vostochnaya Literatura.

Maher, J. Peter. 1977. *Papers on language theory and history*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Majewicz, Alfred E. 1996. "Kashubian choices, Kashubian prospects: A minority language situation in northern Poland." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* no. 120:39-53.

Matossian, Mary. 1992[1968]. "The peasant way of life." In *Russian peasant women*, edited by Beatrice Farnsworth and Lynne Viola, 11-40. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mills, Margaret. 1992. "Conventionalized politeness in Russian requests: A pragmatic view of indirectness." *Russian linguistics* no. 16:65-78.

Mladenova, Olga M. 2001. "Neuter designations of humans and norms of social interaction in the Balkans." *Anthropological linguistics* no. 43 (1):18-53.

Norberg, Madlena. 1994. "Small languages and small language communities 16: The Sorbs between support and suppression." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* no. 107:149-158.

O'Reilly, Camille C. 2001. "Introduction: Minority languages, ethnicity and the state in the European Union." In *Language, ethnicity and the state, vol. 1: Minority languages in the European Union*, edited by Camille C. O'Reilly, 1-19. New York: Palgrave.

Perkowski, Jan L. 1970. "A survey of the West Slavic immigrant languages in Texas." In *Texas studies in bilingualism: Spanish, French, German, Czech, Polish, Sorbian, and Norwegian in the Southwest*, edited by Glenn G. Gilbert, 163-169. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Peterson, Ronald E. 1980. "A little known aspect of Russian-Norwegian relations." *Studies in Language* no. 4 (2):249-256.

Priestly, Tom. 1996. "Denial of ethnic identity: The political manipulation of beliefs about language in Slovene minority areas of Austria and Hungary." *Slavic Review* no. 55 (2):364-398.

Spradley, James. 1979. *The ethnographic interview*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Stankiewicz, Edward. 1958. "Slavic kinship terms and the perils of the soul." *Journal of American Folklore* no. 71 (280):115-122.

Stone, Gerald. 1977. "Address in the Slavonic languages." *Slavonic and East European Review* no. 55 (4):491-505.

Sussex, Roland, and Paul Cubberley. 2006. *The Slavic languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Taranenko, Oleksandr. 2007. "Ukrainian and Russian in contact: Attraction and estrangement." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* no. 183:119-140.

Thomason, Sarah G. 2001. *Language contact: An introduction*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Voss, Christian. 2007. "Language ideology between self-identification and ascription among the Slavic-speakers of Greek Macedonia and Thrace." In *The Pomaks in Greece and Bulgaria: A model case for borderland minorities in the Balkans*, edited by Klaus Steinke and Christian Voss, 177-192. München: Otto Sagner.

Vucinich, Wayne. 1976. "A *zadruga* in Bileća Rudine." In *Communal families in the Balkans: The zadruga: Essays by Philip E. Mosely and essays in his honor*, edited by Robert F. Byrnes, 162-187. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Ward, Charles A. 1980. "Intrafamilial patterns and Croatian language maintenance in America." In *Studies in ethnicity: The East European experience in America*, edited by Charles A. Ward, Philip Shashko and Donald E. Pienkos, 3-14. Boulder, CO: East European Monographs.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 1985. "Different cultures, different languages, different speech acts: Polish vs. English." *Journal of Pragmatics* no. 9 (2-3):145-178.

Slavic 3760: Slavic Words – Slavic Worlds

GE Rationale
Social Science: Individuals and Groups

1. Course rationale, in the context of the goals for the GE category

Slavic 3760 students will engage directly with the following goals of the Social Science (Individuals and Groups) GE category: understanding human behavior and cognition; the structure of human societies and cultures; and the processes by which individuals, groups, and socials interact and communicate.

    Human behavior and cognition: Slavic 3760 students will examine how language, culture, and cognition are intertwined, so that different languages (e.g., Russian and English) prime their speakers to have different perceptions of emotions, social relations, and even aspects of the physical world. The discussion challenges students not to take their own worldviews as universal but to understand how their attitudes, perceptions, and behavior are influenced by cultural factors embedded in and expressed through language.

    Structure of human societies and cultures: Slavic 3760 students will explore how languages (e.g., Croatian and American English) model different conceptualizations of social organization, including kinship, ethnicity, nationality, and otherness. The students will examine how these conceptual models influence individuals in constructing their identities as members of imagined communities; how they shape cultural norms (e.g., patriarchy and familism) and reinforce them through mechanisms such as verbal taboos; and how they can play out on the societal level in ethnic, regional, and national identities, and nationalism and state policies (e.g., language standardization and the linguistic rights of ethnic minorities).

    Processes by which individuals, groups, and societies interact and communicate: Slavic 3760 students will further discuss how social relations (individual and group interactions) are indexed, constructed, and negotiated through language. For example, they will compare/contrast pragmatic strategies such as politeness, impoliteness, and speech acts in various Slavic languages to English to understand how linguistic systems create different expectations of social interaction among individuals and, in cultural-contact situations, lay the ground for miscommunication on an individual and societal level. In addition, students will look at how speakers of different languages sometimes minimize their linguistic differences to create solidarity – on an individual level in the phenomenon of speech accommodation, code-mixing by bilinguals, and linguistic 'borrowing'; on a societal level in language shift, the creation of interdialects, and linguistic convergence (Sprachbunds). Students will also examine the countervailing trend – how speakers emphasize or even exaggerate linguistic differences at both individual and societal levels in the service of politics, national-identity formation, nationalism, and cultural Othering. In discussing linguistic divergence, students will necessarily also discuss how the differentiation of related dialects and languages proceeds in tandem with socio-cultural factors such as migration, economic and cultural contacts, and religious and political shifts.

2. Individuals and Groups Expected Learning Outcomes

1. Students understand the theories and methods of social scientific inquiry as they are applied to the study of individuals and groups.

Topics: As discussed in section 1, topics of the course will explore theories and methods of linguistic inquiry that are grounded in the social sciences – historical linguistics, sociolinguistics, and anthropological linguistics.

Readings: Many of the readings for Slavic 3760 directly promote this learning outcome. For instance, the assigned chapters from Fox (1995) give an introduction to the major methodological principles from historical linguistics for reconstruction of earlier states of languages, known as the comparative method, and the major theoretical models of historical relatedness of languages (the tree model), and change in language over time (language-internal change model). This is accompanied by readings on relatedness of the Slavic languages – individual languages within the Slavic family (Sussex and Cubberley 2006), and Slavic in comparison to other branches of the larger family, Indo-European (Hamp 1994), which serve to ground the methodological and theoretical knowledge with the particular language communities that are the focus of this course. The historical linguistic approach is also compared with methodological principles from sociolinguistics for investigating language change as a result of contact with speakers of other dialects/languages. The assigned chapter from Thomason (2001) is an introduction to major methodologies of contact sociolinguistics (sociolinguistic interview, geographical dialectology, social network analysis) and the corresponding major theoretical model of contact-induced language similarity (the wave model). The assigned chapter from Foley (1997) is a theoretical introduction to concept of linguistic relativity – to what extent different linguistic systems entail different cultural worldviews, or, in the most radical formulation, whether "language determines thought" (aspects of cognition). Examined here are the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis and Neo-Whorfianism. This reading is paired with a methodological introduction to the ethnographic interview (section from Spradley 1979). Other readings are less directly focused on introducing methodological principles, but illustrate methodological and theoretical principles in practice.

Written Assignments: Students will engage with the methods of social science inquiry primarily through the analytic problem sets, and secondarily through exams. The analytic problem sets will ask students to apply the theories and methodologies introduced in the class to new data related to the language behavior of individuals and groups, and to consider challenges that arise in the process of analysis. These assignments are designed to help students improve their analytic abilities, deepen their knowledge of methodology, and extend their understanding of the course material through hands-on, data-driven exploration. The first three problem sets are tied to the three main methodological approaches discussed in the course: comparative method (from historical linguistics), ethnography (from anthropology), and social network analysis (from contact sociolinguistics). The fourth analytic problem set will be an analysis of public policy issues.

Students will engage with theories of social science inquiry primarily through exams ("mini-tests", final exam), and secondarily through analytic problem sets. The exams will ask students to compare the three major disciplinary perspectives of the course (historical linguistics, sociolinguistics, anthropological linguistics), and how they approach common questions, e.g, how languages change without disrupting the continuity of social relations within communities of speakers. The goal is for the exams to focus on critical thinking and synthesis of ideas as they relate to the linguistic behavior of individuals and groups. Moreover, since methodologies are tied to particular major theories (e.g., the comparative method is connected to the tree model),

the analytic problem sets will also force students to engage with issues of theory as well as of methodology.

Other Course Components: Class participation is important for this and all of the expected learning outcomes, since in-class activities – the collective grappling with ideas through lecture, discussion, small group work, and in-class writing – are foundational to all other assignments in the course. Class work will model the ideas and analyses that students will then practice and develop through written assignments.

2. Students understand the behavior of individuals, differences and similarities in social and cultural contexts of human existence, and the processes by which groups function.

Topics: As described in section 1, students in Slavic 3760 will develop an understanding of the important role that language plays in the formation of ethnic, cultural, and national identities, and how it shapes individual perceptions, attitudes, and behavior.

Readings: The assigned readings connect the level of the individual with the level of the (ethnic, national) group and balance the two levels of investigation. For instance, at the individual level, readings like Stone (1977), Kess and Juričić (1978), Mills (1992), and Wierzbicka (1985) examine conversational norms for politeness (and impoliteness), and how they are enacted through Russian and other Slavic languages. As discussed above, these micro-details of social norms and pragmatics are important for understanding how linguistic systems create different expectations of social interaction among individuals. In cultural-contact situations, they also lay the ground for miscommunication and societal level. Assigned readings like Adamou (2010), Fraenkel (1995), Friedman (1995), Jahr (1996), and Taranenko (2007) extend the interactional approach to larger social units, exploring the social and linguistic consequences of interactions between groups speaking different languages. A central idea here is that while there are similarities across language contact situations, the societal-level consequences of contact nonetheless differ depending on the nature of individual interactions. This connects the micro-interactional investigation of conversational strategies (e.g., politeness) with group-level sociolinguistic behavior. Connecting individual behavior and group functioning in a different way, Bilaniuk (1997), Priestly (1996), and Voss (2007) explore language ideology – attitudes and beliefs about language – and the consequences of ideology for minority group identity (in Eastern Ukraine, Slovene-speaking areas in Austria and Hungary, and Macedonian-speaking regions in Greece, respectively). Finally, reflecting the largest unit of analysis, readings like Grenoble (2003), Hornberger (2006), Majewicz (1996), Norberg (1994), and O'Reilly (2001) explore how language ideology is used for national language policy in Slavic countries, both in support of minority group rights and in suppression of them.

Written Assignments: After the first unit, which is an introduction to the Slavic peoples and their languages, the course will progress from exploration of the individual as a unit of analysis to progressively larger groups. The problem sets and mini-tests will reflect this progression; each assignment will reflect different theories, methods, and resulting data, as appropriate to the level of analysis. Across the course of the semester, this will offer an opportunity to compare and contrast in an organized way the analytic issues that arise at the level of the individual, as opposed to the level of the group. Later assignments will ask students explicitly to reflect on this comparison. The written assignments will also seek to reinforce a point made in the readings (and class discussions, etc.) – that similarities and differences in the social structuring of groups in the Slavic world are determined in part by the contexts of their

interaction. For example, we anticipate that Problem Set 3 will ask students to compare the linguistic structures that are the result of language contact between Romani and Turkish speakers in two communities in the Balkans. The comparison is interesting because the communities are superficially parallel cases of contact, and the linguistic outcomes are similar in some respects, yet they are different in others. The point will be for students to analyze how the linguistic facts given in the problem set are related to the very different social structuring of each community, as revealed by social network analysis.

3. Students comprehend and assess individual and group values, and recognize their importance in social problem solving and policy making.

Topics: In Slavic 3760, students will study the important role that language plays in the formation of ethnic, cultural, and national identities, with their complex of values and attitudes; how language serves as a means of uniting or dividing individuals and communities; how language influences the development of attitudes and norms regulating social relations and behavior; and how it has been used as an instrument for state control of diverse populations. Thus students discuss how linguistic distinctions have served as rallying points both for minority groups targeted by assimilationist state policies and for dominant groups who feel that their traditional status is challenged by ethnic "Others".

Readings: As noted above, many of the readings address questions of individual and group values (in the form of language ideology), and their importance for social problem solving and policy making. Bilaniuk (1997), Priestly (1996), and Voss (2007) discuss the consequences of language ideologies for minority group identity. Grenoble (2003), Hornberger (2006), Majewicz (1996), Norberg (1994), and O'Reilly (2001), among other readings, explore how language ideology is used for national language policy in Slavic countries, both in support of minority group rights and in suppression of them. There is no need to belabor the point by discussing all of the relevant readings, but two of the four major units of the course ('Unit 3: Worlds in Contact – Slavs and Their Neighbors' and 'Unit 4: Worlds Inside Worlds: Language, Politics and Identity Among Slavic Minorities'), and all of the corresponding readings, are centrally focused on this learning outcome. A primary goal is to have students explore and develop a better understanding of how values are translated into social outcomes, including social policy.

Written Assignments: The written assignments, and especially Problem Set 4, Mini-Test 3, and the Final Exam, will ask students to synthesize and evaluate arguments about social policy in Slavic countries or related to Slavic minorities in non-Slavic countries. For example, the Bulgarian government has traditionally denied the existence of a Macedonian language/identity that is distinct from Bulgarian, and many individuals also adhere to this idea. (Bulgaria and Macedonia are neighbors in the central Balkans. The reasons for denial of Macedonian are too complex to review here, but we note that the Macedonian language was standardized quite late compared to many European languages (1945), and that a distinct Macedonian threatens some of the historical-cultural underpinnings for Bulgarian national identity.) One part of Problem Set 4 will ask students to analyze the argumentation of an influential treatise published by the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. The goal is for students to assess how the values on which 'Bulgarianness' is established are enacted to deny Macedonian language and identity. Another part of the assignment will ask students to compare and contrast minority language policy in different Slavic countries, based on case studies introduced in readings and in class.

References

Adamou, Evangelia. 2010. "Bilingual speech and language ecology in Greek Thrace: Romani and Pomak in contact with Turkish." *Language in Society* no. 39 (2):147-171.

Bilaniuk, Laada. 1997. "Speaking of 'Surzhyk': Ideologies and mixed languages." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* no. 21 (1/2):93-117.

Foley, William A. 1997. *Anthropological linguistics: An introduction*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Fox, Anthony. 1995. *Linguistic reconstruction: An introduction to theory and method*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fraenkel, Eran. 1995. "Turning a donkey into a horse: paradox and conflict in the identity of *makedonci muslimani*." *Balkan forum* no. 3 (4):153-163.

Friedman, Victor A. 1995. "Persistence and change in Ottoman patterns of code-switching in the republic of Macedonia: Nostalgia, duress and language shift in contemporary Southeastern Europe." In *Papers from the summer school code-switching and language contact, Ljouwest/Leeuwarden, 14-17 September 1994*, 58-67. Frske Akademy.

Grenoble, Lenore. 2003. *Language policy in the Soviet Union*: Springer.

Hamp, Eric P. 1994. "Indo-European." In *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, edited by R.E. Asher, 1661-1667. Oxford: Pergamon.

Hornberger, Nancy H. 2006. "Frameworks and models in language policy and planning." In *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method*, edited by Thomas Ricento, 24-41. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Jahr, Ernst Håkon. 1996. "On the pidgin status of Russenorsk." In *Language contact in the Arctic: Northern pidgins and contact languages*, edited by Ernst Håkon Jahr and Ingvild Broch, 107-122. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kess, Joseph, and Želimir Juričić. 1978. "Slovene pronominal address forms: Rural vs. urban sociolinguistic strategies." *Anthropological Linguistics* no. 20:297-311.

Majewicz, Alfred E. 1996. "Kashubian choices, Kashubian prospects: A minority language situation in northern Poland." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* no. 120:39-53.

Mills, Margaret. 1992. "Conventionalized politeness in Russian requests: A pragmatic view of indirectness." *Russian linguistics* no. 16:65-78.

Norberg, Madlena. 1994. "Small languages and small language communities 16: The Sorbs between support and suppression." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* no. 107:149-158.

O'Reilly, Camille C. 2001. "Introduction: Minority languages, ethnicity and the state in the European Union." In *Language, ethnicity and the state, vol. 1: Minority languages in the European Union*, edited by Camille C. O'Reilly, 1-19. New York: Palgrave.

Priestly, Tom. 1996. "Denial of ethnic identity: The political manipulation of beliefs about language in Slovene minority areas of Austria and Hungary." *Slavic Review* no. 55 (2):364-398.

Spradley, James. 1979. *The ethnographic interview*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Stone, Gerald. 1977. "Address in the Slavonic languages." *Slavonic and East European Review* no. 55 (4):491-505.

Sussex, Roland, and Paul Cubberley. 2006. *The Slavic languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Taranenko, Oleksandr. 2007. "Ukrainian and Russian in contact: Attraction and estrangement." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* no. 183:119-140.

Thomason, Sarah G. 2001. *Language contact: An introduction*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Voss, Christian. 2007. "Language ideology between self-identification and ascription among the Slavic-speakers of Greek Macedonia and Thrace." In *The Pomaks in Greece and Bulgaria: A model case for borderland minorities in the Balkans*, edited by Klaus Steinke and Christian Voss, 177-192. München: Otto Sagner.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 1985. "Different cultures, different languages, different speech acts: Polish vs. English." *Journal of Pragmatics* no. 9 (2-3):145-178.

Slavic 3760: Slavic Words – Slavic Worlds

Course Assessment Plan
Social Science GE: Individuals and Groups

Assessment of student learning in Slavic 3760 will occur in multiple ways. Following standard practice in the Department of Slavic and East European Languages and Cultures (SEELC), each instance of this course will be reviewed via the following mechanisms:

1. Quantitative SEI forms
2. A course-specific evaluation form, administered either in-class or on-line, that asks students to evaluate the course on general strengths and weaknesses (open-ended, discursive), and according to the specific learning goals of the course (quantitative). A sample evaluation form is given in Appendix B.
3. Review of student work by the instructor. In their written and in-class work, students will be expected to synthesize and evaluate data and published research related to how interactions among Slavic individuals and groups (and with non-Slavic neighbors) have shaped groups' languages, as social and cultural structures. The written work will include exams and problem sets that require students to apply the scientific methodologies of linguistics to new data. Students will thus have ample opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge, and informal assessment of the extent to which students have succeeded in grasping and synthesizing major issues, taken in the context of the stated learning goals, is a metric by which to evaluate the course. Sample materials for written assignments are given in Appendix A.

In the first semester the course is taught, and at least biennially thereafter, it also will be reviewed via:

4. Class observation conducted by a member of the SEELC faculty, including a written report to be submitted both to the instructor and to the department chair.

The goal of all four types of evaluation is to assess how well the learning goals for this course are being met, including learning objectives for the Social Science: Individuals and Groups GE category. The resulting feedback from quantitative SEI forms, discursive evaluations and class observations will be maintained on file in SEELC so that the progress of the course can be monitored and evaluated across time as the course evolves and to enable the department to address any major concerns or drift from the established goals and standards. If the results suggest that the GE learning objectives are not being clearly communicated through course content, the instructor(s) will undertake revision of the course content as needed. Even when the feedback is positive, the instructor(s) will make minor changes to the material to keep the information up to date.

   Periodically, SEELC's Undergraduate Studies Committee reviews the department's undergraduate courses; future reviews will include Slavic 3760. These reviews are based upon:

1. Representative portfolios of student work
2. Syllabi for past and current instantiations of the course
3. Surveys of enrolled students

The purpose of such as review is to assess whether the GE and program goals for the course are being met. As with the other forms of evaluation, if the results indicate that the course is not living up to its intellectual promise, then a revision of the course content will be undertaken.

Appendix A: Sample Materials for Written Assignments

On the analytical problem sets, mini-tests, and final exam, questions will be written specifically to assess student achievement according to each GE expected learning outcome. The responses to these questions will be analyzed so that the data can be used in revising the course and for GE assessment reporting purposes.

Sample questions for the tests and final exam:

1. Students understand the theories and methods of social scientific inquiry as they are applied to the study of individuals and groups.

1A. Define the following theories of language change: *tree model* and *wave model*. For each model, give one example of how it helps to explain the development from Common Slavic to separate modern Slavic languages. Finally, compare the two models by answering the following questions: What kinds of research questions does each model answer? How are these questions similar? How are they different?

1B. Compare the *sociolinguistic interview* to *social network analysis*, as two methods for investigating linguistic variation. Which is more suitable for investigating variation at the level of the individual? Which is more suitable for investigating variation at the level of societal groups? Explain in detail how each method is employed to study variation in linguistic systems.

2. Students understand the behavior of individuals, differences and similarities in social and cultural contexts of human existence, and the processes by which groups function.

2A. Discuss the linguistic outcomes of contact between Slavic language speakers their (Slavic or non-Slavic) neighbors, and how these outcomes depend on the intensity of the contact. What kinds of language contact patterns are found in casual contact situations? What is found in intense contact situations? Illustrate your answer with specific examples.

2B. First, explain what the system of Slavic kinship terms reveals about traditional family and community structures. Then, explain how this is an example of linguistic relativism.

3. Students comprehend and assess individual and group values, and recognize their importance in social problem solving and policy making.

3A. Identify three features of the grammar of Russian that can be used to express politeness or impoliteness. Explain what they reveal about Russian societal values, as contrasted with American societal values.

3B. From the case studies that we have considered this semester, describe one way in which language policy has been used to promote a pluralistic model of society (including minority rights and minority group identity), and one way in which it has been used to promote an assimilationist model of society.

Sample topics for the problem sets:

1. Students understand the theories and methods of social scientific inquiry as they are applied to the study of individuals and groups.

The first three problem sets are tied to the three main methodological approaches discussed in the course: comparative method (from historical linguistics), ethnography (from anthropology), and social network analysis (from contact sociolinguistics). For each one, students will explore original data and apply

appropriate methods of interpretation and analysis, with the goal that they will not only learn about the methods themselves, but also how data is connected to theory in social science inquiry.

2. Students understand the behavior of individuals, differences and similarities in social and cultural contexts of human existence, and the processes by which groups function.

Through the first three problem sets, students will also explore the behavior of individuals and the structure of groups. For example, Problem Set 3 will ask students to compare the linguistic structures that are the result of language contact between Romani and Turkish speakers in two communities in the Balkans. The comparison is interesting because the communities are superficially parallel cases of contact, and the linguistic outcomes are similar in some respects, yet they are different in others. The point will be for students to analyze how the linguistic facts given in the problem set are related to the very different social structuring of each community, as revealed by social network analysis.

3. Students comprehend and assess individual and group values, and recognize their importance in social problem solving and policy making.

The fourth problem set will be an analysis of public policy issues related to minority language rights. Students will interpret language rights statements from constitutions of countries of the former Yugoslavia, in order to examine how each reflects cultural/institutional pluralism or assimilationist models of society. Language rights statements are reflections of group values at the level of the country; students must understand these values, and also the social and historical contexts in which they were written, in order to successfully interpret the language rights statements.

Appendix B: Sample Course Evaluation

This course evaluation is designed to help the instructor determine whether the learning goals for the course have been met, and to provide information that can be used to improve this course in the future. This form has two parts -- please answer both parts. Please do NOT put your name on this sheet.

PART 1: General Course Assessment. Please answer the following questions.

1. In this course, did you do more, less, or about the same amount of work, compared to other courses that you have taken at the same level?

2. What were the strengths of this course? What were the strengths of the instructor?

3. What were the weaknesses of this course? What were the weaknesses of the instructor?

4. Were there any course activities (readings, written assignments, in-class activities) that particularly helped you to better understand the course material?

5. If you had the opportunity, would you change or eliminate any of the assigned readings? Which ones, and why?

6. If you had the opportunity, would you change or eliminate any of the written assignments? Which ones, and why? What kinds of assignments would you recommend instead?

7. Would you recommend this course to others? Why or why not?

PART 2: Specific Learning Outcomes. For each of the following statements, please circle the appropriate number to indicate whether you agree with the statement (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree).

1. The problem sets and in-class analytic assignments taught me about some of the theories and methods of linguistics (and social science inquiry more generally), and allowed me to put my knowledge into practice.

<table>
<tr><td>strongly
disagree</td><td></td><td></td><td>strongly
agree</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr>
</table>

2. Because of this course, I now have a better understanding of how interactions between individuals and groups have shaped the various Slavic languages.

<table>
<tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr>
</table>

3. Because of this course, I now have a better understanding of the cultural and identity functions of language in Slavic communities, including similarities and differences within and across groups.

<table>
<tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr>
</table>

4. Because of this course, I have a better understanding of the importance of language as a factor in social policy in Slavic countries, and how language policies reflect societal values.

<table>
<tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr>
</table>

5. This course encouraged me to critically examine my own preconceptions, and those of other people, about language and its relationship to social structures.

<table>
<tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr>
</table>

Please add any comments about these learning goals, and whether/how they have been achieved in this course:

Subject:
Re: Concurrence request - Slavic 3760
From: Shari Speer <speer.21@osu.edu>
Date: Fri, 30 Oct 2015 16:09:49 -0400
To: Andrea Sims <sims.120@osu.edu>

Hi Andrea,
Linguistics supports the creation and offering of this course.
best,
Shari

--

Shari R. Speer, PhD
Professor
Chair of Department
College of Arts and Sciences Department of Linguistics
108B Stadium East, 1961 Tuttle Park Place, Columbus, OH 43210-1234

speer.21@osu.edu osu.edu

On 10/30/15 3:47 PM, Andrea Sims wrote:
> Hi Shari,
>
> I am writing with a concurrence request for a new course that Dan Collins and
I are developing -- Slavic 3760: Slavic Words, Slavic Worlds. The syllabus is
attached. GE category: Social Science Individuals and Groups. I am also
attaching the concurrence form. You can either send me back the completed form,
or just send an email with the relevant info.
>
> If you have any questions or concerns about the course, please let us know. We
are happy to provide more information as needed. A response from Linguistics by
November 13 would be appreciated. Thanks.
>
> Best,
> Andrea
>
> --
> Andrea D. Sims
> Associate Professor of Slavic Linguistics
> The Ohio State University
> sims.120@osu.edu