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Frank Borchardt—We are having a panel discussion on a very important topic, a topic that we complain about quietly, perhaps, among ourselves in small groups, but it concerns us deeply and we have only now in the course of time found enough self assurance to address the issue publicly. And that is the relationship between the work that is specific to CALICO, to educational technology specific to foreign language, on the one hand, and our professional lives at our various institutions at the other. This has been in a certain sense an almost tabu issue, an almost tabu question and yet it is central to the professional life of this association. One of the reasons that we gather together for mutual support is because we are not necessarily in the securest of positions in a professional life that does not always acknowledge advances in technology.

In my after-dinner remarks at the last CALICO Conference I cited an attempt to reform a University system five hundred years ago, an attempt that went on for fifty years, to bring the humanist curriculum to the scholastic universities in Europe; at the end of those fifty years, the attempt failed. The Reformation happened and convulsed all institutions of society and after that convulsion the attempt succeeded. I do not think we live in a time that has the luxury of such a long transition period, and we don't need a convulsion throughout society even if it were to benefit our work.

Participating in this panel are a number of long-term CALICO members and prime contributors to the realities of computer assisted language learning. Otmar Foelsche from Dartmouth, who has brought some of the wonders of technology, not just to language learning but to fields broadly in the humanities. Mary Ann Lyman-Hager who is a one of the chief organizing forces in Interactive Video and in the multiplicity of media. Willard Daetsch who has to qualify as 'a' or 'the' eminence grise of CALL. Nina Garrett, whose work in the solid scientific basis of what we do is well known and well respected. She gave the keynote address at the recent Helsinki meetings which helped to bind all of Europe together. John Underwood who is a doyen of our field and brought the attention early on, of the entire Modern Language Association in its vastness to some of the problems, issues, debates, in the work that we do together.

Willard, who suggested and organized this luncheon session has agreed to chair the panel so I will step aside.
Daetsch: Frank has made the introductions so we can move rapidly into the topic at hand. Some of you may remember when I said a couple of years ago that I was not very far removed from the level of computer sophistication when I said to a friend: "Gee, you know, it's really great to learn how to use the rat." I know a bit more about technology now and I know a great deal more about the problems of moving this powerful aid to learning, teaching, and research strongly into the education scene. I am very pleased that today we can talk about these problems before as many people as possible, because we are all concerned individuals. I had a fairly lengthy list of potential speakers for the topic and a short time to set up the panel. However my task proved to be easy because the first four I asked accepted my invitation in spite of very heavy academic loads. I didn't have to do any arm twisting.

Each one of our participants has a very special ability. Mary Ann Lyman Hager is going to speak first on the criteria for evaluation of software and the ramifications. Nina Garrett will talk about research and pedagogy in language, literature, culture learning—I am sure you all know that she has shown strength and outstanding leadership in these areas. John Underwood will address the problem of certification of accomplishments by whom and how. This is a challenge we must address. As you look around and get to know each other you will find that a good many of us have the security of tenure. But we older leaders in the field must be very concerned for our younger colleagues. You all know people who don't dare do the kind of work we are doing, because it will jeopardize their tenure, jeopardize their promotion. All too many of us have heard comments like: "Are you still doing computer stuff?" I think we'll hear that message particularly clearly when John speaks. Otmar Foelsche who will speak last will have some recommendations on how we best present our concerns to our brother/sister organizations, MLA, ACTFL, AAT's and so forth.

Day before yesterday I spent part of the day down at Irvine with Lee Ann Stone, who is a member of our organization, but is also president of IALL (International Association of Learning Laboratories) which will be co-presenting the International FLEAT (Foreign Languages Education and Technology) Conference in Japan at which some of us will be presenting. She assured me that the concerns that we are addressing today are also the concerns of IALL and so we have a clear area of cooperation. It is a tremendously exciting time to be in education, even with all sorts the pitfalls. The Germanists here know that the heroes and heroines of Friedrich Hebbel's dramas were at the cutting edge of things happening in society. Most of them went by the wayside. That is the risk some of us run, but those of us who are older better run that risk so that the young people can move with confidence into a new age.
I have just finished reading Ernest Boyer's Scholarship Reconsidered, Priorities of the Professorate. In this special report for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching he designates four areas of scholarship: 1) scholarship of integration; 2) scholarship of application; 3) scholarship of teaching; and 4) scholarship of discovery. What Boyer has to say is central to what we are doing. But he states that, "this isn't going to work unless we have real leadership at the top." I don't presume for us in CALICO to be leadership at the top of all of academe, but we certainly are in the position of leadership in a crucial area. As we assume the leadership role we must be constantly aware of the sentiment expressed in a comment in the Los Angeles Times two days ago: "Neo-Luddites argue that the steam rollers advancing technology pose a threat to humanity." Mary Ann, would you lead us off?

**Lyman-Hager:** Let me just say a few words about software evaluation. Inasmuch as I have been recently embroiled in a rather unpleasant controversy over a piece of software I had judged rather harshly in an article in the *Modern Language Journal*, I feel perfectly qualified; I'm ready to take this one on. There is really no bad software, just software without a purpose or "raison d'etre" in the world, or software that doesn't really work well although it has a perfectly good reason for being. The software may have been poorly programmed, but I believe it was released prematurely and therefore didn't work quite right in the hands of the hypothetical troublesome and inquisitive undergraduate language student. It did have a purpose and although it didn't really state it, it's purpose wasn't really the same as mine. I'm sure someone out there would find this program serious, and worthy of consideration. How does one go about weeding out software without a purpose and software which does not work well? That to me is the real issue. Let's first weed out the purpose-less software.

My own purposes are tied to what my goals and objectives are for the classes I teach. Presumably, I had a hand in stating these goals and these objectives and presumably I lead in translating them to classroom practices. I am evaluated by my students on my ability to carry out my end of the deal, to facilitate their growth and their confidence in the foreign language classroom. Software carefully constructed to my specifications can help me in this task. However, very few software programs will do this unless I create them myself, and that's the dilemma. I can't create new materials without lead time and without support staff. There is, however, another possibility; I can search for the next best alternative, and that is a well constructed general purpose piece of software or combination of software programs which will allow for student self expression and communication within a proficiency based or communicative based classroom or lab situation. It will also be software which will allow students to home in on very specific skills which they may need to practice. It would seem that these are mutually exclusive
categories of software, but these very two distinct types of software are actually complementary and not mutually exclusive.

Some folks who came to the DLI (Defense Language Institute) and worked with Col. Fischer discovered that there are actually three types of software worthy of consideration. I am speaking of my colleagues Nina Garrett, and Robert Hart. I want to work on defining some types of software, some useful types of activities using software which have a reason for being in the world and a specific use in the DLI context. The first criterion of software, the first group of software proposed by Hart, require developing linguistically related sub-systems of discourse and morphology, vocabulary, phonology, etc. This type of software tends to emphasize the activities of the individual learner in out-of-class settings. The second perspective, which happens to be mine, is more socio-linguistic in nature and emphasizes more in-class use of software and collaborative settings, where students are working together perhaps on a project, that is more task based, and involves small groups, groups creating meaning in relation to carefully guided stimuli, perhaps a video-text or an authentic text. These activities by their very nature are more open-ended and holistic. They call for a combination of the skills that were required in Robert Hart's sub-sets, putting them together in a meaningful way.

Garrett’s purposes would reflect more development of the conceptual grammar base, which underlines actually both Hart’s purposes and the purposes that I suggested. And that perhaps would be considered more psycho-linguistic software. We have three distinct perspectives, three distinct types of software, but what does that all mean? How do we evaluate it once it’s out there? As I see it, it means that we must acknowledge as professionals that there are very good reasons why teachers like drill and practice and there are very good reasons why teachers like a facilitator, a piece of software, say, for an example like Système D. If one accepts, for example, the proportional model of syllabus integration as Janice Yalden does in her book The Communicative Syllabus, we can see that there are different strokes for different folks at every level in the continuum. There is a need for very specific sub-sets of software which deal with very, very limited and yet broad knowledge bases. So drill and practice should be acceptable, let me say that once and for all. What constitutes good is a matter of considerable debate but I believe that there should be sound, very identifiable purposes to the software, and I say again there must be a "raison d'être", there must be a reason for being in the world, that is the world of the students, for the software to exist. The use of the software should be very self-evident from the manner in which the instructions are displayed on the screen. "The unmotivated, mischievous, or not very able student" of whom Nina Garrett speaks in a recent MLJ article "should not be able to foil the software by bumbling about, further feedback should be tailored as much as possible to
guide the student to a cognitive understanding of the specific nature of the error." It is no longer acceptable in our day and age to simply have as a feedback "non ce n'est pas correct." This is not good software. In my way of thinking, there are other avenues open to us. John Underwood says in a recent article, "in using computers for language practice, one runs the risk of merely mechanizing the least attractive aspects of what we already do. The 'wrong, try again' approach in which the computer asks all the questions, knows all the answers and tosses students an occasional verbal reward to keep them going will probably not go far in helping them achieve real proficiency in the language." What is needed is practice which most closely resembles natural contextualized use of the language and that makes fuller application of the computer's capacity for flexible and personalized interaction. It can be done, can't it John? It can be done, but the other question is, will they like it? I think that is important.

I will cite a conversation we had right before this luncheon with Otmar Foelsche. Since I had not found a good quote, I asked Otmar for one. His response, if I remember it correctly, was, "are teachers and learners using the software after three years? If they are still using it after three years, they like it or they seem to like it, it must be good software." Now I know that's not very helpful for those of you who are out there asking "what are the criteria?", but I think it is very important, it stands the test of time. Three years in the life of a piece of software is really considerable, Of students, I would ask: Do they like it? Is it fun? The idea of why students like the software is important, but there are other questions which must almost always be asked, such as, how do students interact with the software? and are there significant advantages for that type of interaction over another type of interaction? Do students learn more about how to learn when they use a particular piece of software? The "how to learn" as an epistemological question is as important as what is learned.

The nature of knowledge and what is really knowable in the information age is up for grabs. We need machines which can be better knowledge managers so that people can be better evaluators and synthesizers of information. This is the new paradigm, the latest expectation of software and I think it is possible to achieve with a little help from our friends. Jack Burston gives some better, perhaps more definable characteristics for good software, his list is: "pedagogical content, use of computer capacities, technical performance, design flexibility, ease of use," he gives a grade for each of these, I think these are important to look at, although I may like my categories better.

Daetsch: Nina you please take over?
Garrett: The organizing topic here is the academic status of our effort to integrate technology use into language learning, and the over-arching point that needs to be made is that if we are to achieve disciplinary prestige we must see to it that technology is recognized as having a solid legitimate relationship to the entire discipline and particularly to those segments of the discipline that are already regarded as inherently prestigious.

At present technology is still perceived as being relevant mostly to the more mechanical, less intellectual aspects of language learning, and language learning in turn is still widely perceived as being the more mechanical, less intellectual part of the discipline of foreign language study, where literary study and its adherents automatically have the lion's share of the academic status. Even where CALL does focus on culture (which seems often to be thought of within our own ranks as having more intellectual status than a focus on language per se) our emphasis is usually on "culture with a small c," as Nelson Brooks used to put it - the cultural aspects of every-day interpersonal interaction - rather than on "culture with a capital C" (literature, art, music, sometimes film) which is regarded by the senior members of our departments, the power-figures in the discipline, as more intellectually prestigious.

So there is really a two-level totem-pole, with CALL fort he most part at the bottom of the hierarchy. To a very considerable extent, our problems with getting CALL recognized as a valid part of language learning as a whole are a subset of the problems of language teachers generally, whether or not they are involved with technology. Willard disclaimed, a few minutes ago, any megalomaniac intentions of setting ourselves up as academic leaders or pioneers for academe as a whole, but in fact I'll be a little more fool-hardy: I actually believe that we in CALL have the power not only to improve the status of our work but also, in so doing, to improve the status of the language-teaching end of the operation generally. Of course a lot of language teachers who still want to reject or ignore technology would think it outrageously presumptuous of us to make such a claim. What would be its basis?

Language teachers have for years been insisting, plaintively or angrily, that they work just as hard as (in many cases much harder than) literature teachers, that language study is just as complex, challenging, worthwhile in its own right, as literary study, and so on, but we all know that such arguments have had little effect on the ongoing fact that 'we don't get no respect." Similarly, we in CALL have been insisting that we work just as hard, that developing software is just as complex, challenging, and important activity as publishing literary criticism. Even though all these arguments are true—and we should go on insisting that they are true—the whole tirade plus fifty cents may buy us a cup of coffee, but won't get us tenure.
So how do we go about building our case in terms that academic administrators and senior people in the profession will actually accept and reward? We are not going to have a revolution in the university, a sea-change in the ways status is allocated, so we have to learn how to present our work in the terms that will compel academic recognition. We have to operate on one level further. Not only is CALL the least prestigious area of language teaching, not only is language teaching the least prestigious kind of teaching in FL departments—but—teaching in general is less prestigious than research. It's not enough, therefore (though I do believe it's important), to work at integrating technology use into ,,upper-level" courses of the department and persuading our senior colleagues that technology can significantly broaden our collective sense of what foreign language study means, bridging those often-deplored gaps between courses on language, literature, and linguistics. Regardless of how valuable technology can be to the teaching effort, our case for academic prestige and institutional recognition has to be built on research. The call for research is common enough, but we seldom specify just what kind of research we mean and what kind of contribution to the discipline we envisage its making.

There are really four kinds of research that have to be considered in connection with technology use and the ways it fits into the profession, and these are ranged along a continuum of academic status. The two that occur to people most often are at opposite ends of this continuum. The first kind of research that comes to mind in the context of CALL is efficacy research, which is—crudely defined—an attempt to compare computer-assisted and non-computer-assisted language learning to find out "which works better." I'd like to suggest (hoping I will not offend those of you who have undertaken studies along these lines) that it is almost impossible to assess the efficacy of technology in language learning on any large scale or broad measure. For one thing, there are simply too many uncontrollable and confounding variables, and for another technology use is not a "method" and therefore does not lend itself to valid methodological research. Certainly we can structure carefully limited studies of how certain kinds of technology assist certain kinds of language learners in certain aspects of the language learning task. But it seems to me to be impossible to prove that the use of technology makes language learning more efficient, faster, or better. And unfortunately even if we do produce carefully defined valid studies indicating the efficacy of using technology, we are still doing our research on the low end of that totem pole. No matter how successful that research is, it will not confer much academic prestige in most research universities. This kind of research is what literary scholars refer to as their "own research," i.e., that which is not necessarily directly connected to their teaching. Here there have been some very significant advances in the use of technology.
More work is probably being done along these lines in the study of literature in English than in foreign languages, but at the MLA there is every year an increasing number of presentations by faculty who are using concordances and various kinds of database manipulations, searches, etc., in doing their research. This is certainly something we will want to encourage so that our literary colleagues will come to understand technology beyond wordprocessing, feel a little more sympathetic to it, see it as important. In fact, it is not at all uncommon for faculty members who first get involved with technology for doing their own research to begin to use it in their teaching, for after all they are training graduate students to do the kind of literary research that they do, and the technology can be seen as a very important tool for training up-and-coming young scholars. But just as with efficacy research, success with technology-assisted literary research is not going to transfer prestige or academic status to language teaching. The work that literary scholars do for scholarly and critical purposes is not seen as having any particular relationship to language learning. Thus even encouraging our senior colleagues’ involvement with technology in the context of literary research is not necessarily going to increase their recognition of the possibility for intellectual productivity in what we do.

Midway on the continuum, between efficacy research on the one hand and literary research on the other hand, there are two kinds of research that we ought to be exploring and promoting as the proper concern of language learning professionals. One of them is the use of technology in general—language pedagogy studies, where the aim is not to evaluate the use of technology but to use technology as a research medium within which to study the results or the process of language pedagogy. We could use technology-based tasks to study a whole range of pedagogical variables—for example, what kind of classroom or homework activities result in what kinds of learning or mastery, how well different kinds of outside-of-class work prepare learners for spontaneous communicative activities in class, and so on. We could also use technology-based tasks as data-elicitation tools to carry out many familiar kinds of pedagogical research but on the much broader scale made possible by the computer’s enormous data-processing capabilities. (Data-intensive studies which have traditionally been limited to a very few cases can now be designed for large numbers of learners.)

Finally, the other mid-continuum kind of research is theoretically rather than pedagogically motivated—second language acquisition research, in which technology is used as an interactive environment that simultaneously supports and tracks learners’ language processing. In computer-assisted research on language acquisition (I’ve referred to this elsewhere as CARLA) we will develop (for the computer or for multimedia) meaningful language-use activities, such listening, reading, writing, or translation, and we will attach data-collection programming to these tasks that will allow us to look into what is actually happening in learner language processing.
relating those data to hypotheses in linguistic, sociolinguistic, or psycholinguistic theory. The enormous advantage of technology as a research tool is that computer tracking allows us immediate "on-line" observation of learners as they work at the process of comprehending and producing language; without that immediacy we are far more limited to analysis of the learner's language product. However, the success and value of this effort depend on our developing many new kinds of language learning activities based on SLA theories, and developing the tracking mechanisms to make the relevant data-collection possible. I've harped on this often enough that Jim Pusack has labeled the idea the Garrett imperative, and although I blush at the notion that I should be thought of as laying imperatives on the profession, I really am convinced that this provides a feasible and valuable way of carrying out the oft-reiterated call for "more research."

Developing the theoretical rigor of our work is one of the most important ways we can establish academic prestige, and it is because of technology's advantages in this regard that I dared to suggest that CARLA can actually benefit the academic status of all language teaching, not just CALL. If we develop an agenda of basic research in addition to extending our capabilities for pedagogical research, no one can quibble about the value of the resultant publications or the tenurability of the research.

**Daetsch:** John, will you please pick up the thread?

**Underwood:** I have a confession to make first and that is that a group of us went white watching this morning at nine o'clock. It was beautiful out there, and we saw four grey whales. We watched their massive bodies and we watched them spout off and couldn't help think of college administrations. On the boat, in fact, we talked about this problem. We talked about the whole issue of professional status and CALL. To me, publishing software is not the same as publishing a book on deconstructionism which will be read by twenty-seven people. And who is it that does this stuff? It tends to be the tenured who dabble in it. As for those who are using technology - it's the one in that dead-end TA-training position who feels he/she has nothing to lose anyway, the part-time staff member, the lab director and so forth. But the tenure-track person tends to steer clear of this kind of work, and that's sad.

I suspect that I have been asked to be on this panel in part because of my own experience, and therefore I feel compelled to tell you a little bit about that experience; but I am going to do it anonymously. I will only say that this took place at a small, private women's college west of the Mississippi in a traditional language and literature department, which nevertheless encouraged me to develop linguistics and other courses because, in fact, that was my training.
So, in 1980, I developed some linguistic courses, including a course on computers and language. In 1982 I began publishing articles on CALL; in 1984 I published a book on CALL; and in 1985 I won an MLA award for the outstanding publication in the field of language research. In 1986 I was denied tenure. The reason that I was given for being denied tenure (and they were very apologetic) came from the President, who said, "your area of specialization and research is not consistent with the needs of the department."

The real issue seems to me to be evaluation. The department was not in a position to evaluate what I was doing in either linguistics or CALL, and this was something that had been bothering me for years. When the time came, who was going to look at my stuff and judge it? In the end they judged it and said: "He has ten articles." So, it seems to me that what we have to look at, as Nina was saying, is the question of academic prestige, and that really starts with deans. We need open-minded deans—if that's not an oxymoron. I am in an institution now which does have an open-minded dean; he is interested in a lot of things and technology is one them.

Obviously though, my point in being here, what I am supposed to address, on this panel is the question of evaluation, who evaluates and how do we do this? I think that what we need is a board on an institution such as this, a group such as CALICO; we need a board, maybe a west coast board and a east coast board, that is recognized, that people are aware of, that can be called upon. The people on these boards would be only too happy to express their judgment on software, on publications about software and so forth which typical departments and department chairs cannot address.

As long as people on the traditional side of our profession are judging what we do on the non-traditional side, we are always going to have problems. So, I would like to suggest that CALICO seriously think about providing a jury and offering its services to college deans everywhere to fulfill this purpose and to save us from cases such as the anonymous person about whom I just spoke to you. We had plans to have questions on this panel. I would love to hear the questions; I am sure that everyone else on the panel would also, so let's continue the discussion.

Daetsch: John gets an extra plus, doesn't he? In the Spring I saw Otmar's hypermedia presentation on Faust and I think his work is one of our major springboards to the literary and cultural aspects of what we anticipate the role of technology will be. Mr. Foelsche....

Foelsche: Okay, actually I thought I was asked to talk about how CALICO was supposed to interact with Modern Language Association and ACTFL in the various AAT's and what should be done and thought about and planned for the future with
those organizations. But let me give you a report on what is happening on the MLA side. I hope that Nina will support me, because Nina is the former Chairman of the MLA committee for computers and emerging technologies and I happen, unfortunately I think, to be the present Chairman of the same committee; we share our experiences and cry together sometimes. The problem with an organization such as the MLA which has a membership well above seventeen thousand is, I believe, that it has a hierarchy which is very, very difficult to move and when it comes to computers it is even more difficult to move. For example, publishing the e-mail addresses of the members of the MLA in the MLA membership directory is a project which we have been working on for about three years now and my expectation is it will take at least another two or three years, or the organization will probably die before we have the e-mail addresses of the membership in the directory. So that's the situation on the MLA.

I cannot say much about ACTFL. ACTFL didn't impress me very much either, in being ready to deal with modern technology. The last ACTFL conference and the organization of the text show in Washington is, I think, is a prime example of how difficult it is for an organization like ACTFL to deal with the needs of the profession when it comes to technology. I think that we have a duty to do this, to interact with these organizations and, personally, I am not very sure as to what the best ways are to get involved with these organizations and get more presentations into their annual meetings as well get more publications into the journals of these organizations.

There is also a problem with CALICO, in this context. I think CALICO is an organization which is loaded with good ideas and good people, it has tremendous potential, but we also have to see the other side of the coin; CALICO lacks implementation beyond the researcher's desk and laboratory. We do not see enough materials going directly into the classroom and we lack research data of all kinds, as Nina Garrett pointed out very clearly. I think there is a delusion of the image of CALICO outside, which has been caused by computers moving into various other areas, in all disciplines and CALICO is not the central organization for language and technology anymore, that's my opinion. It is a pretty drastic way to say this, I must admit, but you don't look at CALICO as the only organization which provides professional standing for computers in language and literature traditions and I think we have to recapture this position in the future. There are many things we can do to put CALICO in this position and I think that the challenges we have at this moment allow us to identify certain areas where we can do something and recapture a position where people in the languages and literature will look upon this organization rather than any other organization for leadership.
I would like to mention EDUCOM as a possible cooperating body to help with establishing guidelines and standards. I am looking particularly at the whole issue of software evaluation and software development. We need to have standards and we need to address compatibility issues. I think CALICO is just the organization that needs to put the fist on the table and say "we must have standards", and if we develop materials for certain software shells for the languages we must have data compatibility for the various platforms. The things have to run on Unix, they have to run on MS DOS, they have to run under Windows and they have to run on the Macintosh platform. If somebody designs a software program of questions and answers, this program must be in some kind of format that can they can be transported easily from one machine to another. The same applies very importantly in the future for all types of video. I think the industry is already showing us that the standards are going to be there, that we are going to have video standards where we have digitized video which is capable of running on all the platforms we have. In addition to that there are the issues of fonts, operating systems and so on. We have to pledge that whatever we produce will not be produced in a "home-made" fashion. We must go with the ISO code of the Unicode so that our materials are totally compatible. That also means that we are going to address the two bit characters for Japanese and Chinese and other languages which are exotic compared to the usually taught European languages.

In addition to these matters we have to look beyond the United States, we have to connect to the rest of the world, and the rest of the world has to connect to us, and I think we have a tremendous challenge there. The people in Europe are developing right and left but in comparative isolation and we go on doing what we have been doing for the last five years. It is time for the Europeans to join a coordinating organization an organization which will go into Europe and connect with the people who are developing materials. There are lots of ideas overseas, and I think strong connections are going to be very fruitful for all of us in the long run.

My last point is to support Nina once again; we need to do more elaborate research and we need to address the research business in computer-supported instruction; I put it in general terms on purpose. We need to be able to go to the large vendors with credible data collected from the appropriate sources. We need to go with something real and concrete in our hands. And with that I finish.

Daetsch: We are really going to run out of time for the questions I thought were crucial, but I do want to ask those on the panel if they would like to make some final comment.
Garrett: I don't think that I have really anything very specific to add to what Otmar said but I would like to note that the participation of CALL and CALICO related work in the profession as a whole is certainly becoming a great deal more visible, and it has in many institutions a kind of spurious prestige. By that I mean there are administrations who believe that their foreign language departments ought to get involved with technology, but their belief is based on arguments with which we would not be altogether happy, such as 'it will make foreign language learning so much cheaper" or, "as soon as you add technology to foreign language learning you can increase class size fifty or one hundred percent." Those are very common rationales, even if administrators are not quite crude enough to come out and say so openly. These arguments are what I mean about the specious visibility and specious prestige. If we are actually to gain academic recognition for what we do, we cannot go with that kind of reasoning and we must insist on building the intellectual legitimacy.

Lyman-Hager: I have just had one further comment which may concern many of you. I'm untenured. After what John said, maybe I'll rethink this whole thing when I go home. But one really major area of concern to me, is that our journal, our CALICO journal, needs to be seen by our colleagues in literature and by the powers that be, as a strong journal and that it have very good, well refereed articles. There is a magic list that the MLA holds, of acceptable journals, and my Department Head could not find CALICO on that list. I said "What? This cannot be." So I think the strength of the Journal is something that we really need to address. We need to push the Journal, to support the Journal, submit articles to the journal and maybe see about the MLA list.

Borchardt: There are a couple of things I want to mention: first — Otmar's thesis. We must indeed work on communication with professional associations. We have been making overtures but without results in a timely fashion. Some contact has now been made, but the prospect of talking about meaningful connections may wait for another two years. What Otmar said about what's going on in the rest of the world is crucial and we are very alert to that being the case. It is the chief impulse for the CALICO meeting in Maastricht. The Europeans who are going to be there are the people who are working on EC modern language initiatives. And, in general, one receives the impression while there that the Europeans are burningly more concerned than we are, both with language learning and with their young being conversant with technology. And when they see the two together, in CALL, they are tickled to death and ready to put in very serious support. Furthermore, as to CALICO's role, last summer I was assured by several of the leadership figures, at least in northern Europe, that the Europeans did not feel that they had a representative professional organization and that they were looking to CALICO, perhaps, to provide it in one form or another, a CALICO Europe, a
CALICO East Europe, a CALICO International, and these are certainly initiatives that are going to be realized in the Maastricht initiative. In about two weeks the joint National Committee on Languages will be addressing these issues.

**Daetsch:** If we could push on for just a couple of moments I too want to pick up the international theme. You have heard that Nina has already addressed a major meeting in Finland. Otmar is going to be in Hamburg in a week or so. Chantal Cornu6jols and Kathryn Murphy-Judy, who are here, will be off to Paris next week. Frank will have a trip to China and several of us will be going to the FLEAT 2 (co-sponsored with IALL) in Japan. CALICO is sponsoring the European meeting in Maastricht in August, so I think we are indeed starting to get a bit of international outreach.

Please do forward to any of us on the panel all your suggestions. The topics addressed here today will be receiving much consideration by the new Executive Board of CALICO and we need your input.
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