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Section 1

Introduction

The author's earlier work in the area of computer-based language instruction indicates that this approach to the teaching of foreign languages can successfully replace regular classroom instruction even when the skills to be acquired by the students include the comprehension and production of oral speech. It would therefore not seem unreasonable to hope that CBI would be at least equally successful in teaching "dead" languages, which normally require little or no competence in speaking or oral comprehension.

This consideration in turn permits us to ask whether one of the major disadvantages of most CBI, namely, the relatively high cost of each hour of individual instruction, might not be largely or completely eliminated in the case of such dead languages if the classroom enrollment in the course in question was a relatively small one. Thus, if a Stanford professor with a salary of $20,000 per year gives a one-quarter introduction to such a language to a group of four graduate students, the cost could be viewed as the equivalent of one-sixth (one-fifth in many cases) of his salary, i.e., $3,667 (or $4,000). If the course could be successfully taught on an IMSSS teletype, the total cost for the quarter would currently be less than $1,500. (This cost would remain unchanged

---

1 The research described in this research was supported by the Stanford University Progress Fund and National Science Foundation Grant NSFJ-443X.

even if the enrollment in the course increased to six or eight students.)

In an attempt to ascertain whether the teaching of low-enrollment "dead-language" courses would indeed prove a practical alternative to classroom instruction, the principal investigator has undertaken the implementation of a computer-based introduction to the morphology of Old Church Slavic (henceforth OCS)--the language of the first Slavic translation of the Bible. This material, which included twenty-four programmed computer-based lessons and supplementary computer-generated drills, constituted the principal means of instruction in a one-quarter course successfully given for regular academic credit to five Stanford graduate students during the winter quarter of the academic year 1972-73. Although the 1972-73 course also included eight final sessions with the instructor, devoted to the reading and analysis of texts, it would appear that most or all of these could be replaced by CBI sessions centering around the recognition and analysis of OCS forms as they actually occur in the texts.

Section 2

Methods

2.1 The Students

The participants in the computer-based course consisted of those five individuals who registered for Slavic 211, Introduction to Old Church Slavonic and Early Russian Texts, during the winter quarter of the academic year 1972-73. No effort was made either to recruit students or to discourage any interested individual from enrolling. Since the fact that the course was largely computer based had not been publicized, it is probable that the enrollment would have been the same regardless of the nature of the course.

This hypothesis is borne out by an examination of the background of the individuals enrolled. Two of the five (henceforth referred to as "A" and "B") were first-year students in the Ph.D. program of the Stanford Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures. Such students
are regularly required to enroll in Slavic 211 at the first possible opportunity, and only an inadequate control of Russian (revealed on the placement test administered by the Department to all entering graduate students) would cause enrollment in this course to be postponed until the second year. The third student (henceforth "C") represented just such a case. Required to take intensive remedial work in Russian during her first year in the Department, this second-year student in the Ph.D. program would definitely have taken Slavic 211 in any case. Student D, a first-year student in the M.A. program, was also enrolled in the course in compliance with the normal requirements for her degree program. Only Student E, a graduate student in electrical engineering, took Slavic 211 on a voluntary basis. This individual, a French citizen of Russian parentage, possessed a certain degree of familiarity with computing and may have been influenced in his decision to enroll by the utilization of CBL. On the other hand, since he explicitly stated that his original reason for taking the course was his interest in the origin and history of the Russian language, it is not at all unlikely that he would have enrolled in a non-computer-based version of Slavic 211.

In view of the limited enrollment, no attempt was made to have some of the students take a non-computer-based version of the course during the quarter in question. However, since the material covered in Slavic 211 changes little from year to year, it is not unreasonable to view the performance of students who took the non-computer-based course in earlier years as a rough gauge of the progress of the 1972-75 group (see Section 5 below).

2.2 The Physical Framework

The computer-based lessons took place in the same classroom at the Institute for Mathematical Studies in the Social Sciences in which our computer-based Russian courses have been given. Only teletype stimuli and responses were utilized. Two of the Model-55 teletypes which had been used in the Russian courses were provided with a modified Cyrillic keyboard (see Appendix 1) to enable the student to type OCS responses containing characters not found in the contemporary Russian alphabet. (It proved possible to add the required OCS letters without sacrificing
any contemporary Russian characters other than ₂. This was achieved by (1) eliminating the exclamation point, (2) utilizing the Cyrillic letter ₂ for the numeral ₂ and the letter ₀ for the numeral zero, and (3) utilizing digraphs containing the element ꙣ to render OCS ꙣ, ꙣ, ꙣ, ꙣ, and ꙣ.

As in the case of the Russian courses, assignment sheets and homework were regularly left for and picked up by the students in a set of slots, each of which was assigned to one student. While the principal investigator was present during the first two computer-based lessons in order to insure that the students learned how to interact with the system successfully, no proctor was present during the other sessions. Students having difficulties either reported them immediately to personnel at IMSSS, or contacted the principal investigator either at his home or through the Department of Slavic Languages.

2.3 The Underlying System

The material for the computer-based sessions as well as the assignment sheets and homework material was typed, corrected and converted to a transcription system coordinated with the keyboard given in Appendix 1 on one of a number of IMAC display consoles belonging to IMSSS. The coding system used in preparing the material for the computer-based sessions was a small subset of the one used in connection with the Russian courses and is outlined in Appendix 2. (The limitations on input coding resulted from inadequacies in the PDP-10 program written to replace the PDP-1 programs which processed our Russian input. It is hoped that the present PDP-10 program will soon be replaced by a more adequate one.)

2.4 Classroom Scheduling

Students were provided access to the computer-based classroom from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. In order to prevent conflicts over teletype use, each student was assigned a teletype for a period of approximately forty-five minutes for each of the five days the classroom was available. During the first two weeks, before a second teletype was modified for use in the OCS course, some difficulties did arise, when students either did not arrive on time or found a lesson.
too long to finish within the assigned period. As soon as the second
teleype was available, such difficulties largely disappeared.

2.5 Student-Computer Interaction

2.5.1 Presentation of Material

Throughout the course the presentation of material remained essentially
the same: English or OCS material was typed by the teletype. However, it
should be noted that, although each word and rule covered in the CEI lessons
was explicitly introduced to the students during the sessions themselves,
the students were informed well in advance of each lesson which sections
covered the material to be presented. Consequently, "new" material was
presented at a much faster pace than had been the case in the computer­
based Russian courses, and the ratio of material calling for a typed
response to material involving only passive recognition was much higher
in the OCS course.

2.5.2 Response Evaluation.

Except in the case of fill-in responses, which were evaluated as
originally typed, students were permitted to correct typing errors or
other unintentional mistakes before submitting a given typed response for
evaluation by the computer. As in the case of the Russian courses, cor­
rections could be achieved either by deleting one or more separate
characters from right to left (by striking the "rubout" key for each
character to be deleted) or by deleting the entire contents of the answer
buffer (by striking "control X"). Since most of the OCS responses were
relatively short ones, the "control X" feature could be used much more
effectively than in the case of the Russian courses, where responses
often ran to nearly fifty characters.

Incorrect fill-in responses caused the machine to print out "No,
try again" plus those characters of the student's response which preceded
the first incorrect character. Students at first found this procedure
confusing, since they attempted to type the response over from the
beginning and were consequently credited with a second error by the
computer, which expected only the portion including and following the
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first incorrect character. While the students soon learned to pay close attention to the characters typed out after a "Try again" message, it would appear that, in the case of the relatively short responses used in the OCS course, the response-evaluation routine should be modified to accept a correct retyping of the entire original response.

2.5.3 Branching

Although the program-imposed limitations mentioned under 2.3 above precluded the use of computer-generated remedial blocks, it was possible to include in the original input test-dependent remedial blocks providing a more detailed explanation of and/or additional drill on a given rule. However, because of the relatively straightforward nature of most of the material, the OCS sessions made little use of such techniques.

2.5.4 Individualized Drill Sessions

The OCS course differed markedly from the computer-based Russian course in that it made available to the student drills on noun and verb inflection in which the student himself played a major role in selecting both the inflectional categories and the concrete vocabulary items to be drilled.

Thus, the verb-driller not only asked the student to select the verbal stems to be covered but permitted him to include or exclude any of ten different form sets (present tense, aorist forms, imperfect tense, imperative mood, infinitive and supine, and any combination of five participles). In addition he could include or exclude the dual forms and the 3.s., l.p. and 2.p. of the present, aorist and imperfect; the 3.s., l.p. and 2.p. of the imperative; the nominative singular neuter and feminine, accusative singular neuter, and nominative plural masculine of active participles; and compound forms of active participles. In the case of the noun drills the student could include or exclude the singular, dual and/or plural number of any noun he selected. Examples of the verb and noun drills are given in Appendix 3.

The verb and noun drills were made available to the students after they had completed the 24 computer-based sessions and had begun to meet twice a week with the instructor for the reading and analysis of texts.
Since these drills were not a required part of the course, they were largely ignored by the students, despite the fact that the students' active control of OCS morphology tended to degenerate with the passage of time. It would therefore seem advisable that such drills be integrated with the computer-based lessons from the beginning of the course and made a regular part of the required work (see Section 4, below).

2.5.5 Restart Points

All computer-based lessons contained a number of restart points which permitted a student whose progress through a given lesson was interrupted (either at his own request or as a result of technical difficulties) to continue the lesson at a later time, beginning at the last restart point reached before the interruption. (It should be noted that voluntary interruptions were unusual, since the students definitely preferred to reach the end of a given lesson—even an excessively long one—during the same session in which it was begun. However, systems difficulties were frequent enough to cause all of the students to utilize the restart feature at one time or another in order to avoid repeating material covered prior to an involuntary interruption.)

2.6 Supplementary Activities

The computer-based lessons were coordinated with H. G. Lunt's *Old Church Slavic Grammar*. Students were given assignment sheets indicating the content of future lessons and were urged to familiarize themselves with the appropriate sections of the grammar before taking a given lesson. It should be noted, however, that all of the grammatical material covered in the course was explicitly presented to the students within the computer-based lessons, so that a student could handle a grammar lesson successfully without having read the corresponding passages in Lunt. A sample assignment sheet is given in Appendix 4.

As the course progressed the students were also assigned homework in the form of short OCS passages for translation and analysis. The homework was collected, and, after being corrected by the principal investigator, returned to the students via the set of slots discussed in 2.2 above. Direct contact between the principal investigator and
the students for the purpose of discussing the homework was relatively rare. A sample homework sheet is given in Appendix 5.

After the sixth week of the course, when all the students but one had completed all the computer-based lessons, the students began to meet with the instructor twice weekly to translate and analyze OCS texts. Since the students were already familiar with OCS grammar they were able to cover a page of material each session, an amount which in previous years would have been covered in three or four separate sessions. As a result, the students ended up covering approximately the same amount of OCS textual material as they would have covered in the regular version of the course.

2.7 The Collection of Data

As a result of system changes we were unable to include in the present project either daily summaries of student progress or the collection of detailed data on student performance, both of which were features of computer-based Russian courses. As a result, feedback on such important factors as the amount of time the students needed to complete a given lesson was obtainable only from conversations with the students themselves. It is hoped that the driver program can be modified in the course of the coming summer to permit the collection of sufficient material for daily summaries when the course is run in 1973-74.

The students in the course were requested to evaluate it on the evaluation sheets regularly employed at Stanford for this purpose. These sheets are reproduced in Appendix 6.

2.8 The Curriculum

A lesson-by-lesson summary of the material covered in the course is given in Appendix 7. The twenty-four computer-based lessons cover practically the entire morphology of OCS except for a few isolated points related to the inflection of single words (e.g., the numerals three, four and ten, the pronoun kyi) or very limited groups of words (e.g., the stems elik-, tolik-, etc.). It also includes coverage of those features of OCS phonology new to students familiar to Russian and an introduction to the problems associated with the replacement of strong, weak and tense jers.
An important feature of the lessons was the fact that they were concerned almost exclusively with the students' ability to reproduce the "ideal" representations of OCS forms being taught. The vast majority of student responses in the CBI sessions consisted of supplying the correct ending of an OCS word. Little or no attention was paid to the problem of form recognition or to the question of the "corrupt" forms so often encountered in OCS texts.

2.9 The Final Examination

As was the case in other years, the primary criterion for the evaluation of the students' progress was a three-hour written examination administered during the regularly scheduled university examination period at the end of the winter quarter. A copy of the final examination is given in Appendix 8.

It should be pointed out that the examination given in connection with the computer-based course was actually a more difficult one than those administered in connection with the regular course. The latter regularly included only material of the type covered in Sections I, II and III. Sections IV and V, which call for a more active control of OCS inflection, were included in the hope of ascertaining whether the CBI sessions had resulted in the students' gaining a firm command of this area.

Section 3

Findings and Analysis

3.1 Results of the Final Examination

The author is aware that the following comments are highly subjective in nature. However, in the absence of a satisfactory control group, such impressionistic speculations are the sole way in which he can attempt to evaluate the effectiveness of the course.

All of the students in the course passed the final examination. The letter grades assigned for the course were one A-, three B+'s and one B-. Only the last grade was below the level deemed satisfactory for graduate work at Stanford. (The grades for the non-computer-based
version of the course given in 1971-72 are two A's and three B+’s. Those for 1970-71 are A, A-, B+, C+. It should be noted that one of the B+ grades given in 1971-72 was assigned to a student who had failed the course in 1969-70. The student receiving the A in 1970-71 had previously had a course in OCS at another university and had audited the Stanford course the year before.

It would appear that the ability of the 1972-73 group to translate OCS passages and to analyze forms in context was on approximately the same level as that of students taking the non-computer version of the course. Of somewhat greater interest was the fact that the CHI group did not do very well on those sections of the examination (IV and V) which called for the generation of OCS paradigms or the analysis of forms out of context. Thus, in the case of three out of five students the grade assigned for whichever of these sections the student chose was lower than the grade assigned to the other sections of the examination. In the other two cases the grade assigned for those sections was identical with the grade assigned for the examination as a whole.

3.2 Analysis of Student Performance in Certain Sections of the Examination

It is not surprising that the out-of-context analysis of forms caused difficulties, since this type of analysis was not included in the computer-based lessons, the homework assignments coordinated with those sessions, or the class sessions which took place during the last part of the course. The only conclusion we can draw is the not particularly unexpected one that drilling on the production of paradigms does not automatically prepare the student to analyze individual forms out of context. It follows that if the ability to handle this type of analysis is deemed a desirable skill the computer-based lessons should be modified to include instruction in this skill.

At first glance it would appear to be considerably more difficult to explain why the students did not do better in the production of paradigms. However, it would appear that this problem is directly related to defects in the organization of the course. First of all, the class sessions which occupied the last weeks of the course totally
ignored the production of OGS forms except insofar as this question was directly related to the analysis of a form encountered in the passage being translated. Thus, whatever the students' control of the paradigms may have been at the end of the computer-based sessions it was given little or no direct reinforcement during the class sessions. Indeed, in view of the large number of "incorrect" forms occurring in OGS texts, the analysis of such passages may well have served to weaken the students' control of the "correct" forms taught in the computer-based sessions.

On the other hand, the computer-generated paradigmatic drills, which could have served to strengthen the students' control of the "correct" forms, were not made part of the required course work—a fact which led to their being largely ignored by the students.

Finally, the students had been assured that active control of the paradigms would not be required on the examination (as indeed it was not, since the students did not have to choose Part IV of the examination). As a result, the students had no motivation during the period immediately preceding the examination either to repeat the computer-based lessons or to utilize the computer-generated paradigm drills.

It would thus appear that the relatively poor control of the paradigms resulted from the failure to make such control a required part of the course. The students had no real reason to maintain or improve their competence in this area and probably neglected it once the computer-based lessons were completed. This assumption is easily reconciled with the apparent decline in the students' ability to analyze forms in context, noted by the instructor during the last week of the course. At that time it seemed that students who had previously correctly associated certain forms with the appropriate paradigm were becoming uncertain about such associations or even replacing them with erroneous ones, a development which can be viewed as resulting from the large number of "corrupt" forms encountered in OGS texts.
Conclusions

4.1 Goals Achieved and Suggestions for Further Research

The findings discussed in Section 3 indicate that the computer-based lessons in OCS morphology served as a satisfactory replacement for those parts of the non-computer-based version of the course which were devoted to presenting and drilling the inflectional system of the language. It is clear that this results in a considerable reduction in the number of hours which the instructor must devote to classroom instruction—from thirty hours to eight hours. It would, however, appear that the present course could be made considerably more effective and the amount of classroom instruction reduced still further by (1) utilizing the computer-generated form drills as a regular (required) part of the course, (2) increasing the number of computer-based sessions from 24 to at least 30, and (3) including in the computer-based lessons material on the analysis of OCS forms both out of context and within the context of short passages paralleling in complexity and degree of "corruptness" those found in the texts themselves. Since the implementation of these changes would result in a significantly modified instructional program, I shall devote the following paragraphs to a brief outline of the most relevant characteristics of the new course.

First of all, the modified version of the course would require the students to utilize the computer-generated form drills as a regular part of their study of OCS. Instead of being informed that an active control of OCS forms is not required in the course, students will be required to display such a control not only on the final examination but also on a series of weekly tests. The computer-generated drills will be assigned to the students from the time of their first computer-based lesson in OCS morphology instead of being made available only after all the lessons have been completed. The drills available will, of course, increase in scope and complexity as the students' knowledge grows, but the assigned drills will also provide for the recycling of material presented at an earlier period in the course.
It is hoped that the availability of the drills will make possible the omission of a significant number of form-generation frames from the computer-based lessons. This in turn will permit the insertion into the lessons of material on the analysis of words and phrases and, in the case of some of the lessons, allow us to reduce the run time for the session to a more convenient length.

The inclusion of a greater number of computer-based lessons will also make possible the shortening of excessively long sessions and the inclusion of work on the analysis of OCS forms. In addition, it is hoped that it will make it possible to cover those few details of OCS inflection not covered in the original course and to do enough introductory work in the analysis of single sentences to reduce the number of classroom sessions devoted to the translation and analysis of texts to no more than four.

Finally, the inclusion of material on form recognition should make the course considerably more effective in preparing the students to deal with OCS texts on their own. By calling on the students to analyze both "correct" and "corrupt" forms and passages from the earliest lessons on, the revised computer-based lessons should prove much more helpful than the present ones, which totally ignore this problem.

4.2 Disposal of Course Materials

The computer-based lessons as well as the assignment sheets and homework assignments are presently stored on magnetic tape at the Computer-Based Laboratory of IMESS. Scholars interested in learning more about this material should contact the Institute.
Appendix 2

Outline of Input Coding

The script consists of the following set of basic op-codes:

**Teletype output**

TE  type English

The following text, which begins in English, is to be typed on the teletype.

TR  type Russian

RET  returns

The number following this op-code specifies the number of line-feeds desired for spacing and grouping of material on the teletype at run-time.

**Teletype input**

123  This actually represents 16 separate op-codes. The text following the op-code contains one or more sets of parentheses. The material outside the parentheses will be typed by the computer, that inside the parentheses is the required answer, e.g.,

    book is [(kniga)

    fill in --[on duma(l), ona duma(la).

1  is either null or N. If null, two line-feeds will be generated in the run-code preceding the text in order to space it on the paper; if N, these line-feeds will be suppressed.

2  is one of "S, L." These represent the two basic ways in which a response may be elicited from the student. S (simple) means that the line will be typed with an underscore to position the response and the teletype will then return and position itself at the underscores, awaiting the student response. This is used for responses to fill in blanks. L (linear) means that the teletype will type up to the desired response and wait for the student to supply the answer. Then it will continue the line to the next response desired. This is used for responses to complete word endings. S-type answers require the student to start over and type the entire desired response when given additional opportunities after an error. L signals the program
to supply those initial characters of the answer which are correctly typed in. Thus a student, rather than having to start over later, merely needs to try again at the point at which the error occurred.

is either E or R and merely indicates whether the text begins in English or in Russian.

### Timing and repetition control

**WAIT wait n**

N specifies a length of time for the program to wait while the student repeats an audio message or says a sentence in Russian.

**RST restart**

This marks a restart point to which the lesson will return should system failure cause a student's lesson to terminate abruptly prior to completion.

### Program flow

**BEG begin**

Marks the beginning of a lesson.

**END end**

Marks the end of a lesson.

**TST test**

Marks the beginning of a test section.

**BLK remedial block**

Marks the termination of the preceding test and the start of material which will be ignored if the student responded correctly to the material in that test.

**FIN end of remedial block**
Appendix 3

Verb and Noun Drill Examples

PLEASE TYPE YOUR NUMBER AND NAME

СНБ 58 ON TT35)S TCHU MAB 3I J7 9AAM-PAT

TYPE NAME OF VERB LIST AND A "RETURN". DO YOU WANT ALL CATEGORIES AND FORMS? TYPE A "Y" FOR "YES" OR AN "N" FOR "NO". WANT THE PRESENT?

Δ WANT AORIST FORMS?

Δ WANT THE INF. AND SUPINE?

Δ WANT THE IMPERFECT?

Δ WANT THE IMPERATIVE?

Δ WANT PRES. ACT. P.?

Δ WANT PRES. PSS. P.?

Δ WANT PST. ACT. P.?

Δ WANT PST. PSS. P.?

Δ WANT "L" PTCPL.?

Δ WANT DUAL FINITE FORMS?

Δ WANT THE 3.S., I.P. AND 2.P.?

Δ WANT THE N-A.S., N.S.FEM., AND N.P. MAS. OF ACTIVE PARTS?

Δ WANT COMPOUND FORMS OF ACTIVE PARTS?

Δ TYPE BASIC STEM OF VERB AND A "RETURN", THEN THE PRESENT.

TYPE THE 3.P. БЕДАТЬ?

I.S. БЕДА

2.S. БЕДЕШИ

THE INF. AND SUPINE

TYPE THE INF. БЕСТИ

SUP. БЕСТЪ
THE IMPERFECT
TYPE THE 3.P. БЕДЯХЯ

I.S. БЕДЯХЪ

2.S. БЕДЯШЕ

PST. ACT. P.
NON-COMP.
TYPE THE NNM. БЕДЪ

ASN. БЕДЫЬ

NSN. БЕДЪ

ASN. БЕДЯШЕ

NSF. БЕДЫШИ

NPM. БЕДЫШЕ

TYPE STEM AND A 'RETURN'.
PАДЪ
STEM NOT IN MY LIST

PАДЪ
THE PRESENT
TYPE THE 3.P. ПАДАТЬ

I.S. ПАДА

2.S. ПАДЕШИ

THE INF. AND SUPINE
TYPE THE INF. ПАСТИ

SUP. ПАСТИ

THE IMPERFECT
TYPE THE 3.P. ПАДЯХЯ

I.S. ПАДЯХЪ

2.S. ПАДЯШЕ

PST. ACT. P.
NON-COMP.
TYPE THE NNM. ПАДЪ

ASN. ПАДЫЬ

NSN. ПАДЪ

ASN. ПАДЕШЕ

NSF. ПАДЕШИ

NPM. ПАДЕШЕ

TYPE STEM AND A 'RETURN'.
КЛЫН
THE PRESENT
TYPE THE 3.P. КЛЫНА
WRONG. START OVER.
КЛЫНАТЬ

I.S. КЛЫНА
2.5. КЛЯНУШИ

THE INF. AND SUPINE
TYPE THE INF. КЛЯТИ

SUP. КЛЯТь

THE IMPERFECT
TYPE THE 3.P. КЛЯНБАХУ
WRONG. START OVER.
КЛЯНБАХУ

I.S. КЛЯНБАХУ

2.5. КЛЯНБАШЕ

PST. ACT. P.
NON-COMP.
TYPE THE NSM. КЛЯН

ASM. КЛЯНБЫШь

NSM. КЛЯН

ASM. КЛЯНБЫШь

NSM. КЛЯНБЫШь

NSF. КЛЯНБЫШь

NPM. КЛЯНБЫШе

TYPE STEM AND A 'RETURN'.

Л-ИОБИ

THE PRESENT
TYPE THE 3.P. Л-ИОБЛ-ИА
WRONG. START OVER.

Л-ИОБАТь

I.S. Л-ИОБЛ-ИА

2.5. Л-ИОБИШИ

THE INF. AND SUPINE
TYPE THE INF. Л-ИОБОТИ
WRONG. START OVER.
Л-ИОБИТИ

SUP. Л-ИОБИТИ

THE IMPERFECT
TYPE THE 3.P. Л-ИОБЛ-ИААШ
ДО СВИДАНЯ

ЧИ

PLEASE TYPE YOUR NUMBER AND NAME.
ОЧН.

ЧОУРСЕ ЬД И МИСТАКЕ

PLEASE TRY AGAIN.
ОЧН.

ЧОУРСЕ ЬД И МИСТАКЕ
Please try again

Q4CH

> IS < 3 1 73 8835 AM - PAT

Type name of vocabulary and a "RETURN". NBQCH
Type a word you wish to drill and a "RETURN".

Do you want all forms?
Type a 'D' for "yes" or an 'N' for "no". N
Do you want the singular?

Do you want the dual?

Do you want the plural?

Type the n.d. пать

D. патья

Do you want the plural?

Do you want to continue?

Type a word you wish to drill and a "RETURN".

Do you want all forms?

The singular
Type the а.s. град

G. с. град

L. с. град

Wrong. Start over.

I. с. градовь

V. с. град

The dual
Type the n.d. града

G. с. градоу

V. с. града

The plural
Type the n.p. гради
DO YOU WANT TO CONTINUE?
A
TYPE A WORD YOU WISH TO DRILL AND A 'RETURN'.
D
DO YOU WANT ALL FORMS?
H
DO YOU WANT THE SINGULAR?
A
TYPE THE A.S. РАКЪ
G.S. РАКЪ
L.S. РАЧЪ
D.S. РАЧЪ
I.S. РАКОМЪ
V.S. РАКЪ
DO YOU WANT THE DUAL?
H
DO YOU WANT THE PLURAL?
A
TYPE THE N.P. РАКЪ
A.P. РАКЪ
G.P. РАКЪ
L.P. РУР.РАКАХЪ
D.P. РАКАМЪ
I.P. РАКАХЪ
WRONG. START OVER.
РАКАМИ
DO YOU WANT TO CONTINUE?
H
ДО СЗИЛАНЯ
Appendix 4

Sample Assignment Sheet

/ ocs lessons 

977 Simple declension, Lunt, 60-64. Hand pronominal declension, nominative, accusative and masculine singular, Lunt, 52 = 4, 256, 54.

978 Remainder of hand pronominal forms. Regular soft pronominal declension — 'your, my', /Forms of 'he, she, it, they, with and without prepositions, Lunt, 52 = 4, 256, 53 = 4, 256, 54.


980 Remainder of anomalous declension, Lunt 61 = 63. Mixtures of two nominal types, Lunt, 63, 64. Personal pronouns, Lunt, 65.

981 Compound declension, Lunt 55 = 58.
Appendix 5
Sample Homework Sheet

THIS ASSUMES YOU HAVE COMPLETED LESSON 97S

1. TRANSLATE INTO ENGLISH.


ИСОУЦЪ ОТЪВЪШТАЄТЪ БОИНОВИ ГЛАГОЛА -- ЧЬТО ТВОРИШИ ДРУЖЕ
НЕ ПѢЧЬТЕ СА ПѢНАСИ А ДОУШѢЯ
СЛѢЩѢА ВѢДОМА ЧАДѢ ИДЕТЕ КѢ ТѢТѢРАХѢУ
Appendix 6
Student Evaluation Sheets

Lectures

These four questions pertain to your own interest and participation in the course:

1. Did you enjoy this course?
   (1) Much more than average  (2) More than average  (3) Average  (4) Less than average

2. Was the course presented at the appropriate intellectual level for you?
   (1) Too difficult  (2) Appropriate  (3) Too easy

3. How hard did you work in this course?
   (1) Extremely hard  (2) Hard  (3) Average  (4) Not very hard

4. Do you feel that the material presented was worth learning?
   (1) Definitely  (2) Yes  (3) Maybe  (4) No

Rate the lectures on the following:

5. Were clear and well organized:
   (1) Outstanding  (2) Good  (3) Fair  (4) Poor

6. Were intellectually stimulating:
   (1) Outstanding  (2) Good  (3) Fair  (4) Poor

7. In comparison with all other lecturers you have had at Stanford, how would you rate this lecturer?
   (1) Outstanding  (2) Good  (3) Fair  (4) Poor

Rate the course assignments: (Papers, problem-sets, readings)

8. Were they valuable in their own right?
   (1) Outstanding  (2) Good  (3) Fair  (4) Poor

9. Were they well integrated with the lectures?
   (1) Outstanding  (2) Good  (3) Fair  (4) Poor

Please identify: Slavic
Course Department and Number
Prof. Van Campen
Instructor's Name
Lectures

These four questions pertain to your own interest and participation in the course:

1. Did you enjoy this course?
   (1) Much more than average (2) More than average (3) Average (4) Less than average

2. Was the course presented at the appropriate intellectual level for you?
   (1) Too difficult (2) Appropriate (3) Too easy

3. How hard did you work in this course?
   (1) Extremely hard (2) Hard (3) Average (4) Not very hard

4. Do you feel that the material presented was worth learning?
   (1) Definitely (2) Yes (3) Maybe (4) No

Rate the lectures on the following:

5. Were clear and well organized:
   (1) Outstanding (2) Good (3) Fair (4) Poor

6. Were intellectually stimulating:
   (1) Outstanding (2) Good (3) Fair (4) Poor

7. In comparison with all other lecturers you have had at Stanford, how would you rate this lecturer?
   (1) Outstanding (2) Good (3) Fair (4) Poor

Rate the course assignments: (Papers, problem-sets, readings)

8. Were they valuable in their own right?
   (1) Outstanding (2) Good (3) Fair (4) Poor

9. Were they well integrated with the lectures?
   (1) Outstanding (2) Good (3) Fair (4) Poor

Please identify:
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Course Department and Number

Van Campen

Instructor's Name
These four questions pertain to your own interest and participation in the course:

1. Did you enjoy this course?
   (1) Much more than average
   (2) More than average
   (3) Average
   (4) Less than average

2. Was the course presented at the appropriate intellectual level for you?
   (1) Too difficult
   (2) Appropriate
   (3) Too easy

3. How hard did you work in this course?
   (1) Extremely hard
   (2) Hard
   (3) Average
   (4) Not very hard

4. Do you feel that the material presented was worth learning?
   (1) Definitely
   (2) Yes
   (3) Maybe
   (4) No

Rate the lectures on the following:

5. Were clear and well organized:
   (1) Outstanding
   (2) Good
   (3) Fair
   (4) Poor

6. Were intellectually stimulating:
   (1) Outstanding
   (2) Good
   (3) Fair
   (4) Poor

7. In comparison with all other lecturers you have had at Stanford, how would you rate this lecturer?
   (1) Outstanding
   (2) Good
   (3) Fair
   (4) Poor

Rate the course assignments: (Papers, problem-sets, readings)

8. Were they valuable in their own right?
   (1) Outstanding
   (2) Good
   (3) Fair
   (4) Poor

9. Were they well integrated with the lectures?
   (1) Outstanding
   (2) Good
   (3) Fair
   (4) Poor

Please identify: 

Course Department and Number

Instructor's Name
Lectures

These four questions pertain to your own interest and participation in the course:

1. Did you enjoy this course?
   (1) Much more than average (2) More than average (3) Average (4) Less than average

2. Was the course presented at the appropriate intellectual level for you?
   (1) Too difficult (2) Appropriate (3) Too easy

3. How hard did you work in this course?
   (1) Extremely hard (2) Hard (3) Average (4) Not very hard

4. Do you feel that the material presented was worth learning?
   (1) Definitely (2) Yes (3) Maybe (4) No

Rate the lectures on the following:

5. Were clear and well-organized:
   (1) Outstanding (2) Good (3) Fair (4) Poor

6. Were intellectually stimulating:
   (1) Outstanding (2) Good (3) Fair (4) Poor

7. In comparison with all other lecturers you have had at Stanford, how would you rate this lecturer?
   (1) Outstanding (2) Good (3) Fair (4) Poor

Rate the course assignments: (Papers, problem-sets, readings)

8. Were they valuable in their own right?
   (1) Outstanding (2) Good (3) Fair (4) Poor

9. Were they well integrated with the lectures?
   (1) Outstanding (2) Good (3) Fair (4) Poor

Please identify:

Course Department and Number

Instructor's Name
Lectures

These four questions pertain to your own interest and participation in the course:

1. Did you enjoy this course?
   (1) Much more than average (2) More than average (3) Average (4) Less than average
   Answer: (2)

2. Was the course presented at the appropriate intellectual level for you?
   (1) Too difficult (2) Appropriate (3) Too easy
   Answer: (2)

3. How hard did you work in this course?
   (1) Extremely hard (2) Hard (3) Average (4) Not very hard
   Answer: (2)

4. Do you feel that the material presented was worth learning?
   (1) Definitely (2) Yes (3) Maybe (4) No
   Answer: (1)

Rate the lectures on the following:

5. Were clear and well organized:
   (1) Outstanding (2) Good (3) Fair (4) Poor
   Answer: (1)

6. Were intellectually stimulating:
   (1) Outstanding (2) Good (3) Fair (4) Poor
   Answer: (2)

7. In comparison with all other lecturers you have had at Stanford, how would you rate this lecturer?
   (1) Outstanding (2) Good (3) Fair (4) Poor
   Answer: ( )

Rate the course assignments: (Papers, problem-sets, readings)

8. Were they valuable in their own right?
   (1) Outstanding (2) Good (3) Fair (4) Poor
   Answer: (1)

9. Were they well integrated with the lectures?
   (1) Outstanding (2) Good (3) Fair (4) Poor
   Answer: ( )

Please identify:

Course Department and Number

Instructor's Name
Appendix 7

Content of OCS Lessons

1. Introduction to the keyboard: Letters typed with fingers in "initial" position and all letters typed with the index fingers. Approximate phonetic value of the OCS jers. Drill questions on pp. 1-3 of Lunt's introduction.

2. All other single letters except for T and S. Approximate phonetic value of OCS E, U, OY, A, R and B. Drill questions on pp. 4-5 of Lunt.


4. Accusative, genitive and locative of hard two-fold nouns and of numeral 'two'. Replacement of velars in locative singular and plural, nominative dual, and nominative plural.


6. Inflection of soft two-fold nouns with stems in a consonant other than -j-. First dual and plural of present tense.

7. Soft two-fold nouns with stem in -j-. First person singular of present tense. Substitutive softening of stem-final consonants in l.s.

8. Basic-stems of OCS verbs. Partial restatement of present-tense inflection in terms of basic-stem approach. Representation of stems ending in -j-.


11. Productive aorist tense and supine.


18. Remainder of hard pronominal declension. Soft pronominal declension. Forms of 'he, she, it', etc.


23. Non-productive comparison of adjectives. Deadjectival adverbs. Second and third singular aorist forms in -të-. Forms of 'to be' and 'to have'.

Appendix 8
Copy of Final Examination

21 March 1973

SLAVIC 211

FINAL EXAMINATION

Do I and II and at least two other sections.

I. Translate each passage into English.

II. For each underlined word:
   A. transcribe the form using either Lunt's or my Latin transcripts.
   B. identify the form in question as completely as possible
      (e.g., for nouns, give declension, declension variant, if any, case, gender, number; for verbs, give tense, 
      person, number, etc.)
   C. note any deviations in the given form from the OCS 'ideal' form and explain them in so far as this is possible.
   D. give in the same transcription you chose for A,
      1) for nouns -- the nominative singular
      2) for adjectives -- the nominative singular masculine
      3) for pronouns -- the nominative singular (masculine if there are gender differences)
      4) for participles -- the nominative singular masculine and feminine, short and compound, and the basic 
         stem of the underlying verb
      5) for other verb forms -- the basic stem of the verb and the first person singular of the tense in 
         which the given verb occurs.

III. Translate the passage into English.

IV. a) Form the l.s. and 3.p. of the present, aorist and imperfect and the n.s. mas. and fem., comp. and non-comp. of the active 
    participles of any two of the following: Δέλαι, ΒΕΑ, 
    ΒΑΣΙ ΜΟΓ. 
    Where more than one aorist exists, give both the productive 
    and the non-productive forms.
    b) Decline in all three numbers: ΠψΤβ, ΔβΗβ, 
    ΔβςΙ, ΜΨΙ

V. Identify the following theoretical forms. Give every possible combination of categories. Indicate all possible declensional types or underlying basic stems.
   a) nouns: ΒΑΣΙ, ΣΑΣΕ, ΛΟΔΟΥ, 
   TΑΙ.
b) verbs: ПОНИША, ТАСТЕ, ВРЪГЪШЕ, ПЕСТИ.
c) adjectives: ЛОУСЪ, БРЪГОУЕМОУ, ДИСЪМЪ, ТЕЛЪИ
Materials for parts I and II

1. Съведьшою же емою съ горы, въ слѣдъ его иск. нарозди мьвнови. 2. 1 се прокажешь, пристаешь къ слѣдъ емою Гала: Гала, идь твоего, слѣдъ твоего. 3. и простоять ряжь искъ косы и Гала, искъ: мьвнови съ и онѣе мьвнови съ отъ прокажы. 4. и емою ишъ: виндет никому же не пойдешь, и въ шедь, покажи са дарнеровы, и несы дерь, иже повелъ Мона въ съвѣтѣннѣе имѣ. 5. Въведьшою же емою неѣшъ въ Катерѣвомьу, пристаешь къ небѣ соньмѣсъ, молд и 6. Гала: Гала, отрокъ мои лежитъ и въ домѣ ослабленъ, лотъ йиско странда.

46. И съ въ трахъ днѣвъ, обрѣтестве вѣ къ царскѣ сѣдѣніе; по орѣзѣ съдѣніе и послѣдванія ихъ, въ каменѣ, послѣдванія ихъ въ разуку. И съ отъ дѣтѣхъ его. 48. И епискуванъ и дивисте са. 1 рече къ небѣ слѣдъ его: жадо чаны теори нань тако, се вик твои. 1 ла: епискуванъ, ла: сепахт твои. 49. И рече къ йюла: чаны епискуванъ ла: не чаны ли йюла лежитъ нань мого. къ тѣлѣ достѣлъ мнѣ съ-лы. 50. И та не разукуванѣ Гала иже рече йюла.
