The Language Flagship Model and the Humanities

Sam Eisen

Disclaimer: The views expressed in this article are solely the views of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views or policy of the Department of Defense.

The Language Flagship program provides a model that strengthens and deepens cultural engagement within the humanities and creates bridges to collaboration across disciplines. Flagship addresses needs for national security and global competitiveness and integrates professional and life experience into the humanities and other fields for the students who engage in this course of study. The cross-disciplinary nature of the Flagship program and the level of personal, cultural and professional engagement required to complete the program are successfully changing the undergraduate study experience in ways that address significant issues in the ongoing discussion of a crisis in the humanities. The Language Flagship model stresses in all aspects: participation over marginality; experiential components of value to intellectual and academic growth; collaboration across disciplines and professional fields; a clear articulation of rationale and accountability to the public; and integration of professional level language proficiency and cultural understanding across disciplines.

The idea of real world and professional experience playing a key role in the fields of literature and history is not a new one. To take an example from Russian cultural history, in the late 1920's and early 1930's Viktor Shklovskii took on with some irony the role of advisor and mentor as a literary professional to the masses of young would-be writers many of whom lacked both literary and personal experience. In his pamphlet on "The Technique of the Writer's Craft" Shklovskii (1928) advised these young writers: "In order to write, one has to have a second profession, besides literature, because a professional person, having a profession, describes things in his own (unique) way, and this is interesting….Before becoming a professional writer, one needs to acquire different experience and knowledge and then be able to bring

that into the literary work" (p.3, p.5). However paradoxically, Shklovskii cites the career of Lev Tolstoy, arguing that Tolstoy's professional experience both as an artillery officer in the military and as a landowner engaged in agriculture underlay his ability to become a fully professional writer: this was the experience Tolstoy relied on as he undertook the drafts leading to *War and Peace*. (p. 4) Addressing an audience congregating in the housing for young writers in the Soviet Union, Shklovskii observes: "If Lev Tolstoy had gone to live in the Herzen House at age 18, then he would never have become Tolstoy, because he would have had nothing to write about" (p.4). Likewise, the literary sociology developed by Shklovskii's friend and colleague, Boris Eikhenbaum, foregrounded the professional and social experience of the author as an integral component of artistic creation (Erlich 1981). This view was deeply rooted in the sociology of knowledge as developed by Georg Simmel and Karl Mannheim (Eisen 1994). Mannheim's observation about the importance of life experience in the social sciences certainly applies to the field of history as well as other aspects of the humanities:

> In order to work in the social sciences one must participate in the social process, but this participation in collective-unconscious striving in no wise signifies that the persons participating in it falsify the facts or see them incorrectly. Indeed, on the contrary, participation in the living context of social life is a presupposition of the understanding of the inner nature of this living context (Mannheim 1985, p. 46).

Active participation in professional and social activity contributes to the strength and vitality of the humanities disciplines. The sociological perspectives above extend the concept of Humanities + in so far as they emphasize that participation in professional activities nurture and enrich the humanities (in addition to the humanities enriching the life and activity of the professional). The Chinese Language Flagship program at Brigham Young University is a model component of the Humanities+ idea, which is the focus of this special section of this issue of *Russian Language Journal*. As we consider the Humanities+ idea, we should examine not only what the humanities contribute to other disciplines and professional fields (see esp. Menand

2010, 91), but conversely, what professional training and life experience through internships and experiential learning contribute back into the study of the humanities. How do professional engagement and career focus contribute back to the study and practice of the humanities as a fully engaged set of disciplines?

Geoffrey Galt Harpham (2011) connects the origin of the term "the crisis in the humanities" in the post WWII era in U.S. higher education to the tendency on the part of those in the humanities to see professional education ("professional or vocational utility") as a threat to general education and the humanities (pp. 14-15). Helen Small (2013) also connects the "rhetoric of anti-instrumentalism" to a reaction to large-scale structural changes in the university in which "humanities departments have come to seem economically and institutionally irrelevant" (p. 63). Interestingly, Small notes that faculty may object primarily to externally-dictated terms of assessment of the value of the humanities, rather than to the idea of the humanities having social value (p. 62). The Language Flagship program introduces practices that incorporate assessment and professional focus in ways meant to strengthen the overall position of foreign languages, literature and cultural study in a broader context. The catalogued experience of participants in the Language Flagship over time may well provide a model for bridging this perceived chasm between the humanities and professional training.

The Language Flagship program under the National Security Education Program (NSEP) is unique in terms of uniting goals both internal and external to the humanities. The program aims to improve language, culture and regional studies education, as well as to serve a pressing national security need: the need to develop a generation of well-educated graduates with professional-level proficiency in strategic languages who will negotiate the global challenges facing the nation. The mission of the National Security Education Program explicitly includes goals both internal and external to the humanities sphere:

*Improving Foreign Language Education
*Creating a Pool of Global Professionals for National Security
*Advocacy for Foreign Language Education.

The Language Flagship is forging a path that serves all three goals of the NSEP mission cited above through close partnership among higher

education, government, and associations aligned with promoting these goals. This article will examine the value of the Language Flagship model for strengthening support for humanities study within higher education and from outside academe as well.

The idea of a "crisis" in the humanities, or relatedly in the liberal arts, goes back decades, and arguably centuries, and has engendered a massive amount of scholarship and discussion. Major scholars addressing the humanities crisis have noted the clichéd nature of the discussions of "decline" (Steiner 2012, p. 26) and the nature of the topic as a "common genre" (Perloff 2012, p. 43). In 1980 the Commission on Humanities outlined issues still discussed today: decline in enrollments and funding, and pressure from the public and the government (p. 60). These elements of the discussion have not greatly changed in the intervening decades. For example, in a May 2010 symposium, Ricardo Gil Soeiro and Sofia Tavares (2012) cited resurgent interest in the same topics of "budget cuts, waning student interest, and dwindling tenure-track positions as evidence of a crisis in the liberal arts and Humanities" (p. 1). In 2013, Michael Berube, President of the Modern Language Association, moved to counter the rhetoric of decline by citing more positive recent enrollment numbers, noting further that constant inaccurate talk about enrollment declines itself feeds a crisis in legitimation. The 1980 Commission report further pointed out that students and faculty are missing out on the richness of connections of the humanities with other disciplines: "Faced with an uncertain economy and job market, a disorderly curriculum, and educators' diminished confidence in the purpose of a college education, many undergraduates choose majors narrowly aimed at obtaining a first job. They seem unaware that most subjects, disciplines, and careers intersect the humanities. Humanists themselves often neglect the connections between their disciplines and education in the natural and social sciences, engineering, business and other fields" (p. 61). The Commission also notes the lack of foreign language skills and cultural understanding as an educational deficit (p. 61).

The 2007 MLA report still represents the leading statement in the foreign language field on reform. The MLA report cites the need for foreign language programs in particular to reach out across the institution: "Replacing the two-tiered language-literature with a broader

and more coherent curriculum in which language, culture and literature are taught as a continuous whole, supported by alliances with other departments and expressed through interdisciplinary courses, will reinvigorate language departments as valuable academic units central to the humanities and to the missions of institutions of higher learning" (p. 4)   However, the report is still highly focused on the language and literature major, and the interdisciplinary approach primarily relates to having language faculty expand their range of topics and material (pp. 4-5).   As the interdisciplinary model relates to students from other majors, the report suggests that interdisciplinary courses may be taught in English with a "credit-bearing discussion module taught in the target language" (p. 5).   Noting this feature of the MLA report, Carol Klee (2009) outlines further discussions in the field for strengthening the Languages Across the Curriculum (LAC) model by developing courses in the social sciences and sciences taught in the target language and developing a "collaborative, integrated curriculum" (pp. 618-619).   Klee points out that the Language Flagship model developed interventions to support students developing their language skills while engaging in content study in the foreign language (previously the LAC model had not been registering language gains for participants due to limited time on task).

Some leading scholars attribute the crisis directly to the trends within the humanities relating to theory and interdisciplinarity. George Steiner (2012) examines what he terms the "radically spurious" (p. 31) misapplication of theory to the humanities through the approaches of deconstruction and postmodernism as part of the malaise leading to the decline in the authority of the humanities practitioners. (An example of the vehement polemics on this topic can be found in Ellis's 1997 _Literature Lost: Social Agendas and the Corruption of the Humanities_).   More broadly, Steiner raises the questions of whether, in light of the atrocities of the twentieth century, the humanities have indeed fulfilled their humane promise (p. 36). Responding in part to Steiner's pessimism, Perloff (2012) argues that the primary need in reviving the discipline of literary studies is to move away from interdisciplinary approaches in which literary studies borrow from other disciplines and instead focus on poetics and the works of art: "Indeed, what is urgently needed in the "Humanities" today is more knowledge of actual art works and a great

emphasis on induction" (p. 57). Julie Thompson (2006) documents statements from a range of prominent scholars (Helen Vendler, Edward Said) who also expressed concern about the interdisciplinary trends dissolving their distinctive field (pp. 100-101). In her 2012 essay on "After the Humanities," Garber observes, "It's only since the Enlightenment that 'science' and 'the humanities' have evolved along different paths. One way of imagining the humanities 'after the humanities' is, as we will see, to repair this breach" (p. 186) Garber points to the Humanities Centers on campuses as "the places where one can do post-humanities work in the humanities. The places where disciplinary boundaries are *meant* to break down, where collaboration, cooperation and cross field investigations are *designed* to take place" (p. 195). Garber emphasizes the need to set up "standards for the evaluation of collaborative work" when the collaboration crosses disciplines, and to concentrate on the question of the "practice" of the disciplines (pp. 200-201). The Language Flagship model creates a cross-disciplinary rather than interdisciplinary space that encourages collaboration and integration of humanities disciplines so as to inform social science and science endeavors. The ability to pursue a discipline or profession is enhanced by humanities study (a biologist who thoroughly understands an African language and culture is better prepared to confront health or environmental issues overseas in conjunction with skills acquired from a biology major or degree: the cultural factors cannot be separated from environmental and medical solutions).

The 2013 report on *The Teaching of the Arts and Humanities at Harvard College: Mapping the Future o*utlined a series of arguments that represent a threat to the humanities. The arguments cited are:

* "The Economic Argument"
* "The Cultural and Social Arguments"
* "The Scientific Argument"
* "The Vocational Argument"; and
* "The Technological Argument"

To summarize, the arguments are that the humanities fail to prepare for economic and strategic need; do not serve a positive social function; unlike science do not go beyond mere interpretation; are not useful in job placement; and will become more irrelevant as technology advances (pp. 3-6). The authors continue to argue for the value of the humanities

in terms of the value of the humanities for democratic society: the distinctiveness of the humanities, and the intellectual training these disciplines provide (See also Small 2013, for a thorough and historically well-informed treatment of the strengths and weaknesses of each of these arguments). Reacting in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* to the overall negative tone of the report, Alexander Beecroft (2013) suggests a more "engaged discussion of why the humanities matter instead of finger-pointing over who's responsible for a largely imaginary decline in our numbers" (Beecroft, in tenth paragraph).

The Harvard report indeed suggests an inherent movement of the humanities toward marginality over time. The authors chart a path of the humanities originating from identity with the center in mediaeval times to an increasingly critical and marginal role within society up to the present time (See also Han Ulrich Gumbrecht's (2004) description of this moment as "a new configuration of self-reference in which men began to see themselves as eccentric to the world" p. 24). The Harvard report finally traces the position of the humanities to the current mode of "scholarly skepticism" or "hermeneutic suspicion" (p. 19). The report summarizes that "Those historical experiences tend to produce a Humanities teaching that stands back from the collective project to critique its premises. The task is to unmask the operations of power" (p.19). The crisis of the humanities stems in part from the inherent marginality of criticism and interpretation that constitutes the field. The tendency towards marginality is problematic as the field faces demands and questions from parents, communities, legislatures, and businesses that are defining educational goals not specifically connected to criticism and interpretation. In *Production of Presence,* Gumbrecht (2004) looks for a way beyond essentially what the Harvard study had termed a stance of "hermeneutic suspicion" (p. 19):

> Today we may add that it was most probably the trauma inflicted by this—hermeneutically induced—'loss of world' that explains why the only value (at least the highest value) that many humanists can find in the phenomena they are dealing with is the motivation to enter yet another intellectual loop of 'self-reflexivity,' and this is also probably the reason why adopting anything but a 'critical' attitude toward the things of

the worlds in which we are living seems to be something like an original sin, at least in the eyes of the average humanist" (p. 92) Gumbrecht goes on to look at ways of incorporating moments of epiphany and "presentification" as a way beyond the current core hermeneutic practice of the humanities. Gumbrecht discusses confronting students with intellectual complexity and "to make them feel specific *moments of intensity*" (p. 97). He primarily looks to aesthetic experience as the locus of this intensity (p.99), but Gumbrecht also leaves the door open to suggest that presentification may be found in lived experience as well as aesthetic experience.Addressing the malaise in the humanities to the American Council of Learned Societies, Robert Weisbuch (2006, 27) concluded, "The world never refused the humanities. The humanities have shown a tendency to refuse the world. Reconsidering that choice should be the chief business of this generation."

The Harvard report characterizes the arguments that contemporary U.S. education should be oriented towards increasing global competitiveness and national security needs as an argument hostile to the value of the humanities in the current world. Yet increasingly there is recognition from within the national security community, drawing on recent experience in Afghanistan and the Middle East, that language, culture, and regional expertise are crucial underpinnings to success in pursuing U.S. interests abroad, with all the historical and cultural background that that entails. While it is true that the stance of "hermeneutic suspicion" is not a value easily embraced within the concern for global competitiveness and national security, the knowledge, perspectives and ability to question assumptions afforded by humanities education are actively sought after in the national security community. The authors of the Harvard report see the disillusionment of the Vietnam experience as still the defining cultural experience for the Humanities today. As Menand (2010) observed, the "war in Vietnam exposed almost every weakness in the system" (p. 77) of the structure of humanities education. However, the authors of the Harvard report seem to dismiss the relevance of the break-up of the former Soviet Union or the events of 9/11 as defining moments for cultural study. The key historical moment for the National Security Education Program was the dissolution of the Eastern Bloc and fall of the Soviet Union. As it became

clear that it was necessary to negotiate a world that was no longer clearly in a bipolar alignment, the David L. Boren National Security Education Act of 1991 posited that U.S. citizens would need greater knowledge of all the regions, countries and languages that had been traditionally less studied. (Sec. 801 [50 U.S.C. 1901] b (3) and (4)) The humanities (language, literature and culture, history) are an integral but not exclusive piece of this mission to provide broader global education to students across all majors and disciplines. The events of 9/11 and subsequent engagements in Afghanistan and Iraq increased recognition of the need for greater understanding of culture and greater professional language skills across government and the private sector. Harpham (2011) concludes his study of the humanities in American higher education with a postscript citing an Air Force Major General and Vietnam POW describing that the humanities courses he took at the Air Force Academy "cultivated the seeds of hope and put [one] in touch with the centuries-long development of an intellectual tradition that contains essential, life-giving wisdom—a body of knowledge that provided a reason to persevere and survive the hell of captivity and torture" (p. 202-203).

The Language Flagship Model
The Language Flagship offers an opportunity for students from all majors and disciplines to work toward professional language proficiency (ILR 3 or ACTFL Superior) in one of ten strategic languages sponsored by the program (Arabic, Chinese, Hindi Urdu, Korean, Persian, Portuguese, Russian, Turkish, Swahili). There are 27 domestic flagship programs at 22 U.S. campuses with 10 capstone overseas study locations. Approximately 2000 students take courses within Flagship, and over 900 are registered as Language Flagship students intending to pursue the full course of domestic and overseas study. On their home campus undergraduate students pursue courses in their chosen major, participate in intensive foreign language instruction and co-curricular activities, and develop the ability to interact in their areas of academic and professional interest in the target language. This model includes higher-level content learning in the target language through special course offerings, special sections in the target language that supplement regular course offerings in various disciplines, and tutoring by native

speakers specializing in the student's domain. Most students take advanced-level media and culture courses in preparation for their overseas Capstone experience.

The Flagship model provides one set of answers to the questions posed by Heidi Byrnes (2009) on the role of foreign language departments in internationalizing curricula on campus (p. 607). In addition, Stephen Straight (2009) has called for foreign language departments, other departments and institutions to expand "meaningful use of multiple languages in every nook and cranny of undergraduate and graduate curricula throughout their respective institutions, large and small" (p. 625). As Alan Goodman (2009) notes, in the Flagship model "language teachers can play a greater role in internationalizing the curriculum and the campus, preparing graduates to succeed as professionals operating in the language in which they have achieved proficiency" (p. 611).

Madeline Spring (2012) describes in detail how the Chinese Flagship program has integrated a Languages for Specific Purposes (LSP) approach in an articulated manner across domestic and overseas programs in coordination with defined student proficiency goals. In discussing the importance of the LSP courses in reaching proficiency goals, Spring writes: "Superior Level language proficiency implies both linguistic goals and sociocultural competence and knowledge-based cultural understanding. […] To succeed in high-level intellectual communication, written or oral, within the various Chinese worlds and professions, students need to be familiar with China's vast historical, philosophical, and literary traditions (p. 146). Spring outlines the various curricular pathways to proficiency, emphasizing the different types of LSP courses that may be included. While theme-based language courses are common in many language programs, sheltered courses provide "accommodations for second language learners both in materials and instruction" (p. 148) in order to enable learners to take content courses in an academic discipline of interest fully taught in the target language. Spring then explains that adjunct courses may be taught concurrently with Foreign Language Medium Instruction (FLMI) courses (content courses fully taught in the target language) in order to assist students in developing strategies to fully assimilate material in the target language (p. 148). Thus, in Spring's example, an adjunct course

on "Chinese for Academic and Professional Purposes" may accompany courses in other disciplines taught in Chinese on the ASU campus such as "Understanding China's Economic Reform" or "History of Chinese Medicine." After completing such coursework on the domestic campus students are fully prepared to take courses in a variety of subjects at programs at Nanjing University or Tianjin Normal University during the Flagship capstone year.

The Language Flagship sets specific language proficiency targets for selection to the overseas Capstone experience, which includes at least an academic year of overseas immersion. Students must demonstrate ACTFL Advanced or ILR 2 level oral proficiency in their target language, and ACTFL Advanced or ILR 2 level proficiency in Reading or Listening on the required online assessment instruments (See ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines and ILR Skill Level Descriptions). No skill level may be rated lower than ILR 1+ or Intermediate-high. Writing skill is also evaluated. In the Arabic Flagship an ILR scored writing test is employed to verify proficiency at least at the 1+ level. In the other Flagship languages candidates provide writing samples which are reviewed by the selection committee to ensure capacity to function well in overseas courses. If students reach these levels and have sufficient preparation in their major and content areas, they can qualify for the Overseas Capstone program, which consists of intensive language instruction and immersion, direct enrollment in courses in disciplines related to the students' major or professional interests, and a professional internship conducted in the target language, in most cases with a local organization as circumstances in country permit. Examples of recent internships include experiences with the St. Petersburg Chamber of Commerce in Russia, Drug Free Zanzibar in Tanzania, the Shanghai Institute of Neuroscience in China, PriceWaterhouse Coopers in Brazil, and work with a local filmmaker in Egypt. On a recent site visit to the Arabic Flagship program in Meknes, Morocco we visited internship sites and discussed internships with the Flagship students. We observed a biology major conducting blood tests at a Moroccan clinic, and discussed internship experiences with a group of students working with the Culture Ministry to prepare for a major exhibition. Most interesting, however, was an internship at a traditional crafts training center (supported in part by the Millennium Challenge

Account) that was training young Moroccans to preserve the intricate traditional crafts that distinguish the local culture. This Flagship student was learning traditional woodcarving alongside Moroccan apprentices from the local craft masters. This internship experience offered a unique opportunity to engage in cultural production and preservation while developing relationships with local artisans. While the traditional professional office internships proved valuable to the students, this internship in particular was distinguished as a method for full cultural engagement and immersion.

At the end of the Capstone students undergo further language proficiency testing, and those who complete all program elements and attain ILR 3 language proficiency receive certification as a Language Flagship Global Professional. Those students who also received Boren Scholarships (Boren Flagship Scholars) are able to document their skills on official government tests from the Foreign Service Institute and the Defense Language Proficiency Test to assist them in their search for a federal position to fulfill their service commitment through the Boren Awards.

As the undergraduate Flagship model matures, numbers of certified students are increasing and overall results are improving. In the 2012-2013 Capstone year 68% of students reached the ILR 3 program goal in oral proficiency, with 93% of students reaching 2+ or above. The core Language Flagship elements of assessment, documented results, and focus on career preparation should be attractive to any Dean of Humanities facing pressure from parents, administrators, and trustees or state education officials to justify programs. Documenting results tied to professional goals provides a powerful antidote to what Menand (2010) calls a "rationale crisis"' or an "institutional legitimacy crisis" in which humanists were unable to make their case to university administration or the public (pp. 61-62). On the question of enrollment, even with the emphasis that students engage in a major outside of the traditional language and literature track, it is clear that the Language Flagship model provides benefits for humanities departments. The insistence that Flagship students attain Advanced and Superior proficiency creates a structure whereby students from a variety of disciplines pursue double majors in languages or area studies in addition to major related to their professional interests. The latest statistics show that out of 964 currently

registered Flagship students, 45% are pursuing a humanities major. More significantly, 74% of those Flagship humanities majors are pursuing a double major, with 57% pursuing a second major outside of the humanities fields. Those students include 128 combining humanities and social science majors, 47 combining humanities and STEM majors, and 38 combining humanities and business and professional majors. (See Eisen, McDermott, and 2014 for summary percentages of primary majors and double majors). Tying language study to the specific professional interests of students, and demonstrating that U.S. undergraduates can attain professional proficiency levels in their chosen language, will underscore the value of advanced language and culture study across campus. The challenge for the Language Flagship model is, over time, to demonstrate and document the results of the program—academic and professional—and to disseminate the model more broadly, garnering the support of administrators and education officials as well as faculty and students. The intended program result is to develop the broad capacity of U.S. higher education to produce a pool of graduates with professional language skills across a variety of disciplines who will contribute greatly to national security and global competitiveness. The aim of the Language Flagship is to promote partnerships among higher education, government, and business in support of improved foreign language, regional studies, and culture education.

Flagship and the Humanities

The emphasis on professional-level language study is breaking new ground in U.S. higher education in terms of the greater cultural, regional and historical knowledge needed in to function at these higher levels in a living environment. Reaching professional proficiency and striving towards near-native ability in the foreign language requires assimilating the elements of culture, cultural and historical references, and the ability to understand highly nuanced discourse in a variety of settings and contexts. Reaching these levels requires rigorous training and education in fields beyond grammar and vocabulary in order to be able to interact in a foreign context as an academic or professional colleague. The ILR descriptors at ILR 3 and above describe precisely the types of skills that humanities departments emphasize as their end result in an English language classroom environment. The ILR 3 speaking definition states:

"Can use the language as part of normal professional duties such as answering objections, clarifying points, justifying decisions, understanding the essence of challenges, stating and defending policy, conducting meetings, delivering briefings, or other extended and elaborate informative monologues." The ILR 3 reading criteria for media and material in one's professional area include "Misreading rare. Almost always able to interpret material correctly, relate ideas and 'read between the lines,' (that is, understand the writers' implicit intents in texts of the above types)." (ILR Reading Skill Level Descriptions) As students progress above these levels (and some Flagship students are registering 3+ and 4 abilities at the end of the overseas capstone year), speaking, reading and listening become more nuanced, with more ability to understand cultural nuance and correctly interpret all but the most specialized technical vocabulary or slang. At these proficiency levels, language study is inherently tied into the skills needed for higher-level critical, rhetorical, cultural and professional performance.

One practice being developed and integrated into the Language Flagship overseas programs is the use of the Language Utilization report, or LURs. In the LUR the students record the amount of time they spend on various activities in their immersive language environment (homework, reading for pleasure, watching TV, conversation with friends, conversation in host family, etc.). In addition to providing valuable information about the types of overseas immersion activities that promote higher-level language gain, the qualitative comments of the students about their experiences provide a reflection on the real-life experience of interacting in classes, internships, and social life while developing these higher-level proficiencies. Sample quotes from the students record moments when they are able to understand local humor or tell jokes successfully and appropriately in the culture, conduct an impromptu exchange on a cultural topic of interest, or behave correctly in the host family environment in order to negotiate the subtleties of different cultural norms in family life and relationships. These comments form a record of learner's experience, including at times epiphanies of heightened cultural awareness and presence within a new cultural environment. In a presentation at the February 2012 Interagency Language Roundtable, Dan Davidson highlighted excerpts from students beginning to interact freely in chance encounters with

people ranging from cab drivers to leading cultural figures. One excerpt cited the experience of a young woman reflecting on her ability to integrate her English language U.S. persona into her Arabic language persona in relations with her host sister. Davidson cites this as an important aspect of higher level language proficiency acquisition, and we can also understand this moment as an important experience for the student in gaining presence within the host culture.

Dan Davidson's initial research on the LUR material from the Russian Flagship program at St. Petersburg State University reveals a significant result at the highest end of the Flagship program. Heritage Russian language speakers in the Flagship program given the opportunity to improve their language structure and cultural awareness have achieved some of the highest language proficiency results in the program, with scores of ILR 3+ or ILR 4, or Distinguished on the ACTFL scale. Davidson's examination of the LUR reflections from this population reveals that Heritage learners identify the internship component of the overseas capstone year as one of the most significant opportunities for improvement. "For example, heritage students consistently identified the field trip and internships components as particularly helpful among the co-curricular components. Internships, in fact, were uniformly rated as of 'great' value for improving their understanding of Russian culture…." (Davidson 2012, 73). The finding that the professional internship component is of the greatest value to those most able to bridge cultures and immerse themselves fully in a cultural experience brings us back to the observations from the sociology of knowledge cited earlier from Mannheim (1985), specifically that "participation in the living context of social life is a presupposition of the understanding of the inner nature of this living context" (Mannheim, p. 46). Davidson notes that in contrast, non-heritage students found homestays to be "most valuable for their linguistic and cultural growth, outside formal instruction" (Davidson, p. 73). One may surmise that the homestay environment represents a new and challenging social environment for the non-heritage learners, while the heritage learners who were more used to a Russian language environment at home were more challenged by the demanding professional internship experience. In both cases the students identified a level of engagement that contributed to growth experiences.

The engagement of the Language Flagship across disciplines and in live cultural experience finds resonance with the concepts of dynamic scholars from within the humanities who are exploring new ways forward for the humanities. The Overseas Capstone experience is a model that merges cross-disciplinary study with immersion experience in the social, academic and professional life of a foreign culture at a level higher than has been the norm within undergraduate education. In particular, the Language Flagship provides educational experience that resonates with Garber's (2012) ideas on collaborative work and practice, and with Gumbrecht's (2004) concept of the importance of "presentification" and "epiphany" in revitalizing the humanities.

The Language Flagship model by its very nature is designed to bring together the widest array of disciplines in a collaborative project of cultural and global engagement. In order to reach advanced and professional levels of language proficiency, students must engage in higher level content learning across a variety of fields in order to become global professionals. Developing appropriate courses requires that faculty from social sciences, science and professional fields collaborate with language and culture specialists to design content courses in the target languages. These content courses should serve the joint goals of increasing proficiency and expanding the global perspective for students and faculty within the content disciplines. As Dean John Rosenberg of Brigham Young University concluded in his Op-ed relating Humanities+ to the Language Flagship (2013): "The Language Flagship is a model not only of language acquisition but also a kind of whole-sighted learning that best serves students and their evolving communities" (p. 3).

As we gather more and more information from the Language Flagship about the lived experience of these exceptionally well-prepared students as they encounter foreign cultures, family life, and work experiences, we may well gather a picture that shows students having moments of epiphany and presence that take us well beyond the traditional classroom and study abroad experience. Exploration of the ties between language acquisition, cultural interaction, student experience in work and scientific fields, and collaborative endeavors across disciplines will position the Language Flagship as a significant laboratory in re-defining the position and mission of the humanities.

Works Cited

ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines. n.d.
http://www.actfl.org/publications/guidelines-and-manuals/actfl-proficiency-guidelines-2012

Beecroft, Alexander. 2013. "The Humanities: What Went Right?" *The Chronicle of Higher Education.*
http://chronicle.com/blogs/conversation/2013/07/03/the-humanities-what-went-right/

Berube, Michael. 2013. "The Humanities Declining? Not According to the Numbers." *The Chronicle of Higher Education.*
http://chronicle.com/article/The-Humanities-Declining-Not/140093/

Byrnes, Heidi. 2009. "The Role of Foreign Language Departments in Internationalizing the Curriculum." *The Modern Language Journal* 93 (iv): 607-609.

Commission on the Humanities. 1980. *The Humanities in American Life.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

David L. Boren National Security Education Act of 1991. P.L. 102-183.
http://www.intelligence.senate.gov/davidlborennationalsecurityact.pdf

Davidson, Dan E. 2012. "Meeting the Need for High-Level Language Professionals: NSEP, The Language Flagship Model and Lessons and Challenges for Language Acquisition and Assessment at the Advanced and Superior Levels (ILR 2-3)" Presentation at the Interagency Language Roundtable, February 10, 2012. Foreign Service Institute, Arlington, Virginia.
http://www.govtilr.org/Calendars/2011-12ILRCalendarPublic.htm

Davidson, Dan E. and Maria D. Lekic. 2012. "Comparing Heritage and Non-Heritage Learning Outcomes and Target-Language Utilization in the Overseas Immersion Context: A Preliminary Study of the Russian Flagship." *Russian Language Journal* 62: 47-78.

Eisen, Samuel D. 1994. *Politics, Poetics and Profession: Viktor Shklovsky, Boris Eikhenbaum and the Understanding of Literature (1919-1936).* Ph.D. Dissertation. Stanford University.

Eisen, Samuel, Ed McDermott and Kaveri Advani. 2014 "The Language Flagship Undergraduate Model: Latest Results and Innovations." Presentation at the Interagency Language Roundtable, February 21, 2014. Foreign Service Institute, Arlington, Virginia. http://www.govtilr.org/Calendars/2013-14ILRCalendarPublic.htm

Ellis, John M. 1997. *Literature Lost: Social Agendas and the Corruption of the Humanities*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Erlich, Victor. 1981. *Russian Formalism*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Garber, Marjorie. 2012. "After the Humanities." In *Loaded Words*, 180-204. New York: Fordham University Press.

Goodman, Alan E. 2009. "Language Learning and Study Abroad: The Path to Global Citizenship." *The Modern Language Journal* 93 (iv): 610-612.

Gumbrecht, Hans Ulrich. 2004. *Production of Presence: What Meaning Cannot Convey*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Harpham, Geoffrey Galt. 2011. *The Humanities and the Dream of America*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Interagency Language Roundtable. n.d. ILR Skill Level Descriptions. www.govtilr.org.

Klee, Carol A. 2009. "Internationalization and Foreign Language: The Resurgence of Interest in Languages Across the Curriculum." *The Modern Language Journal* 93 (iv): 618-621.

Klein, Julie Thompson. 2006. *Humanities, Culture and Interdisciplinarity: The Changing American Academy.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Mannheim, Karl. 1985. *Ideology and Utopia.* Translated by Louis Wirth and Edward Shils. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers.

Menand, Louis. 2010. *The Marketplace of Ideas.* New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Language. 2007. "Foreign Languages and Higher Education: New Structures for a Changed World." http://www.mla.org/pdf/forlang_news_pdf.pdf

Perloff, Marjorie. 2012. "Crisis in the Humanities" In *Rethinking the Humanities: Paths and Challenge*, edited by Ricardo GilSoeiro and Sofia Tavares, *s*, 43-63. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Rosenberg, John R. 2013. "Humanities+: Seeing with Both Eyes." *Discourse: Newsletter of the Language Flagship.* Fall, 2013: 3.

Shklovskii, Viktor. 1928. *Tekhnika pisatel'skogo remesla*. Moscow/Leningrad: Molodaia Gvardiia.

Small, Helen. 2013. *The Value of the Humanities.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Soeiro, Ricardo Gil and Sofia Tavares. 2012. *Rethinking the Humanities: Paths and Challenges.* Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Spring, Madeline K. 2012. "Languages for Specific Purposes Curriculum in the Context of Chinese-Language Flagship Programs." *The Modern Language Journal* 96 (Focus Issue): 140-157.

Steiner, George. 2012. "Humanities—At Twilight," In *Rethinking the Humanities: Paths and Challenge*, edited by Ricardo GilSoiero and Sofia Tavares, 25-41. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Straight, H. Stephen. 2009. "The Role of FL Departments: Enabling and Fostering Ubiquitous Use of Languages." *The Modern Language Journal* 93 (iv): 624-627.

The Teaching of the Arts and Humanities at Harvard College: Mapping the Future. 2013.
http://artsandhumanities.fas.harvard.edu/files/humanities/files/mapping_the_future_31_may_2013.pdf

Weisbuch, Robert. 2006. "The Silence—and the Noise—of the Humanities." In *The Humanities and its Publics*, 19-28. ACLS Occasional Paper, No.61.