

Zeitschrift:	Studies in Communication Sciences : journal of the Swiss Association of Communication and Media Research
Herausgeber:	Swiss Association of Communication and Media Research; Università della Svizzera italiana, Faculty of Communication Sciences
Band:	3 (2003)
Heft:	1
Rubrik:	Conference Report

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 30.01.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

CONFERENCE REPORT

LUCA BOTTURI*

AACE ELEARN 2002

Montreal, Canada

October, 16th-19th, 2002

ELEARN 2002 was the first conference in a new series organized by the AACE - Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (the same organization that promotes EDMEDIA and SITE) . The conference was hosted in the charming city of Montréal, Quebec, just before the arrival of the Northern Winter, when it was still possible to visit the city and enjoy the sun over the Saint Laurent.

"The E-Learn conference series is an international forum designed to facilitate the exchange of information and ideas on the research, issues, developments, and applications of a broad range of topics related to e-Learning. E-Learn is an innovative collaboration between the top public and private academic researchers, developers, education and business professionals, and end users from the Corporate, Healthcare, Government, and Higher Education sectors. All presentation proposals are reviewed and selected by a respected international Program Committee, based on merit and the perceived value for attendees."

(From the ELEARN Conference website, www.aace.org/conf/elearn).

Elearning is unexpectedly one of the few technology-related domain that did not suffer of the downturn that invested other "e-" activities in the last year. The mood that pervaded the conference was therefore that of great expectations, and that of being involved in a domain that can be relevant for the international scene.

Two main adjectives may describe ELEARN 02. First of all, the most referenced researchers in the elearning area attended the conference, and both the presentations and the discussion were surely high-quality. This

*NewMinE Lab, University of Lugano, CH, luca.botturi@lu.unisi.ch

applies specially to keynote speakers, who introduced hot and relevant discussion topics in the conference venue. Secondly, as usual for AACE events, it was huge, with about one thousand attendees from more than 50 countries, more than 600 papers and eight parallel sessions during the whole day. On the one hand, this was a good chance for meeting interesting people in the field and for bringing them together for discussion, but getting an overall impression of what was going on was a real challenge.

This is why this report does not have any claim of completeness. Its aim is pointing out four main topics arisen during the conference, that from the author's point of view seem the most valuable to be addressed by future research in the elearning domain.

An Interdisciplinary Environment

Elearning could probably be considered as of the currently privileged domains for interdisciplinary research. ELEARN Attendees came from education and psychology departments, technology research centers, management institutes, etc. Several communities and sub-communities met in Montreal, and had the valuable opportunity to share methods, results and research issues. I really enjoyed and appreciated discussing with telecommunication engineers and psychologists, as well as with people from consulting firms or education studies programs.

But this was an opportunity, indeed. The conference confirmed that bringing people together is just the first step towards knowledge sharing and the creation of a common understanding.

I went to Montreal with a special interest for two main topics: adaptive hypemedia systems and instructional design. While I enjoyed the rich offer of the conference, I realized that two different and separated groups of people attended the parallel sessions concerned with those two topics. It would be actually interesting drawing a sort of "social map" of the people involved in such an interdisciplinary research domain. One of the main dimensions on this map would probably be stretched between human sciences and technology. But other distinctions could be made reflecting the different domains, such as Higher Education, K-12, Health Education, etc.

Actually, it is not easy to express ideas across different specialized languages, disambiguating terms, matching concepts and - this is probably the greatest issue - recognizing the value of different methodologies. Nevertheless, one of the conclusions that I drew from the conference - mostly

from the special interest group discussions - is that only a really interdisciplinary research approach is sensible and promising in this complex field.

Adaptive Hypermedia & Elearning Standards

One of the most recognizable sub-communities at ELEARN was surely that of Adaptive Hypermedia Systems (AHS), and was one of the most technology-oriented ones. All the main authorities in the field, such as Paul De Bra or Peter Brusilovsky were attending the conference and animating the discussion during the related sessions.

This particular domain is currently reaching a new development stage, leaving prototype-based research and beginning to address the issue of how these systems can be effectively integrated and exploited in real educational contexts. Remarkably, the first authoring interfaces have been proposed on this occasion: they would allow non-technical educators to use some adaptive systems.

But the greatest and completely new issue tackled at ELEARN was the integration of AHS with elearning standards, namely with SCORM, which is currently the most promising initiative, and is foreseen to be the content development standard for the next years . Actually, AHS and SCORM may find several complementarities. Standards impose a significant work overload in elearning content production, and this may be reasonable if effective reuse is possible.

On the other hand, the reuse of elearning content requires an effective management of resources, which may be as costly as production itself. AHS can be developed as platforms that automatically do much of the work, by assisting and guiding educators for content production and reuse in different contexts .

The Community of Practice Strand

I said before I went to ELEARN for following two main topics, but I actually focused on a third one, which I discovered as extremely interesting right during the conference: the Communities of Practice Strand.

The community dealing with Communities of Practice was indeed one of the groups more intensively at work during the conference days, and was gathered around the initiative of the people of CPSquare . Etienne Wenger, one of the guru authors in this field (and an exquisite per-

son) gave probably the most intriguing, rich and stimulating keynote of ELEARN 2002.

But what is at stake with Communities of Practice? Several experiences have revealed that the effect of technologies in creating and managing interpersonal and social relationship is of paramount interest. And this is true from at least two points of view:

1. New media have allowed an incredible extension of a person's social outreach: we can interact and collaborate with people across the ocean and across time zones in a way which was previously simply unconceivable. This offers of course new exciting opportunities, but at the same time poses a new set of delicate issues.
2. These new issues can be translated into new research question aiming at a better understanding of the very nature of social relationships, such as cooperation or learning. The introduction of technologies can be the element that creates new situations where the attention can be catalyzed to old issues concerning human relationships as such. Wenger's keynote drew attention exactly on the relationship that exists between identity, community and learning: a new research domain offers new possibilities for inquiring this everlasting issues.

The next conferences on elearning, knowledge management and communities of practice, will surely be interesting places for following the further developments in this area.

Elearning: new "e-", old (and interesting) issues

"The introduction of technologies can be the element that creates new situations in where the attention can be catalyzed to old issues concerning human relationships as such" - you just read this sentence some lines above, and it was applied to Communities of Practice. But exactly the same remark is valid for elearning as such, and this is probably the greatest gain that the author brought home from ELEARN 2002.

Let's list some of the most addressed issues in the parallel sessions:

"How can we evaluate a learning environment?

"What is the role of the instructor(s) in a learning environment?

"What is the correct balance between personal (online) work and group work or lectures?

"How to present the same topic to different learners with different learning styles?

These relevant issues do not allow easy solutions. But what is specific about elearning? All of them could be posed almost in the same form for traditional "brick-and-mortar" learning environments.

And this is what is interesting in elearning, and what makes a conference like ELEARN a valuable experience: new media are the element that provoked a shift in the way educators conceive their job, and that let them think more carefully to some relevant issues that before seemed clear. The need to chose among a wider set of opportunities, and the willingness to try out something new, have revealed that those issues were not clear at all, and that some work could be done to improve teaching and learning as such. May we exploit technologies or not, now we have to answer these issues, and do our work of educators in a more critical and conscious way.

BENEDETTO LEPORI*

GAINING INSIGHT FROM RESEARCH INFORMATION

6th International Conference on Current Research Information Systems

Gesamthochschule Kassel, Germany, 29th – 31th August 2002

The 6th international conference on current research information systems was the sixth conference in a series which started in 1991 in Bergen and which has become a periodic occasion to review and discuss the most recent developments in the field of research information systems¹. The conference was organised by EuroCRIS, a non-profit organisation which provides a platform for communication and exchange between practitioners in the field, and was attended by about hundred people from more than ten European countries. Swiss participants included representatives of the Federal Office for Education and Science (ARAMIS project), from the Swiss National Science Foundation, from the Swiss Documentation Service on Social Sciences SIDOS, from the Federal Institute of Technology in Zurich and from the Università della Svizzera italiana.

After a short introduction to the CRIS domain and issues (section 1), I will focus on three main discussion areas which are relevant for the future development of CRIS, that is:

standardisation off data structures and interoperability between different systems (section 2);

mapping between data sets with different semantic structures (section 3); relevance and targeting user needs (section 4).

I will conclude with some remarks on the possible role of research in communication sciences for the development of CRIS (section 5).

*Faculty of Communication Sciences, Università della Svizzera italiana, Lugano; blepori@unisi.ch

¹ Previous conferences were held in Bergen (1991), Amsterdam (1993), Milan (1995), Luxembourg (1998) and Helsinki (2000). The proceedings of the last two conferences are available on-line on the CORDIS web site (<http://www.cordis.lu/cris98> and <http://www.cordis.lu/cris2000>). The programme of the previous conferences is available on the Eurocris website (www.eurocris.org). All on-line references have been checked October 17. 2002.

1. CRIS: an overview and different models

CRIS are by definition systems which gather information on existing research activities and then make it accessible to different user groups through a variety of means. At the beginning of the CRIS conference series, the main tasks of CRIS was to document existing research activities at national or European level by collecting information that was not available elsewhere and putting it into a standard format. Central issues were data collection, definition of suitable data formats and data accessibility for the end users.

The traditional model of CRIS were (and still is) that of large databases containing the description of research projects at a national or European level; typical examples are the CORDIS database of European projects (www.cordis.lu), the Swedish system SAFARI (<http://safari.vr.se/>) and the project of a Swiss research database ARAMIS (www.aramis-research.ch).

However, the development of the Web has changed dramatically the landscape of CRIS: the easiness to publish information on the Web and to access it and the use of hyperlinks has made other CRIS architecture possible and has promoted the emergence of new services. Among these are systems specialised on single disciplines (like SIDOS, the Swiss Documentation Service on Social Sciences www.sidos.ch), university information systems (like the Forschungsbericht Online of the University of Kassel, http://www.uni-kassel.de/wiss_tr/ or the KISS project of the Swiss federal institutes of technology³) and, of course, the web pages of the researchers or research institutes themselves. Finally new actors like journal publishers and commercial information providers building specialised portals (like the US based Community of Science www.cos.com) are entering into this market⁴.

Thus, the scope of CRIS is not any more limited to research project information, but encompasses also data on persons (for example CVs) and on organisations performing research, while the whole domain of research results (especially publications) is being integrated into it. As a consequence, it becomes increasingly difficult to distinguish the CRIS domain from the electronic publication of research results in general.

³ Ulmer D., Birkenmeier B., Development of a central Knowledge Transfer Platform in a highly decentralised environment, CRIS2002 paper.

⁴ For an inventory of approximately 90 existing CRIS see the Global Research Information System (GRSI) on the Eurocris Web site www.eurocris.org.

Despite all standardization efforts, the world of CRIS is characterized by an extremely high diversity, as showed the results of a survey of European CRIS presented by Eric Zimmermann of the Bar-Ilan University in Israel⁵. Existing systems differ widely for their coverage (both geographically and thematically), but also for the choices of architecture, classification schemes and technology.

This heterogeneity is reflected also in different views on the organisation of CRIS, which surfaced in the final discussion at CRIS2002.

A first model emphasizes the structure of CRIS as coherent information system, having a common syntax and semantics and thus granting interoperability and the possibility of combined searches across different systems (K. Jeffrey, Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, UK). This requires to implement a standard format for research information (through the use of CERIF model; see section 2), as well as the systematic use of metadata to allow for semantic mapping between the different systems.

The alternative model provides for the creation of specialised, user-targeted information portals, which gather *already available* information from different sources through the use of search engines and harvester tools and don't try to superimpose a standard structure since most of the user won't make use of it (Wolfgang Sander-Beuermann, University of Hanover, Germany). Examples are the German portal <http://forschungsportal.net/> and the Swiss portal www.swiss-science.org.

2. Heterogeneity and interoperability

A major success in the development of CRIS has been the definition of a common base format at the European level. The CERIF (Common European Research Information Format; www.cordis.lu/cerif/) has been developed at the end of the '80 to support the development of project databases. It was completely revised at the end of the '90 to account for the broadening of the CRIS scope; CERIF2000 is a data model based on three primary entities, that is research projects, persons and institutions, and a series of secondary entities (like CV or project results); these entities are interlinked through n:m relationships with role and time stamps as attributes, so that it is possible to express in the data model the fact that a person worked as a research coordinator (*role*) in a project from

⁵ Zimmermann E., CRIS-Cross : Current Research Information Systems at a Cross-roads, CRIS2002 paper.

time X to time Y (*time stamps*). Moreover, CERIF provides a framework for data exchange between different CRIS and a metadata model for the semantic description of records.

It has been shown during the conference that this model provides for great flexibility and thus can match the needs of most CRIS⁶. There are also many examples of successful implementation of CERIF 2000 as formal data model. Thus, the group of CERIF promoters hopes that CERIF2000 will become the standard data model for CRIS application, thus allowing for easy interfacing between different CRIS and for join searches across different databases.

A major application of CERIF2000 as been the European Research Gateway On-line (ERGO; <http://www.cordis.lu/ergo/home.html>), a pilot project launched in 1997 from the European Commission to build a common catalogue of national research projects databases across Europe; despite its demonstrated technical feasibility, the ERGO project has been terminated in 2001 due to lack of political support and interests; this shows that interfacing more databases to build larger catalogues with more projects doesn't lead necessarily to CRIS that offer more value to end-users and to political authorities (see also section 4).

A different view on CERIF has been expressed by representatives of European universities (workshop on Embedding of CRIS in a university research information management system, led by Jostein Hauge of the University Library Bergen). In many cases universities don't have the means to implement the full CERIF model and, also, have needs for specific information and data structures (e.g., to interface CRIS with existing databases for the management of employees). It seems then suitable to adopt CERIF as a general reference model – in particular the architecture based on projects, persons and organisations, which appears to be quite "natural" for CRIS –, but to implement it on a data model which bests suits the specific needs of the university. Here also the conflict between the move towards standardisation and that of adapting general models to specific local situations appears to a central tension in the development of CRIS.

⁶ Asserson A., Jeffrey K., Lopatenko A., CERIF : Past, Present and Future : An Overview, CRIS2002 paper.

3. Metadata and semantic mapping

Despite all standardization efforts, a major problem for CRIS is handling the semantic heterogeneity of research information on the Web; in fact, despite the development of metadata⁷ standards for web sites like the Dublin Core Initiative (<http://dublincore.org>), most of the available information on the subject lacks simply good semantic descriptors and, if these are present, their meaning may be quite different, because of differences in the underlying classification scheme, but also in the way descriptors are produced (e.g., automatically produced descriptors vs. those produced by expert people).

The central issue is then how to make queries across the widest possible set of research information systems (including for example personal web pages of projects and of researchers) and getting better results than with the use of commercial search engines like Altavista and Yahoo. This research line was strongly represented at the CRIS conference both at the level of general models⁸ and of the demonstration of test applications⁹. Among the tested approaches we could cite automatic generation of metadata from web pages, semantic web applications and automatic translation of queries using statistical methods.

However technically sophisticated, these approaches are at the moment far to be convincing at the level of their practical implementation and of their real usefulness. In fact, a major flaw is that they fail to consider that CRIS users seem to have a very clear representation of the quality and possible use of the different sources and thus are selective in using them; then simply concealing differences between sources behind a uniform interface may not be a right strategy. Moreover, faced with the low quality of data retrieved through general queries, users may develop more clever strategies to get relevant information (e.g., by looking at the personal web pages of the researchers more relevant in a field, instead of searching directly for a scientific theme). It seems then that the development of CRIS should take into account much more the whole complex-

⁷ Jeffrey K., Metadata and some Issues, ERCIM News No.35 - October 1998 http://www.ercim.org/publication/Ercim_News/enw35/intro.html.

⁸ Krause J., Current Research Information as Part of Digital Libraries and the Heterogeneity Problem, paper at CRIS2002.

⁹ Andricik M., Metasearch engine for Austrian research information, paper at CRIS2002. Strötgen R., Treatment of Semantic Heterogeneity using Meta-Data Extraction and Query Translation, paper at CRIS2002.

ity of the searching process for scientific information and the active role of the users in it.

4. Relevance and user targeting

Behind the set-up and the public funding of CRIS services there is the will to render more effective the process of knowledge production and of steering of the research system; thus, CRIS should favour the diffusion of knowledge, avoiding unnecessary duplication of research activities, and allow policy-makers to better coordinate research (e.g., having a quick overview on on-going research and on new fields to be developed)¹⁰.

Thus, the CRIS community is aware that CRIS need to respond to specific user needs, rather than simply to put large amounts of information on the Web; in the words of the Eurocris president Keith Jeffrey (Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, UK): “The end-user requirement is for the relevant information (relevance, recall) at the right place (wherever worldwide), at the right time (when required) in the appropriate form (optimal presentation, integrated for further use in electronic information / office environments)” (K. Jeffrey).

This issue was analysed in more detail in the two presentations of Nieske Iris Koopmans (Netherlands Institute for Scientific Information NIWI)¹¹ and of Benedetto Lepori and Lorenzo Cantoni (Faculty of Communication Sciences, Università della Svizzera italiana)¹².

The paper of Koopmans could identify four main potential user groups of CRIS, i.e. researchers, policy maker's and policy researchers, media and users from the private sector. The survey showed that these groups differ markedly concerning aims in using CRIS, knowledge of the subject and available resources for getting information. Researchers possess normally a very good knowledge of their subject and good information channels, mostly through personal contacts and scientific literature. At the contrary, policy-makers need information at macro-level, like on the volume of research in a given field, to make or justify their decisions on research policy. There is a clear need for CRIS to provide information which is more structured and controlled than available on the Web, but

¹⁰ See for instance the objectives of the Swiss Aramis project:
<http://www.bbw.admin.ch/f/forschnat/aramis/aramis.html>.

¹¹ Koopmans N. I., What's your question ? The need for research information from the perspective of different user groups, paper at CRIS2002.

¹² Lepori B., Cantoni L., Is there any user for this CRIS ?, paper at CRIS2002.

different level of detail are needed and information must be tailored to the different user groups.

However, as Lepori and Cantoni showed in their survey of Swiss research information systems, there may be structural factors which prevent CRIS to respond to user needs; many information services are in fact the spokesman of official institutions (like the European Union or the national funding agencies) and then publish information according to the corporate orientation of the institution and for a generic public rather than tailoring specific users. They showed that building a CRIS starting from the choice of a target group and of the definition of their needs (like www.swiss-science.org) leads to quite different results at the level of the content and structure of the information, but also of the organisation of work and of company structure.

Thus, the development of CRIS like that of other communication services on the Internet, appears to be shaped by two basic forces, that is the pressure of the providers of information towards standardisation and interoperability, to achieve reusability of the data, and that of users towards localised systems which answer clearly defined needs and match specific (semantic and pragmatic) representations of the world. This leads to the observed heterogeneity of CRIS and, in particular, to the coexistence of more institutionally oriented and user oriented systems.

At the same time this means that the unification strategies pursued by many (technically oriented) developers may well destroy the rationale for CRIS existence, because more generic a CRIS is, less relevant for the users will be its information content. The universal CRIS, they concluded, could then be the end of CRIS, as example of ERGO may show.

5. Conclusions

I would like to develop two final comments to this conference, one more oriented to practice, the other to scientific research in the communication sciences.

Firstly, the work done in the past ten years by the CRIS community is impressive, in terms of advancement of knowledge on these services, but also for the development of practical solutions and of standards like CERIF. Moreover, CRIS are not any more an issue for specialists of large projects databases only, but concern many more people in the research administration of the state and of universities, but also researchers themselves. This means that researchers and research administrators must be

aware of the existence of CRIS and of their underlying principles, either to search for information or to set up some (even very simple) information systems (like an university research database).

Secondly, CRIS issues are strongly related to many fields in the communication sciences, not only at the technical level, but also concerning issues of communication on Internet and of semantics and pragmatics of information. In fact, CRIS can be interpreted as one (rather new) element in the development of scientific communication (inside science, but also with politics and with the general public), a subject which of course has a long-standing tradition in the communication sciences. It is then my opinion that the CRIS community, which was and partially still is dominated by technically oriented approaches, would strongly benefit from a larger contribution from communication sciences, as the session dedicated to user needs at the CRIS2002 conference clearly showed.

Conference web site: <http://www.uni-kassel.de/CRIS2002/>

Conference papers: ADAMCZAK W., NASE A. (eds.), *Gaining Insight from Research Information*, Kassel University Press, 2002.

NICHOLAS JAMES MAXWELL*

THE LUGANO CONFERENCE ON “ARGUMENTATION IN DIALOGIC INTERACTION”

University of Lugano, Switzerland

June 30th-July 3th 2002

The conference, held at the University of Lugano in the early summer (June 30th-July 3th,) was an excellent opportunity to explore argumentative dialogue from different perspectives in a truly interdisciplinary framework. What made it a very special occasion – apart from the splendid surroundings of the Swiss lake and the excellent hospitality of the Faculty of Communication Sciences – was the fact that it was actually co-organized by three International Associations: the International Society for the Study of Argumentation (Amsterdam), the International Association for the Study of Controversies (Tel Aviv) and the International Association for Dialogue Analysis (Bologna). The multiplicity of approaches offered by the three Associations was also reflected in the conference programme: not only were there a plurality of disciplines involved (linguistics, philosophy, rhetoric, sociology, anthropology, psychology etc.), but also there was a wealth of opportunities for real dialogue.

Argumentative dialogue was the centre of the conference in many ways. In particular, it represented the intersection of the other two strands of the conference: analysis of argumentative dialogue contributes to the study of controversies and to their key role in the evolution of ideas, institutions and social practices; and a dialogic view of argumentation *per se* contribute to most theories of argumentation.

The conference was opened by Frans van Eemeren with a plenary lecture on the “State of the Art” of Argumentation Studies which offered a

*University of York, UK & University of Modena I, maxwell.nick@unimo.it

thorough grounding for the conference by briefly tracing the historical and methodological foundations of the renewed interest in argument and by outlining the problem areas of current interest.

A series of other plenary lectures extended over the four days of the conference. Jonathan Cole introduced a perspective on argumentative dialogue that explored the interaction between neurological patients and neurophysiologists. Alan Gross offered an analysis of the notion of incommensurability (in Kuhnian terms) and an interpretation of the development of science in interdisciplinary space, focusing on how scientists communicate and on how they constitute their world rhetorically. Sally Jackson, Scott Jacobs and Douglas Walton presented different perspectives on argumentation studies, highlighting the role of design in argumentation, models of rational conditions for disagreement and dialogue types.

The parallel sessions followed up on a great number of threads and themes introduced by the plenaries and offered a wealth of ideas that cannot be correctly represented here.

Papers often focused on characteristic features of argumentative dialogue in specific settings. The media certainly played a major role as an object of study: many interesting contributions centred on argumentation in talk shows, political debates and parliamentary debates. Another interesting strand was to be found in a number of papers that investigated argumentative moves and their interpretation in therapy-related settings. Smaller but equally interesting sessions focused on literary dialogues, religious discourse, academic discourse, business negotiation, judicial debates and dialogue on the Internet.

A number of papers in two parallel sessions dealt with argumentative moves in dialogues from the point of view of a methodology for dialogue analysis. Other papers explored the boundaries of rationality in dialogues or the role played by emotional factors. Controversies, of course, were studied in a number of sessions, both with a view to analysis in terms of moves and strategies and with an eye to the implications for the fields of philosophy and rhetoric.

The final round table session reconsidered the variety of approaches to the study of argumentation, controversies and dialogue and highlighted the potentiality of further interdisciplinary work.

To conclude, the conference was scientifically very successful. Most of the papers were of a very high standard and stimulated lively discussion. Many new aspects of the relationship between argumentation and dia-

logic interaction emerged and points of contact in the work carried out by the three Associations were highlighted as potentially suggestive for further research. The conference definitely emphasised the need to strengthen links between associations with common interests. So much so that it was decided to hold a similar joint conference every four years.

The social programme was also rich and offered plenty of opportunities for further dialogue, with two dinners and an excursion to the Bellinzona castles. The organisation was as near perfect as can be and the organizers received, and deserved, the warmest of congratulations from all participants.

EDDA WEIGAND*

EMOTION IN DIALOGIC INTERACTION. ADVANCES IN THE COMPLEX

*Scientific Report on an ESF Exploratory Workshop, Münster, Germany,
15-18 October 2002*

1. Executive summary

The European Science Foundation Workshop on 'Emotion in Dialogic Interaction. Advances in the Complex' took place in the 'Senatssitzungssaal' of the historic building of the 'Schloss' where the Rectorat of the University of Münster is located. The workshop was organized by Prof. Edda Weigand and the assistant coordinator Jörn Bollow. Additional financial support was generously provided by the Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster and the 'Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Westfälischen Wilhelms-Universität zu Münster e.V.'

Nineteen speakers, mostly well-known experts in the field and a few younger scholars, and discussants were invited from different European countries (Germany, France, Italy, Sweden, Great Britain, Czech Republic, Bulgaria, Russia) and from abroad (Israel, Canada). An interdisciplinary approach which goes beyond academic boundaries was guaranteed by combining different linguistic disciplines such as Comparative Linguistics, General Linguistics, Linguistics of different languages and related disciplines such as psychology, philosophy and psychotherapy.

At the beginning of the workshop the participants were welcomed by the delegate of the European Science Foundation, the prorector and the convener. There were four thematic parts: Addressing the complex, Communicative means, Emotional principles in dialogue, Final round table discussion. Every speaker had one hour speaking and discussion time. In spite of the workshop taking place in a historic building all modern means of presentation were at the participants' disposal. The possibility

*University of Münster, Germany, weigand@uni-muenster.de

of having time for discussions after the lectures and during the breaks was very much appreciated by the participants. The final round table discussion structured by guiding questions from the convenor was taken up with much interest and engagement and lasted more than two hours.

Not only the scientific but also the social framework was very much appreciated by the participants. Every evening there was a special social programme. A concert in the historic Town Hall performed by prize-winning scholars of the University demonstrated the relationship between music and emotion and was very much enjoyed by the participants. There was a reception by the Mayor of Münster in the famous 'Friedenssaal' of the Town Hall where the first European peace was negotiated and then participants had dinner in a typical Westphalian restaurant. Thus also the historic and cultural framework of the region was taken account of.

The whole workshop was characterized by a clear scientific orientation on the one hand and a pleasant atmosphere on the other and was thus evaluated as a great success by the participants. A selection of the Proceedings will be published with Benjamins.

2. Scientific content of the event

The workshop started with the following scientific premises:

"Emotions were considered to be an integrative component of human behaviour in dialogic interaction as indicated by recent findings in neurology.

"Dealing with complex natural phenomena such as emotions should start from an understanding of the object and derive an adequate model of description from the object. Such a model must be capable of addressing the complex.

The speakers were invited on the basis of these two premises. Approaches which separate emotions or those which define emotions by means of simple artificial units were not taken into account.

The core issue therefore was, on the one hand, to demonstrate how human abilities, among them having emotions, are interrelated in dialogic interaction. On the other hand, it can be presupposed that human behaviour is in part culturally dependent. In this respect, the focus was on identifying a specifically European way of expressing emotions and dealing with them in dialogue. In order to achieve a deeper understanding of such a complex phenomenon as human interactive behaviour and

European identity it was necessary to cross academic boundaries and to develop a theoretical foundation by means of which to address the complex. The issue of identifying Europeanness necessitates comparing different languages and cultures insofar as it is the diversity of cultures and languages which makes up the general concept of western culture.

In the first part of the workshop: 'Addressing the complex' issues of theoretical foundation were dealt with. John E. JOSEPH (Edinburgh) in his opening paper on 'Body, passions and race in classical theories of language and emotion' outlined the classical background from a historical-comparative point of view and emphasized the interrelationship between language, body and culture. Edda WEIGAND (Münster) in her paper on 'Emotions: the simple and the complex' then highlighted the modern view of addressing the complex object of dialogic interaction by starting from the natural object-of-study and deriving an appropriate model from it. The model of the Dialogic Action Game follows the guideline of a new paradigm which is not restricted to rules but based on principles of probability. The focus is on human beings acting and reacting in complex ever-changing surroundings on the basis of their abilities. The minimal communicatively autonomous unit is considered to be the Dialogic Action Game which integratively comprehends the essential components of interaction such as language, perception, cognition, emotion, and includes variables of different kind which influence human behaviour. The key concept for opening up the complex of human behaviour is considered to be specific interests, in the end survival needs, and communicative, i.e. interactive or dialogic purposes. Communicative action can be described as the correlation of communicative purposes and communicative means. Communicative means are not only verbal means but cognitive and perceptual means as well which are used in an integrative manner. Human beings cannot separate their abilities such as speaking, thinking and perceiving and they are inevitably influenced by emotions. As purposeful beings they try to negotiate their positions in dialogic interaction. Weigand not only gave an outline of the theoretical framework but also demonstrated by means of authentic texts how emotions are verbally expressed in the utterance and how cognitive emotional principles influence the dialogic sequence by emphasizing specifically European features.

The papers by František DANEČ (Prague) on 'Universality versus culture specificity of emotions' and Svetla ČMEJKOVÁ (Prague) on 'Are there emotionless dialogues? Emotions and involvement' shared this view

of emotions as complex integrated phenomena and focused on specific cultural dependencies. Karin AIJMER (Göteborg) in her paper on 'Interjections in a contrastive perspective' analysed minimal verbal units such as interjections as expressions for complex functions in different languages. Carla BAZZANELLA (Torino) in her paper on 'The context of emotions' addressed the complex dependency of emotions on contextual, especially cultural variables.

The second part of the workshop on 'Communicative means: grammatical categories, lexical means and utterances' focused on the verbal means of dialogic interaction with which emotions can be expressed in the utterance. True to the integrating point of view the verbal means were not isolated, for instance, as single words but analysed as means-in-use, words or grammatical categories within the utterance, or the whole utterance as means for a speech act.

The paper given by Michael JANDA (Münster) on 'Emotions as magic bonding in Indo-European languages' referred to the origin of European languages and demonstrated how emotions were considered as a bonding force in various Indo-European languages. Wolfgang TEUBERT (Birmingham) dealt with the specific emotion of 'guilt' from a corpus-linguistic and discourse-analytic point of view. A corpus-based comparative analysis of the vocabulary of 'Joy, astonishment and fear' in English, German and Russian was given by Valerij DEM'JANKOV (Moscow). Christian SCHMITT (Bonn) focused on dictionaries of Spanish, French and German. Maxim STAMENOV (Sofia/Göttingen) dealt with ambivalent emotions in intercultural communication with reference to Turkish loanwords in Bulgarian. Ronald GELUYKENS and Bettina KRAFT (Münster) analysed utterances of complaint with respect to emotion and politeness.

The third part of the workshop was devoted to emotional principles, ie to cognitive means and to the issue of how emotions influence the sequence of dialogue without being explicitly expressed. Sara CIGADA (Milano) dealt with the topic of emotional strategies in political discourse, Elda WEIZMAN (Ramat Gan) and Tamara SOVRAN (Tel Aviv) interpreted emotions in literary dialogue, and Christian PLANTIN (Lyon) addressed the 'Strategic use of emotion in argumentation'. Questions of the relationship between emotions, language and the body were the topic of Varda DASCAL's (Tel Aviv) and Michael WALROD's (Langley/Canada) presentations, Varda Dascal starting from a psychotherapeutic point of view and Michael Walrod highlighting the difference be-

tween European and non-European cultures. Finally, the papers by Jörn BOLLOW (Münster) and Marina BONDI (Modena) aimed at emotional strategies in media dialogues.

At the end of the workshop there was a final Round Table Discussion of more than two hours which clearly showed the engagement of the participants and also indicated the direction of progress made in the days of the workshop. The discussion was structured by key questions introduced by Edda Weigand which mainly aimed at elaborating what the participants had expected and what was achieved, on the one hand, and at pointing out future perspectives, on the other. In a vivid exchange of opinions, many proposals and evaluations were brought forward. In general, the position of addressing the complex and of describing it by means of an open model such as the model of the Dialogic Action Game was approved and accepted. Much interest was shown for continuing work on this integrative line as well as on the line of comparing different languages and cultures and thus of profiling European identity. Proposals were made to jointly use the model of the Dialogic Action Game and to apply it either to the same type of action game in different languages and cultures or to different complex action games such as business communication, legal argumentation and media dialogues and to elaborate the important role of emotions in these types of dialogic interaction. Other proposals were directed at lexical comparative research on words-in-use. Compiling databases was considered as an essential prerequisite for future work. The various proposals can be summarized along two guidelines: the integrative line of the complex which goes beyond patterns and the comparative line which refers to different languages and cultures.

3. Assessment of the results, contribution to the future direction of the field

The workshop had a clear theoretical conception which was considered to be a tentative basis for addressing the topic 'Emotions in dialogic interaction'. This tentative basis has become strongly confirmed and deepened in its fundamental assumptions. The results can be indicated as follows:

"To deal with complex phenomena of performance such as emotions or human behaviour in general it is necessary to start from an understanding of the object and to derive a methodology which is able to address the complex.

"The Model of the Dialogic Action Game has proved to be an appro-

priate model for such an advance in the complex (e.g. WEIGAND 2000, 2002). It is an open model, based on principles of probability and thus conforms with the new paradigm of theorizing emerging in different disciplines, not only in the Humanities. It is a paradigm which has the capacity of mediation between order and disorder and of adaptation at ever-changing surroundings. Human beings in this sense are complex adaptative systems, to use an expression by GELL-MANN (1994).

"It is an essential element in the new paradigm that human abilities such as emotion, cognition, language, perception, are integrated abilities. Integration of human abilities corresponds to recent neurological findings, for instance, by DAMASIO (2000).

"Emotions are verbally expressed in the utterance by words-in-use or phrases as well as by grammatical categories and the whole utterance. On the one hand, the papers confirmed that corpus-linguistic techniques are needed to verify assumed conventions. On the other hand, it is necessary to compare different languages and cultures insofar as the peculiarities of our mother language become evident only in comparison with other languages. The Model of the Dialogic Action Game was considered an adequate theoretical basis insofar as it offers a pragmatic, action-oriented approach and integratively comprehends all components, among them verbal means.

"Emotional principles, i.e. cognitive means, influence the dialogic sequence. As the papers demonstrated these principles are strongly culturally dependent. A European way of dealing with emotions emerges, for instance, following a principle of 'Hide your emotions in public' which to some extent is in contrast, for instance, to a presumed American attitude of displaying the private in the public. However, more detailed studies are needed to differentiate and to verify the results.

"The issue of Europeanness or of European identity was an always present issue. Again the starting assumption has been confirmed, namely that Europeanness is characterized by internal cultural diversity and that some sort of unity becomes evident only from outside, for instance, from the culture of the Ga'dang people as demonstrated in the paper by Walrod. The general view of European identity as emerging from diversity could gain more concrete profile. European identity however is only partly grasped by a view looking at existing attitudes and features. As a great step forward it was recognized that European identity still has to be created, not only politically but also by decisions in other areas, in the area of European law or European management. As a result of the discus-

sions it was mostly considered necessary to create and develop a joint European interest. The importance of interests which underly all human behaviour is a crucial feature of the Model of the Dialogic Action Game. They should be highlighted as point of orientation for future research on human behaviour.

References

DAMASIO, A. (2000). *The Feeling of What Happens. Body, emotion and the making of consciousness*, London: Vintage.

GELL-MANN, M. (1994). *The Quark and the Jaguar. Adventures in the simple and the complex*. London: Abacus.

WEIGAND, E. (2000). The Dialogic Action Game. In: COULTHARD, M.; COTTERILL, J. & ROCK, F. (eds.). *Dialogue Analysis VII. Working with Dialogue, Selected papers from the 7th IADA conference, Birmingham 1999*, 1-18. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

WEIGAND, E. (2002). The Language Myth and Linguistics Humanised. In: HARRIS, R. (ed.) *The Language Myth in Western Culture*, 55-83. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon.

