

BERKELEY
LANGUAGE
CENTER
NEWSLETTER

PUBLISHED BY
Berkeley Language Center
B-40 Dwinelle Hall #2640
University of California, Berkeley
Berkeley, CA 94720-2640
Phone 510.642.0767
Fax 510.642.9183
http://blc.berkeley.edu

EDITOR
Victoria Williams
510.642.0767 x 19
victoria@socrates.berkeley.edu

GRAPHIC DESIGNER
Orlando Garcia
space@uclink4.berkeley.edu

BERKELEY
LANGUAGE CENTER

Claire Kramtsch
Director
510.643.5136

Mark Kaiser
Associate Director
510.642.7221

SERVICES
510.642.0767
Administrative Services x 10
Classroom Services x 19
Duplication Services x 29
Library Services x 24
Recording Studio x 12
Technical Services x 14

IN THIS ISSUE

| | |
|---|----|
| Reality Programming | 1 |
| Notes from the Director | 3 |
| Notes from the Associate Director | 4 |
| Teaching Japanese | 5 |
| BLC Outreach | 7 |
| BLC Fellows' Reports | 8 |
| Lecturer Reports | 11 |
| Announcements | 11 |
| Calendar | 15 |

LANGUAGE TEACHING
AT BERKELEY

VOLUME NO. 18 ISSUE NO. 1 FALL 2002

In the entertainment industry, reality TV is the name of the game. Now I must admit that I have yet to watch any of it, but a post-dinner talk about an academic testing procedure seemed to need a contemporary cultural context. Just as with TV programming, the Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) generates love/hate relationships with its format and with its production. But, fundamentally, the Oral Proficiency Interview is a reality check. Its format and the spoken language sample elicited, observed, and analyzed reveals what individuals can do in a language, what interactive tasks they can carry out, how they express themselves on concrete and abstract topics, and where the language learned fails to support the concepts they wish to express. The OPI does not indicate what students have been taught, what they have studied—it does demonstrate the oral language available to them in the immediate time frame of the interview itself. Indeed, it is not the Web cam following them around 24/7—it is rather the snapshot, the video clip outsiders are able to observe. It does parallel reality in ways that rehearsed and practiced performances may not.

The OPI, long a measurement tool in government circles, first attracted the interest of academics in the mid-eighties as several currents came together. At that time more students engaged in the study of languages for purposes in addition to or for reasons other than traditional literary purposes; their reasons were pragmatic and their goals were to use the language for study and work in target-language countries or communities at home. Second language acquisition was becoming an active field of research; the much-touted globalization moved from being an economic abstraction to a reality. International travel for students became increasingly available and, more importantly, affordable; students in language classrooms ceased to ask, “Why should

I study French or German or Spanish? I’ll never go there!” Furthermore, technology was invading our classrooms with film, video, and television to the degree where students heard voices other than their teachers’—and even those students most interested in literary pursuits still wanted to be able to converse on ordinary topics. They did not see it as an either/or choice: They wanted it all.

Survivor: On TV and in the OPI

The initial hype on the TV program, *Survivor*, has dissipated a bit; however, *Survivor Africa*, *Australia*, and the upcoming *Marquesas* continue to attract audiences who, at least, learn to locate some places on a map and identify the particular horrors or challenges of a particular region. In the academy, objections over “survivor” level lan-

guage, as supposedly perpetuated by the OPI, was seen as denigrating to the cultural and literary goals of programs. The initial reaction may have been because of the clash of rating results with expectations.

As teachers heard student performances on the OPI, they experienced a rude awakening: their awareness of the eight tenses they had taught, drilled, and tested students on were converted to student speech in something that can only be characterized as a “timeless present.”

Students, too, felt the conflict much to their chagrin. Armed with good grades and a solid reading list, they went overseas only to discover they felt like verbal infants at dinner tables and with native speakers. They felt cheated, incomplete, under-prepared. No test, no measure had ever matched their learning to their communicative needs. A disconnect had occurred between classroom and experiences abroad. Students anticipated that their sojourn would be one in which they would gain proficiency in communicating; they had not realized that they would be in a situation where linguistic survival was a daily

REALITY PROGRAMMING:
SURVIVOR, BIG BROTHER,
AND THE OPI

by Professor June K. Phillips, Dean of the College of Arts and Humanities, Weber State University, Utah

occurrence. I was one of those students in the 60s: I could do an *explication de texte* on the *Chanson de Roland* but had great difficulty holding my own at the dinner table with the very empathetic family with whom I was living. I didn't know why I couldn't transfer my literary knowledge into more mundane contexts and this lack of correspondence frustrated me.

What was perhaps understandable in the 60s is not tolerable in the 21st century. Students today, who study language from high school through university, rightfully expect to be able to interact with native speakers on a variety of topics and they expect to do more than survive linguistically (not with gestures), to narrate, describe, and eventually to hypothesize and discuss within cultural norms issues and ideas. Therein lies our challenge as faculty.

The OPI continues to generate controversy—even fears—in some quarters. Those fears are linked to the question posed at the end of each episode of *Survivor*: “Who gets voted off the island”? For language learners, that depends on the goals. For those who want to be teachers, the minimal standard will not be the Intermediate proficiency level of survival, but the Advanced level (Intermediate high in languages requiring more time for English speakers). If one cannot narrate; describe in past, present, and future time; deal with complications, explanations, elaborations, and clarifications at a sustained level of discourse that is culturally appropriate, then that student is figuratively voted out of the teaching space.

Big Brother in TV and the OPI

At the outset, the fact that the OPI had its roots in government agencies such as foreign service, defense, and intelligence, provoked negative reactions among many faculty members. Some rejected it solely because of that perceived taint. It reeked of Big Brother. It was an outside intruder into the sacrosanct classroom where a test of student performance was being designed and administered by someone other than the professor. As both the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) and the Educational Testing Service

(ETS) worked to make the assessment more relevant to students in the academic learning sequence by expanding the lower stages and by experimenting with topics more amenable to the range of student ages and interests, it began to be accepted by faculty in many places as the tool that they had lacked for measuring what had become an important classroom goal, oral communication.

In today's academy, external assessment has become a reality, especially for those in public systems where university-wide outcomes assessment is increasingly mandated by governing boards. Many programs around the nation have used proficiency assessment as a guide for their placement, for their requirements, and for assessing outcomes for majors. Without external pressure many institutions still find great value in measuring student progress and proficiency against a scale and an elicitation technique that is accepted beyond their classroom and that has reduced—if not eliminated—subjectivity and idiosyncratic measurement. At the same time and for most purposes, whether a faculty adopts the OPI as part of its assessment program lies primarily with that body. The majority of institutions trust their departments to design

The OPI is only one tool, albeit a very useful one, for focusing on speaking...

outcome measurements that align with their goals and missions.

So the trick to Big Brother isn't whether he is out there watching or not, but what purpose might he serve. There is one set of students for whom OPIs or appropriate equivalent tests will be mandatory and that group comprises future teachers. It has long been the attitude in less-enlightened departments that somehow foreign language education majors are of a lesser status, although that perception has diminished over recent years. The new *Standards for the Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers* (in press) that will be submitted to the National Association for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) in October 2002 will require that programs graduate students with an Advanced Low speaking proficiency (Intermediate High for languages that require longer periods

for English speakers). The draft of these standards was released in October 2001 and has been posted on the ACTFL Web site for feedback. These standards require evidence of disciplinary knowledge, skills, and dispositions to a greater degree than ever before. The reality check here is that teachers who cannot speak at the advanced level cannot possibly teach toward the national standards for foreign language learning as outlined in *Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century* (1999). As states embrace earlier starts for language teaching and promote longer sequences, teachers need, minimally, the flexibility that comes with advanced level proficiency. Of all the feedback on the NCATE draft, the concern that we hear surrounds this single requirement. Universities and colleges who prepare teachers will need to engage in the kinds of curricular discussion conducted by Byrnes (1998) that challenges faculty to attend to development of advanced level language proficiencies in upper division courses.

Reality Programming for Foreign Language Educators

In the mid-to-late 1980s, the initial results of OPI testing of students in our classrooms gave us a harsh dose of reality. Many faculty were shocked to see how unexpectedly low on the proficiency scale their students rated and the dissonance between those ratings and what had been taught and supposedly learned. Performance in the classroom frequently failed to translate to communicative tasks as anticipated; the interview was blamed for inadequacies in measuring communication appropriately. As time went on, it became apparent that what the interview really illustrated was the “what is taught does not equal what is learned does not equal what is internalized” formula. Informal classroom observations and ethnographies alike identified that even in advanced level courses, students rarely spoke in sustained discourse—instead they answered questions with a sentence or two. Regardless of the literary reading they might do or the essay writing, their speaking practice resembled a Ping-Pong game of question and answer rather than interactive discussion.

NOTES FROM THE DIRECTOR

by Claire Kramtsch

Dear Fellow Language Teachers:

Welcome back to the new academic year at UC Berkeley! I hope your classes started on a good footing and that the word is spreading among undergraduate students that knowledge of one or several foreign languages is a desirable asset these days.

The BLC has once again received support from the College of Letters and Science and from International and Area Studies (IAS) to continue to serve the language learning community on campus. After a most congenial retreat for language program coordinators last May, your coordinators come back energized and full of ideas. We welcome our new BLC Academic Coordinator and Arabic lecturer, Sonia S'hiri, who will be organizing regular meetings with the coordinators over the year. She will also coordinate next spring a special conference on "Language and Identity in the Arab World" that I hope many of you will be interested in attending.

We will hold this term an informal, social meeting for all lecturers to exchange views and discuss ways in which we can better keep in touch with one another. Look out for an upcoming invitation!

We will continue to honor requests for travel monies for UC Berkeley lecturers. Lecturers teaching any of the critical and less commonly taught languages can look forward to special scholarships from IAS for their professional and technological development. Stay tuned!

You may wish to think already of a project you would like to engage in as a fellow of the BLC next year (see p. 14). The deadline for submission of proposals is March 1. Feel free to approach Mark Kaiser or me to discuss your ideas, however outlandish they might seem.

After a most successful workshop on the teaching of heritage languages at UCLA last June and an equally successful series of ACTFL OPI workshops last July

(see p. 11), the links between the BLC and the UC Consortium for Language Learning and Teaching (UCCLLT) are stronger than ever. I hope you won't miss the November 1 deadline for submission of project proposals to the UCCLLT (see p. 12). We have some exciting guest speakers lined up this term (see p. 15). Don't miss this opportunity to meet fellow language teachers and to get ideas for your professional and intellectual development. Best wishes for the fall term.

Reality Programming cont

In fact, a great deal of research in second-language acquisition—and especially in the smaller area of foreign language classroom learning—has focused heavily on beginning/intermediate levels of instruction. At last we are seeing efforts to focus on the higher levels of proficiency, and one can only anticipate that results will help us find effective ways for students to cross the barrier into Advanced with the assistance of faculty-created courses, instructional approaches, and experimentation. It is time to go beyond commiserating that students can only reach advanced level with maturity, sustained time abroad, and other excuses for being content with a lesser standard. The OPI is only one tool, albeit a very useful one, for focusing on speaking; the larger goal is to merge issues of proficiency and issues of content in ways that enable students to exit undergraduate programs fully formed. The reality is that to be an advanced speaker one must exit the world of "I" and "my."

Advanced speakers are able to tell stories that engage listeners. They most probably learn to do that by reading and listening to narratives in the press, in the cyberspace world in which they engage, in literary texts, in film. Students reaching toward this level are ready for challenging content in the arts, humanities, and sciences. As faculty, regardless of specialty, we must join together to provide them with constant opportunities to use language creatively and to stretch into the less known. We have to require that students, as speakers of the language engage in higher level purposeful tasks of narration, description, hypothesis, analysis, synthesis, argumentation—all the functions that we value in upper division and graduate classes. Achieving these outcomes will not happen by osmosis or chance or exposure. The barrier between those who teach language and those who teach literature has to come down for the sake of students who want and who deserve to achieve in both domains.

References

- Byrnes, H. *Learning foreign and second languages*. New York: MLA, 1998.
- National Standards for Foreign Language Education Project. *Standards for foreign language learning in the 21st century*. Lawrence, KS: Allen Press, 1999.
- Standards Collaborative on Foreign Languages. *ACTFL standards for the preparation of foreign language teachers*. Web version at www.actfl.org. In press.

NOTES FROM THE ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR

by Mark Kaiser

On behalf of the entire BLC staff, I welcome you back to campus for the 2002-2003 academic year. I'm pleased to announce that this fall the BLC will be hosting a very exciting lecture series (see Calendar) and that a new computer lab and technology training for lecturers will be coming online.

New Computer Lab

This summer Information Systems and Technology (IS&T) transferred administration of the computer lab in B-21 Dwinelle to the BLC. The first computer lab on campus dedicated to foreign language applications, B-21 was "administered" jointly by Workstation Support Services (WSS) and the BLC, with staff from the Instructional Technology Program (ITP) providing assistance to faculty interested in developing software and using the 21-station Macintosh lab for language instruction. ITP and WSS were particularly helpful to the BLC at a time when the BLC had limited computer expertise.

This summer we installed in B-21 twenty-one new PCs with the latest Windows XP operating system. The choice of computer platform was particularly difficult. On the one hand, we wanted to continue our tradition of supporting both the Macintosh and PC platforms to accommodate all faculty and student interests. However, usage trends, expenses for multilingual sup-

port, and the flexibility of being able to reserve one lab for classroom use and offering a second for drop-in use, dictated the installation of a second PC lab. To accommodate faculty interested in using the Mac for instruction, we are experimenting with a new piece of software that allows emulation of the Mac on a PC. Our limited experience this summer indicates that this software works for applications written for OS 9 and earlier. If this software proves inadequate for faculty and student needs, we will install 10 new Macs later this fall.

B-21 may be reserved for classes by contacting Victoria Williams, manager of Classroom Services. Schedules of reservations are posted outside B-21, on the bulletin board across from B-36, and on the BLC Web site.

Technology Workshops

At press time we are working out the details of a series of technology workshops for foreign language lecturers to be offered this fall. These workshops will cover the basics of computer technology for the creation of computer materials for language learning. Topics to be covered include the following:

- working with images (scanning, basic editing)
- audio and video digitizing and editing

- asynchronous (e-mail, voice-mail) and synchronous (instant messaging, audio chat, Multiple User Dialogues or MUDs) communication
- Web development (individual pages and learning management systems) and working with text (fonts and Optical Character Recognition or OCR programs)

Morever, there will be scholarship funds available for lecturers to attend the workshops. Please watch the *berklangcent* e-mail list for announcements of workshop details and dates and times. If you are not subscribed to *berklangcent*, contact Victoria Williams at victoria@socrates.berkeley.edu or phone 642-0767, ext. 19.

Finally, please join me in welcoming to the BLC Ana Arteaga, our new Office Manager. Ana has been on campus since 1982, most recently as a budget and personnel specialist in the College of Environmental Design.

Teaching Japanese at Berkeley cont

The results at this level are interesting. For Levels 4 and 3, those who studied Japanese in Japan had higher mean scores in all three areas than overseas examinees, but at Level 2, this was not the case: the examinees in Japan had higher scores only in listening. This fact can be interpreted to indicate that, while living and studying in Japan makes a significant difference in listening, it does not guarantee improvement in reading. Although we have not used the highest level, Level 1, with our students, and

the results of Level 1 are not included here, the data indicate that Level 1 also displays the same characteristic. That is, the acquisition of the high intermediate to advanced level of reading competence can be accomplished equally well anywhere. UCB students are strong in all areas; it can be said that the overall competence of our third-level students matches those who have studied Japanese elsewhere for 4 years.

TEACHING JAPANESE AT BERKELEY

by Yoko Hasegawa, Associate Professor
and Japanese Language Coordinator,
Department of East Asian Languages
and Cultures

Currently, the Japanese Language Program offers the following courses (numbers within parentheses indicate unit values):

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| J1A-B (5-5) | Elementary Japanese |
| J1AS-BS (1-1) | Supplementary Work in <i>Kanji</i> |
| J10A-B (5-5) | Intermediate Japanese |
| J10AS-BS (1-1) | Supplementary Work in <i>Kanji</i> -Intermediate |
| J100A-B (5-5) | Advanced Japanese |
| J101-J102 (4-4) | Fourth-Year Japanese |
| J111-J112 (4-4) | Fifth-Year Japanese |

With 7 full-time and 2-3 part-time Lecturers, 2-3 GSIs, and 1 Coordinator, the Program has been providing instruction for approximately 400-500 undergraduate and graduate students from a wide variety of disciplines per semester. Brief descriptions of these courses follow:

First Level: J1A-B

All basic grammatical constructions are taught as early as possible to enable the students to use the language in real situations. This methodology helps students understand the structural organization of the language: they can see the similarities and differences among various grammatical constructions. The classroom instruction is exclusively in Japanese from the very beginning. By the end of this course, students have acquired the skills adequate to perform the following tasks:

- Describe themselves, their family, and friends.
- Talk about daily events, using basic vocabulary and grammatical constructions.
- Understand conversations on those topics and all classroom instructions.
- Read and write all *hiragana* and *katakana* and approximately 300 *kanji*.

- Read and write short, simple compositions.

Second Level: J10A-B

The second-year level aims at the integration of the basic vocabulary and constructions learned at the first level from a communication viewpoint. The textbook is organized according to communicative functions, which dovetails nicely with the structurally organized first-year textbook. Second-year level also introduces more advanced linguistic elements, e.g., additional clause linking devices, collocations, and idiomatic expressions. Vocabulary is expanded to express and comprehend complex thoughts in a manner appropriate for many social situations; an increasing amount of reading and writing is included. Students begin using *kanji* dictionaries and Japanese word processing software, and they do projects using information obtained through the Internet. By the end of this course, students are able to:

- Perform and understand essential communicative functions, e.g., describing, defining, inquiring, answering, requesting, apologizing, complimenting, condoling, etc.
- Express and comprehend a wider range of ideas and more complex thoughts than those of the first-year level.
- Read and write approximately 400 new *kanji* and their compounds.
- Read and write longer, more structured compositions, including authentic documents.
- Write essays using a Japanese word processor and retrieve information written in Japanese on the Internet.

Third Level: J100A-B

Third level aims to develop further communicative skills in speaking, listening, reading, and writing in a manner appropriate to the various contexts, enabling the students to use acquired grammar and vocabulary with greater confidence. Course materials include textbooks for reading newspapers and understand-

ing radio news, supplemented by short stories to provide insight into Japanese culture and society. Projects and oral presentations are incorporated to enable interaction via e-mail and Web-based information retrieval activities with students at Japanese universities. Students acquire adequate skills to:

- Perform and understand essential communicative functions in different registers (casual, semi-formal, formal).
- Express and comprehend a wider range of ideas and more complex thoughts than the second level.
- Read and write approximately 400 new *kanji* and their compounds, bringing their command to an approximate total of 1100.
- Read newspapers and other authentic materials.
- Write expository prose.
- Communicate via e-mail in Japanese.

Fourth Level: J101-102

Fourth level aims to develop further linguistic skills so that students can utilize Japanese newspapers, magazines, and other media to gather information and write short research papers. Although much class time is devoted to reading-oriented activities, students also participate in listening exercises and related discussions. Audio-visual materials are used to enhance the understanding of their readings. Students will be able to perform the following:

- Discuss and debate complex issues; comprehend college-level lecture styles.
- Read and write approximately 300 new *kanji* and their compounds.
- Read, analyze, and translate authentic materials.
- Take notes during mock lectures.
- Write a short research paper.
- Use databases, online dictionaries, and search engines on the Internet.

Fifth Level: J111-112

This level aims to develop skills that will enable students to utilize Japanese

materials for research and job-related purposes, to present orally the results of their researches, and/or to pursue college-level courses taught in Japanese. With the instructor's guidance, students conduct their own research projects based on in-depth reading of materials drawn from their own areas of specialization and present the results in class. As an option, students can select the preparatory track leading to taking Level 1 of the *Japanese-Language Proficiency Test* (see below).

ASSESSMENT

In order to assess the effectiveness of our curriculum and instruction, in addition to the achievement testing of each course, we have utilized the

Japanese-Language Proficiency Test since 1995. It is considered the most authoritative standardized test of ability to use the Japanese language, administrated jointly by the Japan Foundation and the Association of International Education, Japan. Consisting of 4 levels, the Test measures proficiencies in (1) *kanji*/vocabulary, (2) listening comprehension, and (3) grammar/reading comprehension. Level 4 requires 150 hours of study, Level 3 300 hours, Level 2 600 hours, and Level 1 900 hours. Passing the Test requires the examinee to provide at least 60% of the answers correctly. Persons who wish to enter a graduate school at one of the national universities of Japan must pass Level 1.

The 1992 version of the Test has been used consistently because detailed statistics are available for the test results. Our first-year students (about to complete 150 hours of study) have taken Level 4; second-year students (300 hours) have taken Level 3, and third-year students (450 hours) have taken Level 2. The UCB mean scores are compared with the means of the total examinees who actually took the Test in 1992 and the subset of the examinees who took the same Test in Japan. The latter subgroup had presumably studied Japanese in Japan for some period of time.

continues below

LEVEL 4: J1A-B

| | <i>Kanji</i> Vocabulary | Listening | Grammar/ Reading | Total | Passing Rate |
|--|----------------------------|-----------|---------------------|--------|--------------|
| 10,873 examinees who took the Test in 1992 | 67.3 % | 60.2 % | 61.3 % | 62.5 % | 56.4% |
| 731 examinees who took the Test in Japan | 74.8 % | 80.3 % | 71.9 % | 74.8 % | 83.0 % |
| UCB Students | 79.3 % | 73.7 % | 71.3 % | 73.5 % | 84.6 % |

In general, our first-year students are strong in all three areas. Our average passing rate (84.67%) is higher than the total passing rate (56.4%) and the passing rate of those who took the test in Japan (83.0%). This is a good piece of evidence that the efficiency of our first level is higher than the average overseas training. The UCB students' high mean score of the *kanji*/vocabulary section (79.3%) reflects our strong *kanji* training. Our students' listening average (73.7%) is also notable. Those who live in Japan are naturally exposed to Japanese constantly and therefore have tremendous advantages in listening comprehension. Although our listening mean does not match the mean of the examinees in Japan (80.3%), it is impressively higher than the overall average (60.2%). We believe this is due to our constant and exclusive use of Japanese in classroom instruction.

LEVEL 3: J10A-B

| | <i>Kanji</i> Vocabulary | Listening | Grammar/ Reading | Total | Passing Rate |
|--|----------------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------|--------------|
| 13,750 examinees who took the Test in 1992 | 64.8% | 59.7% | 62.4% | 62.3% | 56.4% |
| 4,479 examinees who took the Test in Japan | 63.5% | 69.5% | 59.1% | 62.8% | 58.8% |
| UCB Students | 66.9% | 72.6% | 64.6% | 68.7% | 70.5% |

Our mean passing rate of level 3 is 86.2%, whereas the total passing rate is 69.3% and the passing rate of the examinees in Japan is 88.2%. The UCB students have performed very well at this level in *kanji*/vocabulary and listening.

LEVEL 2: J100A-B

This test requires 600 hours of study; it is used for our third-year students, who have completed only 450 (=150x3) hours if they have not studied Japanese elsewhere.

| | <i>Kanji</i> Vocabulary | Listening | Grammar/ Reading | Total | Passing Rate |
|--|----------------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------|--------------|
| 12,194 examinees who took the Test in 1992 | 70.3% | 59.2% | 71.3% | 68.0% | 69.3% |
| 2,244 examinees who took the Test in Japan | 74.8% | 79.4% | 76.6% | 76.8% | 88.2% |
| UCB Students | 77.9% | 70.4% | 73.7% | 73.1% | 86.2% |

cont pg 4

Spring semester proved to be very exciting in terms of BLC language activities and events. The two-day colloquium on the Oral Proficiency Interview, which had originally been scheduled for fall and then delayed due to the terrible tragedy of September 11, did take place in February. Chantal Thompson (Brigham Young University), who is a leading figure in the OPI, gave the introductory presentation initiating us into the theoretical underpinnings of the OPI and its interviewing techniques. In the afternoon the audience broke into small groups in order to observe live OPIs given in a variety of languages, including English, French, Spanish, Italian, and Russian. In the evening June Phillips (Weber State University), who has been instrumental in the creation of the Foreign Language Standards, gave an inspiring keynote address on the OPI and its relation to the language teaching profession—our front page article. The next day, she presented on the relationship between the OPI and the Foreign Language Standards. Ben Rifkin (University of Wisconsin, Madison) discussed the practical implications of the OPI for curriculum development and teaching practices on a daily basis. Ray Clifford (Defense Language Institute, Monterey) situated the OPI within the context of language testing issues. Raphael Salaberry (Rice University) presented us with some perspective as to the validity of the OPI, calling into question some of the theoretical assumptions of the oral proficiency interview. Some of the key issues he raised included the extent to which the OPI parallels authentic conversation and whether the OPI is a valid instrument for all types of speakers. Leo van Lier also provided us with additional perspective as to the limits of the OPI by suggesting that more encompassing types of oral testing would supply a more complete portrait of speaker competencies. In short, the BLC Colloquium on the Oral Proficiency Interview more than fulfilled the dual goals of introducing the language professionals on the Berkeley campus and at other institutions in the Bay Area

to the OPI and of initiating an intellectual dialogue regarding this important assessment vehicle. Mark Kaiser and I were particularly gratified to see that our hard work on the colloquium more than met our expectations.

The scheduling of the OPI colloquium worked well with other events on the Berkeley campus. The UC campus-wide Association of South and Southeast Languages also held its meeting shortly thereafter and offered as one of its topics the OPI and its relation to the issues its teachers face. I was particularly flattered to have been invited to do a general presentation on the OPI for the group. The February colloquium also served as an introduction to the OPI Workshop sponsored by the American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages, which was held on the Berkeley campus this last July.

One of the most gratifying aspects of the Academic Coordinator position is working with the BLC fellows. This last semester Chantelle Warner, David Pettersen, and David Wacks all had very interesting projects. Chantelle set up a study to determine the efficacy of synchronous computer “chat” within the context of the German classroom. Students in her study used the MOO to interact with each other via the computer, transferring classroom face-to-face role play and communicative activities to the computer format. She gathered lots of interesting data in her “chat” transcripts; and it was interesting for all of us to engage in the analysis of students’ online discussions. Some of the questions she raised involved the efficacy of “chat,” the psychology of this relatively new mode of communication, and whether it advanced student learning or was simply a fun change of pace. David Wack’s project also involved technology. He set about to evaluate the various types of language learning software available. His work inevitably led him to question the pedagogical goals of the products currently on the market and to explore the limits of the various programs. David Pettersen, who had studied with Stephen

Krashen while an undergraduate at USC, took his cue from Professor Krashen and began the initial work on a larger project examining the effects of both intensive and extensive reading on the literacy development of second-semester French students. During this spring semester, Dave selected the texts he will be using in his study, which will be implemented in the fall semester 2002, and developed the pedagogical apparatus that would accompany the texts. During our meetings, we also discussed the implementation of the extensive reading portion of the study. Of great concern was the evaluation portion of the study; and after much work in this area, David has developed some very interesting written assessment mechanisms for evaluating the effects of reading on language acquisition.

My own project as Academic Coordinator of setting up regular monthly professional meetings for all language coordinators at Berkeley continued this semester. Certainly the group served as the impetus for much that has been accomplished in the BLC, most particularly the OPI Colloquium. This semester we continued our discussion of assessment in light of what we learned in the colloquium and in terms of Dean Hexter’s request from language departments for assessment procedures in relation to Title VI funding. Over the semester, we also discussed a number of other topics. We continued our discussion of the teaching of foreign language writing; and we discussed the work of Kress and Van Leeuwen on visual semiotics and its relation to the teaching of foreign language. By far the highlight of the semester was the language coordinators’ retreat sponsored by the BLC. Claire Kramsch, Mark Kaiser, and I worked hard this semester in setting up the retreat, which took place over two days at the White Sulphur Springs Resort in the Napa Valley. Although it proved to be a relaxing event with a wonderful dinner in St. Helena and a fabulous picnic the next day at V. Sattui, we had also a very ambitious agenda. We discussed classroom-based research,

BLC FELLOWS' REPORTS

Extensive Reading in Beginning Foreign Language Curricula

by David Pettersen,
Ph.D. Candidate, Department of French

How do we learn to read in a foreign language? My research this semester as a BLC fellow has attempted to look at different ways reading and second language acquisition (SLA) theorists have answered this question over the years. From this research, I have developed a modified French 2 class that will hopefully help students become more comfortable and fluent readers in French and prepare them to read more serious literature in intermediate French and upper-division literature courses.

Stephen Krashen offers a deceptively simple answer to the question "How do we learn to read?" He proposes that we learn to read by reading. But not by just any kind of reading. He says that we learn to read by reading for pleasure and by doing lots of it. In SLA theory, this kind of reading is called extensive reading. Extensive reading refers to the kind of reading students do when they select the texts they want to read based on their own interests; when these texts do not exceed the students' capacity to understand the foreign language; and when the purposes of reading are for pleasure or general understanding, not to dissect the texts' lexical, syntactic, and discourse features.

Not surprisingly, extensive reading finds its strongest theoretical articulation in Krashen's Input Hypothesis. If, as Krashen suggests, we learn languages through acquisition, where this term means the subconscious "picking up" of language in relaxed environments filled with comprehensible language input, rather than through learning, where this term means the conscious study and memorization of grammar rules and vocabulary, then extensive reading becomes simply a way to provide large amounts of comprehensible, authentic language input in a low stress environment. Krashen and Terrel themselves

suggest in 1983 that "comprehensible input gained in reading...may contribute to a general language competence that underlies both spoken and written performance." By integrating extensive reading activities of appropriate difficulty into the beginning foreign language classroom, we can expect to see improvements not only in students' global, macro-reading skills but also in their motivation and attitude towards reading and in their writing skills.

The beginning French curriculum already includes two small extensive reading activities. Twice over the course of the semester, students choose a short text to read and write an essay reflecting on their experience of reading in French. In the modified version of French 2 I developed during my fellowship, I plan to expand and enhance the current extensive reading components. In the modified class, students will read significantly more—about four to five books of fiction (250 pages). Students will choose the books they want to read from a fairly large selection of children's and adolescent literature, graphic novels, short stories, fairy tales, mythology, etc. that are appropriate to their individual reading level. They will keep a reading journal in which they summarize what they have read, try to predict how they story will develop, and reflect on their own experience reading the book (their successes, their difficulties, how they make sense of words they do not know, etc.). The modified class will also include a few specific reading activities to help teach them how to read for global meaning without feeling required to look up every third word.

Finally, I used the end of my time as a BLC fellow to develop a study that will assess this modified French 2 curriculum's effectiveness when it is piloted in a few of our French 2 classes this fall. It will test students' global reading skills, writing skills, and their motivation and attitude towards reading. I look forward to reporting back on the results of this study.

References

Works Cited and Good Places to Start Reading

Day, Richard and Julian Bamford. *Extensive Reading in the Second Language Classroom*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Kern, Rick. *Literacy and Language Teaching*. London: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Krashen, Stephen and Tracy Terrell. *The natural approach: Language acquisition the classroom*. Hayward, CA: Alemany Press, 1983.

Krashen, Stephen. *The Power of Reading: Insights from the Research*. Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited, 1993.

Maxim, Hiram H. "A study into the Feasibility and Effects of Reading Extended Authentic Discourse in the Beginning German Language Classroom." *Modern Language Journal*, 86, 20-35, 2002.



Language Learning Software and Virtual Environments: The State of the Question

by David A. Wacks,
Ph.D. Candidate, Department of
Spanish and Portuguese

What good is it?

There is a lot of "language learning software" available out there. Much of it is designed for the general consumer, ostensibly a professional who wishes to brush up on their high school Spanish before going off to a business meeting or vacation in Latin America. Other products are intended for use in a formal instructional setting. Software publishers make all sorts of claims as to the efficacy of their product, but rarely attempt to ground these claims in second language acquisition theory or pedagogical methodology. Often, the pedagogical orientation of the software—by design or otherwise—is loosely based on long-outmoded approaches to language teaching. In this project I set out to explore some of the technological and theoretical problems involved in designing and using language learning software, and examined four different titles (two Spanish, one French,

and one ESL) in light of their pedagogical underpinning.

What is "interaction?"

When computer professionals speak of "interactivity," they mean it in a metaphorical sense; not a literal face-to-face conversation, but an ongoing exchange of interdependent actions (as opposed to the utterance-units of a conversation) between two actors (usually a program and a user). That is, the user clicks the mouse and the program reacts in a way causally related to the user's action. In turn, the user then acts upon the program in a way directly resulting from the program's prior communication to the user, and so on. The program and user are engaged in a metaphorical conversation, and this is interaction—to a programmer.

Elsewhere, second language acquisition theorists have spilled a great amount of ink on the subject of interaction. This means face-to-face, conversational interaction between two people who share knowledge of the same language. These varying definitions of the concept of "interaction" have led to a misunderstanding between producers of language learning software and language learning professionals. Many of these products claim to be "interactive." This is problematic, because the technology upon which such software relies (primarily voice recognition and natural language processing) has not yet enabled a computer to truly interact conversationally with a human in a way that satisfies most language professionals. So, we often see such software as pedagogically challenged, or even just plain bad.

So, what can it do?

Clearly, the software cannot replace human-to-human conversational interaction. No one would suggest that a computer is a substitute conversation partner. So for now at least, our jobs are safe. What language learning software can provide is an unprecedented level of control over input—several types of input delivered simultaneously: video, audio, graphics, and text. Digital media are easily manipulated to finely tune any aspect of input: level, focus on particulars of structure or content, narrative, pace, repetition, user-dependent delivery, etc. The competitive advantage of digital

media over its analog peers is its "interactivity" (programmers' definition). This quality engages the language learner and can be proven to promote acquisition in different ways, depending on how input is delivered.

What next?

One of the most effective ways of engaging a language learner is through interactive narrative—the learner becomes a character in a narrative that is shaped by her actions and decisions. This approach has been hugely successful in the commercial computer gaming industry: gamers have bought millions of copies of graphical and digital video adventure games. Perhaps owing to high development costs, applications of interactive narrative software for language learning have been few and far between. The most innovative product along these lines to date—*A la rencontre de Philippe*—was developed for Macintosh floppy disk and laser disk player. The fate of the laser disk soon rendered the title inaccessible, but it is now being reissued on CD-ROM through Yale University Press. The increasing accessibility to non-professionals of digital video and object-oriented programming environments may help to make the development of such titles for language learning more feasible.

Can we co-opt the X-Box? Should we?

Another option for future developers of such software could be the operationalization of Asher's Total Physical Response method in virtual environments common to interactive narrative. Recent findings in neuropsychology suggest that virtual performance of motor activity (moving one's digital self and manipulating digital objects) drives second language acquisition as do the real-world motor actions characteristic of Asher's method.

Perhaps language professionals can yet cash in on their students' digital savoir-faire: language learning software is still in its infancy. We should encourage developers to undertake innovative projects grounded in second language acquisition theory and method. We should expect new and interesting opportunities for language teaching and learning—ones that supplement classroom instruction. We should walk the line,

grain of salt in hand, between neo-Ludite cynicism and blind techno-faith.



Computer-Mediated "Chatting": The Design and Implementation of Network-Based Activities in the German Classroom

by *Chantelle Warner,*
Ph.D. Candidate,
Department of German

With the emphasis in current second language pedagogy on communicative approaches, it is hardly surprising that many researchers would turn to computer-mediated interaction as a possible means of promoting conversation and developing the literacy skills needed in the second year. Computer Mediated Communication (CMC) is said to increase motivation and decrease anxiety, to foster a sense of community and encourage the social production of knowledge. (Beauvois 1997; Kern 1995, 2000; von der Emde et al. 2001; Warschauer 1996, 1997, 1999). It has also been claimed that CMC conversations produce longer and more complex responses than face-to-face communication, due to the delayed response time (Beauvois 1997; Pelletieri 2000; Sotillo 2000; Warschauer 1997) and thus can prepare students for the sustained argumentation needed to write coherent essays in the second year. Another potential benefit of the medium is its ability to record accurately in writing a conversation which is similar to oral communication. This allows students to reflect and critically examine their own language production.

The project that I originally proposed to the BLC involved the integration of activities using the MOO, a synchronous CMC medium similar to the chat room, into the German 2 curriculum. I hoped to develop activities which were compatible with the communicative curriculum used in first year German, and which would help students to make the move from a focus on oral production in German 1 to an emphasis on literacy including essay writing in the third semester. The activities which I used were adaptations of those used in a standard communicative curriculum

including role-plays, information gap activities, and debates.

As I began to work with the 2nd semester German students, I was struck by the type of language they were producing. Students were completing the activities and managing to carry on conversations, but a large portion of the language production seemed to be for purposes other than the coherent, rational exchange of meanings that the researchers described. The nature of the discourse tended to be playful and informal, with multiple conversation threads and rapid changes in subject. While SLA researchers and instructors were focusing on the “communicative” potential of CMC, the students seemed to want to “chat.” This led me to question my original project. Was the problem that the MOO was not suited to the exchange of ideas and negotiation of meaning implied by the communicative approaches to language teaching, or do these approaches leave out important aspects of ‘real’ language production, which are more than just communicative?

In order to address these questions, I drew on the language play model of communication, which Guy Cook discusses in his book *Language Play, Language Learning* (2000). Whereas the traditional model of communication views language production as the linguistic realization of pre-existing thought (i.e., a pragmatic intention or a piece of information), the language play model shows that form (e.g., the sound, the look, associations with other words) can generate thought. Because the students were generating meaning on-line, their language production was heavily influenced not only by the written look of the word, but also by their conceptions of the medium and the nature of the discourse community.

Cook cites three main categories of language play, which can help to explain the types of language production occurring in the MOO. The first of these categories, linguistic play, includes play with rhythm and sound, repetition and rhyming. In my data, there was much evidence of linguistic play when the students were making creative uses of the language such as writing raps, songs or product slogans. These types of activity

encourage clever word plays and attention to form.

The second, semantic play, often includes references to an alternate reality found in role-playing and inversions of the language/reality relation. For example, students substituted emotes—narrative descriptions of actions—for physical presence in textual environments. This not only allowed students to convey actions, but also to comment on them as in the following example:

Dragon jumps and laughs.

Bies jumps and laughs too.

Sprachmeister jumps and laughs better than you.

The students engaged in another type of semantic play, identity play, due to their ability to change their own names in the MOO and conceal their identities. A student could change her name on the screen at will and others were unable to associate that name with a previous speaker or with a face in the class, which created an environment where students felt they could “say whatever they wanted.” This aspect of the MOO created as much discomfort as it did amusement; the reduction of social context clues, may allow some students to feel less inhibited, but it removes one of the most crucial elements of successful communication. Students also played with the MOO’s potential as an alternate reality by taking on roles suggested by the descriptions of the rooms or the activities at hand.

Cook’s third category of language play, pragmatic play, focuses on the performance of the speaker and is often employed to either create solidarity or antagonism. These seemingly opposite goals may even be achieved with the same utterance in a type of linguistic exchange dubbed verbal dueling, which the students used extensively. Students often latched on to specific derogatory words as insults of choice emptying them of their pragmatic force in German. Thus, for example, scathing words became terms of gentle teasing. Recognition and use of the word was a sign of being “in” on the joke.

Based on the results of my project, I feel that further research must be conducted within SLA to determine the role of language play in language learning and how other models might help us to incorpo-

rate authentic uses of language that go beyond simple information exchanges. As technology progresses and CMC gains a stronger foothold in second language pedagogy, we must consider carefully what we are trying to teach using media such as the MOO. It is no longer satisfactory to treat these media as neutral tools for teaching something vague called communication.

References

- Beauvois, M. H. “Computer-Mediated Communication: Technology for Improving Speaking and Writing.” *Technology Enhanced Language Learning*. M. Bush, ed. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company, 165-184, 1972.
- Cook, G. *Language Play, Language Learning*. Oxford/New York: Oxford UP, 2000.
- Kern, R. “Restructuring Classroom Interaction with Networked Computers: Effects on Quantity and Characteristics of Language Production.” *Modern Language Journal*, 79, iv, 457-476, 1995.
- Pelletieri, J. “Negotiation in Cyberspace.” *Network-based Language Teaching: Concepts and Practice*. M. Warschauer and R. Kern, eds. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000.
- Sotillo, S. “Discourse Functions and Syntactic Complexity in Synchronous Communication.” *Language Learning and Technology*, Vol. 4, No. 1, 82-119, 2000.
- Von der Emde, S., J. Schneider and M. Kötter. “Technically Speaking: Transforming Language Learning through Virtual Learning Environments (MOOs).” *Modern Language Journal*, 85, ii, 210-225, 2001.
- Warschauer, M. “Computer-Mediated Collaborative Learning: Theory and Practice.” *Modern Language Journal*, 81, iv, 470-481, 1997.
- Warschauer, M. *Electronic Literacies: Language, Culture and Power in Online Education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1999.
- Warschauer, M. “Motivational Aspects of Using Computers for Writing and Communication.” *Telecollaboration in Foreign Language Learning. Proceedings of the Hawai'i Symposium*. Mark Warschauer, ed. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1996.

LECTURER REPORTS

The Oral Proficiency Interview Workshop at Berkeley

*by Agnes Dimitriou, Lecturer,
Department of Spanish and Portuguese*

From July 18 -21, 2002, the Berkeley campus hosted the Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) Tester Training Workshop, sponsored by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) and the Department of Spanish and Portuguese. The training workshop was subscribed beyond what was expected, but the campus was able to accommodate all who registered. At the first plenary session participants were welcomed by Mark Kaiser, Associate Director of the Berkeley Language Center and Professor Ignacio Navarrete, Chair of the Department of Spanish and Portuguese.

In all 115 participants in seven language groups—Arabic, Chinese, French, ESL and the Less Commonly Taught Languages, German, Japanese, and Spanish—attended for the four-day period. The sections, eleven in all, were held in Wheeler, and in both the classroom and the office sections of Dwinelle. As could be expected, the participants needed help making their way around Dwinelle, and two students, Ricardo Cisneros and Amanda Leung, of the Berkeley Language Center helped ease the confusion.

All the language programs in the summer were very helpful in finding volunteers to be interviewed for the workshops. Staff, professors, and instructors also volunteered to be interviewed. Agnes Dimitriou, of the Department of Spanish and Portuguese, acted as the site coordinator and with the help of Lynn Purkey, a graduate student in Spanish, worked to find the volunteers. Each language session needed about twenty volunteers so that the participants could really get a sense of conducting an oral proficiency interview.

The language departments at Berkeley, especially East Asian Languages and Cultures, were well represented. At the conclusion of the workshops, participants

from other institutions were pleased with the experience here at Berkeley and felt well received by the campus language community. For those participants who wished to receive university credit for their participation in the workshop, the Department of Linguistics offered two units of credit.



The AATSP Conference in Rio de Janeiro

*by Agnes Dimitriou, Lecturer,
Department of Spanish and Portuguese*

This year the Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese (AATSP) held its 84th annual conference for the first time in a Portuguese-speaking country—Brazil.

The Rio de Janeiro conference began with workshops on Monday and Tuesday, July 29 and 30. (There was also the opportunity to take an intensive course in Portuguese before the sessions started.) Given that the conference was being held in Brazil, there was an emphasis on sessions that dealt with Portuguese and Brazilian literature and language instruction. The conference itself began on Wednesday, July 31, and included a special luncheon in tribute to the late Maria Abreu for her pioneering work in the teaching of Portuguese language and culture.

In general, the atmosphere of the conference was festive, ending on Friday, August 2, with a *fiesta de despedida* that included a splendid buffet dinner and entertainment. The show included a *baiiana*, a dance incorporating many African motifs; a spectacular presentation of *samba* and *capoeira*; and an exciting finale of Brazilian dance. Everyone was most impressed with efforts of the Association to make this a memorable event and an outstanding conference.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Come to the Celebration

*by Agnes Dimitriou, Lecturer,
Department of Spanish and Portuguese*

The Foreign Language Association of Northern California (FLANC) is celebrating fifty years of presenting conferences and workshops for the foreign language professionals in our area. It is a worthy milestone to celebrate and we look forward to seeing the many members and friends of FLANC at this special conference to be held on the Berkeley Campus on Saturday, November 9, 2002. There are some forty special interest sessions being presented with a wide variety of practical and pedagogical views on language and culture. Among the presenters are many from the Berkeley faculty.

The conference features two sessions in the morning, with a break for lunch—to be held in Prytanean Room of the Bancroft Hotel—followed by two sessions in the afternoon. Among the sessions will be those of general interest and those that touch upon language-specific issues for Chinese, Japanese, French, Spanish, Russian, and German. The conference concludes with a reception for all attending that day. We invite the language professionals of the Berkeley campus to come celebrate this special occasion.

For further information, contact Agnes Dimitriou, agnesd@socrates.berkeley.edu

BLC Outreach cont

the potential for language programs of the newly founded system-wide UC Language Consortium, and we began laying the groundwork for an extensive study on student motivations, which we hope can be implemented system-wide. It is hoped that such a study will provide us valuable insights into the reasons students choose to study various languages. Given the success of the retreat, we are hoping that the event will become regular feature of the continuing professionalization of the language coordinators on the Berkeley campus.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The UC Consortium for Language Learning and Teaching Grants Program, 2002-2003 Call for Proposals

Under the direction of Professor Robert Blake (UC Davis), the UC Consortium for Language Learning and Teaching is a system-wide initiative designed to make the most effective use of UC's vast linguistic resources and expertise at a time when foreign language enrollments are increasing dramatically. The Consortium fosters collaboration among and across the language programs at the UC campuses with an eye to increasing student access to language study through a combination of the best classroom practices, technological enhancements, and EAP programs.

The Consortium Grants Program seeks proposals offering innovative and, ideally, collaborative approaches that will combine second language acquisition research and practice and will maximize the benefits to students and to programs system-wide. Accordingly, proposals must demonstrate the potential to impact the teaching and learning of language across the UC system or to provide a model replicable across languages or campuses. The Consortium will also support projects committed to outreach (K-12, state/community college systems).

The Consortium is interested in proposals pertaining to any type of curricular innovation. In funding year 2002-03 the Consortium particularly encourages proposals that focus on one (or more) of the following themes: heritage language acquisition, development and/or integration of technology, or teaching of the less commonly taught languages. Fact-finding meetings to isolate problems of a particular discipline and formulate solutions will also be considered.

The Consortium grants program consists of two categories:
A) grants up to \$5,000, and B) grants up to \$20,000.

In academic year 2002-2003 there will be two separate calls for proposals.

The First Call for Proposals:

The total amount available for this period is up to \$80,000.

Deadline for Receipt of Submissions: November 1, 2002

Notification of Award: December 15, 2002

Tenure of Grant: January 1 - December 31, 2003

For Guidelines for Submission, go to website at: <http://UCCLLT.ucdavis.edu>
Questions concerning the Consortium Grants Program may be addressed to the
Associate Director, Kathleen Dillon.

Ph: 520 754-9727 / e-mail kedillon@ucdavis.edu

Deadline for Proposals: November 1 , 2002

BLC Title VI Travel Grants 2002-2003

Travel Funds for Foreign Language Lecturers Applications due November 1, 2002

The BLC is able to offer moderate financial support for lecturers to attend conferences or other professional events related to the teaching of foreign languages. Priority will be given to those who will be presenting a paper. For further information and an application, contact Ana Arteaga, BLC Office Manager, at aabl@socrates.berkeley.edu or 642-0767 ext. 22. The application is available at <http://blc.berkeley.edu/faculty.html>

The Berkeley Language Center
deadline for new
materials for spring 2003 is
December 1, 2002.

Contact Marianne Garner at
LL-Lib@socrates.berkeley.edu,
642-0767 x 24,
about acquiring language
learning materials for your
spring semester classes.

If you would like to schedule
the use of Berkeley Language
Center facilities for the
spring semester, contact
Victoria Williams at
victoria@socrates.berkeley.edu,
642-0767 x 19.

ANNOUNCEMENT

2nd National Conference on Heritage Languages in America Building on our National Resources

This year's conference will bring together heritage language community and school leaders, representatives from pre-K-12 schools and colleges and universities, world-renowned researchers, and federal and state policymakers to plan and lead new initiatives in heritage language development in the United States.

Keynote Speaker

Claudio Sanchez
National Public Radio

Plenary Speaker

Joseph Lo Bianco
Language Australia

Who Should Attend

- Heritage language community and school leaders
- Representatives from pre-K-12 schools, colleges, and universities
- Researchers
- Federal and state policymakers
- Business leaders

Our Vision

The vision of this conference and the Heritage Languages Initiative is to build on and develop the language proficiency of heritage language speakers in our country. High levels of language proficiency among heritage language speakers will assist in meeting our needs in global economic competitiveness, national security, civic engagement and participation, community leadership, and cultural preservation. To build this national resource, we need policies, strategies, and resources. We also need structures through which we can collaborate to accomplish this vision.

Our Goals

The purpose of this Second National Conference is to provide a place for individuals, organizations, and associations to participate in new initiatives in heritage language development.

Our specific goals are to

- Develop visibility and public awareness of the economic, personal, and social benefits of proficiency in languages other than English and of the language resources that we have in the United States.
- Increase the extent to which heritage language issues are part of the national dialogue.
- Provide a public forum for participants to shape a national heritage language policy and to engage in heritage language planning for the nation.
- Provide a forum for information sharing (current best practices and successes) and information building (new practices and funding opportunities).
- Provide opportunities for participants to work together in various, flexible groups on issues of interest.
- Develop collaboration among all constituent groups and a plan that moves us from rhetoric to action.

October 18-20, 2002

Sheraton Premiere Hotel at Tysons Corner, Virginia

Organized by
Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL)
National Foreign Language Center (NFLC)



FELLOWSHIPS

**Berkeley Language Center
Instructional Research Fellowships
For 2003-2004**

For Graduate Students

The Berkeley Language Center is pleased to announce the availability of up to six one-semester GSRships (IV) for the academic year 2003-2004 (pending authorization of funding).

These fellowships will enable GSIs to work on special projects both to improve the quality of language instruction in their current department and to enhance their professional development as teachers, which can potentially benefit their future chances of employment at other institutions. Research projects might include research in: theoretical aspects of second language acquisition; language learning software and other instructional materials; handbooks on specific aspects of language instruction; innovative activities to teach literature or culture in the language class; drama techniques to teach language; performance based tests to assess linguistic, literary or cultural competence. The fellowship culminates in a presentation to the UC Berkeley language community. Past fellows have also presented their research at conferences, or published their work in established journals.

The projects will be undertaken in collaboration with the BLC Director, Claire Kramersch, and the BLC Associate Director, Mark Kaiser. Regular attendance at the weekly research fellows' meetings is expected. Graduate students teaching any foreign language at UC Berkeley are eligible to apply. Those teaching less commonly taught languages are particularly encouraged to apply. If you are interested, we strongly encourage you to discuss your research project proposal with either Claire Kramersch, ckramersch@socrates.berkeley.edu or Mark Kaiser, mkaiser@socrates.berkeley.edu.

**Berkeley Language Center
Professional Development Fellowships
For 2003-2004**

For Lecturers

The Berkeley Language Center is pleased to announce the availability of two one-semester fellowships for Unit 18 lecturers or language program coordinators for the academic year 2003-2004.

These fellowships will provide lecturers with the equivalent of one-course release time to work on individual projects designed to further their own professional development. Research projects might include: design and development of instructional materials of various kinds, including technology; development of new course syllabi or curricular innovations; independent study of an area of relevant literature, including enrolling in a course of relevant interest offered at UC Berkeley; empirical study related to the acquisition of any of the four skills in the language classroom; preparation of a research paper for public presentation or publication in a professional journal. The projects will be undertaken in collaboration with the BLC Director, Claire Kramersch, and the BLC Associate Director, Mark Kaiser, on a schedule adapted to the nature of the project and agreed upon by the parties involved.

If you are interested in applying we strongly encourage you to discuss your research project proposal with either Claire Kramersch, ckramersch@socrates.berkeley.edu or Mark Kaiser, mkaiser@socrates.berkeley.edu.

A fellowship application form is available in the BLC office, B-40 Dwinelle Hall.

Please complete the fellowship application form, a two-page description of your project (see specifications on application form), a current CV, and a letter of recommendation by the chair of your department, explaining how your project benefits the teaching and research mission of your department and/or your academic/professional development. Send this documentation to:

**Professor Claire Kramersch • Berkeley Language Center
BLC Fellowship Program • B-40 Dwinelle Hall, MC #2640**

Deadline for Applications: Monday, March 1, 2003

2002 - 2003 CALENDAR

BLC LECTURES

CONFERENCES

Friday, September 13

TEACHING THE COMMONLY
TAUGHT LANGUAGES AS HERI-
TAGE LANGUAGES: QUESTIONS
AND CONTINUING DILEMMAS

Guadalupe Valdés

Professor

Department of Spanish
& Portuguese
Stanford University

3 - 5 pm, 33 Dwinelle Hall



Friday, October 18

REDEFINING THE TEACHING
CULTURE: THE PEDAGOGY OF
ELECTRONIC MEDIA

Gilberte Furstenberg

Senior Lecturer in French
Foreign Languages and Literatures
MIT

3 - 5 pm, 33 Dwinelle Hall

Monday, November 4

IMAGE BANKS AND THE
SEMANTICS OF
CONTEMPORARY VISUAL
COMMUNICATION

Theo van Leeuwen

Professor

Centre for Language and
Communication Research
Cardiff University

3 - 5 pm, 370 Dwinelle Hall



Friday, December 6

INSTRUCTIONAL
DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH
PROJECTS

BLC Fellows:

Paige Daniel

Agnes Dimitriou

William Short

Kristen Templeman

Michael Chad Wellmon

3 - 5 pm, 370 Dwinelle Hall

Receptions will follow the lectures.

The BLC Lecture Series is sponsored by
the College of Letters and Science and
by International and Area Studies.

October 18-19, 2002

*South West Association for Language
Learning Technology (SWALLT) Fall
Conference: Building the Profession:
Everyone is a Contributor*
University of Nevada, Reno
Web: [www.humanities.uci.edu/hirc/
SWALLT](http://www.humanities.uci.edu/hirc/SWALLT)

November 9, 2002

*Foreign Language Association of
Northern California (FLANC)*
University of California at Berkeley
Contact: Agnes Dimitriou,
agnesd@socrates.berkeley.edu
Web: www.fla-nc.org

November 22-24, 2002

*The American Council on the Teaching
of Foreign Languages, ACTFL 2002:
Beyond our Customary Borders: Lan-
guage and Culture in Context*
Salt Lake City, Utah
Web: www.actfl.org

December 27-30, 2002

*The 2002 Annual Modern
Language Association of America
(MLA) Conference*
New York, NY
Web: www.mla.org

March 22-25, 2003

*The American Association for Applied
Linguistics, AAAL 2003: The Diversity
of Applied Linguistics*
Arlington, VA
Web: www.aal.org

March 25-29, 2003

*TESOL 2003: Hearing
Every Voice*
Baltimore, MD
Web: www.tesol.org

THE BERKELEY LANGUAGE CENTER

The Berkeley Language Center (BLC) was established on July 1, 1994. It serves as a resource center for all language teachers on the Berkeley campus.

The mission of the BLC is to improve and strengthen foreign language instruction on the Berkeley campus by keeping teachers informed of new developments in the fields of language pedagogy, second language acquisition, and applied linguistics. The BLC promotes and facilitates the use of new language learning technologies in the classroom.

The BLC is particularly interested in helping lecturers develop new materials, attend conferences and in-service training workshops, and publish their ideas and materials. It has modest funds to help lecturers attend professional meetings and develop new teaching projects.

The BLC also provides audio-video-computerized lesson materials, listening, viewing, recording, duplicating and archiving facilities and related technical and administrative services.

The BLC also administers the Dwinelle Computer Research Facility (DCRF) which supports humanities faculty engages in computer-based research projects and provides equipment and technical expertise for the development of instructional materials

2002-2003 BLC ADVISORY BOARD

Robert J. Blake
Ralph Hexter
Mark Kaiser
Claire Kramtsch

David Leonard
Christina Maslach
Maria Riasanovsky
Jane Stanley

2002-2003 BLC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Ana Arteaga
Agnes Dimitriou
Lynne Frame
Mark Kaiser
Claire Kramtsch

Vivian Numaguchi
Steve Poulos
Sarah Roberts
Sonia S'hiri
Victoria Williams

2002-2003 EDITORIAL BOARD

Agnes Dimitriou
Victoria Williams

1-19900-12495-40-HBGF6

BERKELEY
LANGUAGE
CENTER

B-40 Dwinelle Hall, MC #2640
University of California, Berkeley
Berkeley, California
94720-2640

*Address Correction
Requested*

Non-Profit Org.
US Postage
PAID
UC Berkeley



FALL 2002
NEWSLETTER
