IN THIS ISSUE

LANGUAGE TEACHING AT BERKELEY

In the fall of 2004, we marked the ten-year anniversary of the founding of the Berkeley Language Center. To mark the occasion, Director Claire Kramsch and Associate Director Mark Kaiser reflected on what we have accomplished over the past ten years and where we are headed. BLC Academic Coordinator Sonia S'hiri provided her thoughts on the role of the academic coordinator for BLC outreach.
– Victoria Williams, Editor

The Berkeley Language Center

by Claire Kramsch, Director

The Berkeley Language Center was originally founded on the initiative of Anthony Newcomb, then Dean of Humanities in the College of Letters and Science, who wanted to enhance the professional quality of language instruction on campus and provide Unit 18 lecturers with a common academic home. Its inspiration was the newly founded language center at Stanford, but it was different in its conception. The Stanford center is responsible for all language instruction: It hires and trains the lecturers in communicative language teaching and administers the placement tests for freshmen who have to fulfill the language requirement. By contrast, the Berkeley Language Center's mission was not to deliver language instruction nor to impose any particular language pedagogy on all languages, but to "professionalize" the language-teaching lecturers on campus. This mission was consonant with the mission of the Title VI centers on campus, whose responsibility is to provide support to the teachers of the languages they each represent.

When Dean Newcomb appointed me to be the Director of the BLC, we organized in the first few years regular workshops for language teachers on how to teach various aspects of language: grammar, vocabulary, communicative activities, the teaching of texts, and the teaching of culture. However, we discovered soon that this was not what language teachers needed. Most lecturers on campus are already full professionals, many

THE HISTORY AND EVOLUTION OF THE BERKELEY LANGUAGE CENTER

of them hold Ph.D.s, and all of them have many years of teaching experience. Moreover, each department had its own pedagogy and way of doing things that could not be dealt with centrally through a language center. Unit 18 lecturers were much more interested in keeping abreast of what was going on in the field of language learning and teaching, as they didn't have time to read the research themselves. Our mission became that of a research and resource center of which lecturers could avail themselves at their discretion.

We decided to have monthly events such as guest lectures, panel discussions, and colloquia that would feature the latest developments in the field of second language acquisition and applied linguistics. These would be of interest to anyone involved in language study–professional language teachers, GSIs, scholars and researchers, and even undergraduates interested in how people get to speak several languages. The lecture series and the special colloquia or conferences, funded by the Title VI centers, have featured over the years some of the most prominent researchers in SLA/Applied Linguistics. Since 1996, the BLC has offered more than 50 guest lectures by internationally renowned scholars, four special colloquia with some 25 presenters, five panel discussions with guest speakers, and various formal and informal workshops on the use of technology in language teaching. The videotapes of these events are available to the campus community in the Language Center.

We have been very grateful for lecturers who have suggested names of speakers and timely topics: the uses of translation, taking stock of the Oral Proficiency Interview, the teaching of heritage languages, and issues of language and identity in the Arab world. Other guest speakers have been invited to address particular topics, e.g., the role of gesture in language, the role of the mother tongue in the foreign language classroom, or the teaching of foreign languages in multilingual environments such as in the Ameri-

can, the Cameroonian, or the European classroom. As our funds are limited, we sometimes take the opportunity to invite prominent scholars who happen to be in the U.S. or in the Bay Area. In the last few years we have benefited from the graciousness of our Berkeley colleagues in psychology and linguistics who do work that we feel is relevant to language teachers on campus. We often share our speakers with other UC campuses, such as UC Davis.

We have also tried to devise ways of involving individual lecturers more closely with the BLC, through the position of the BLC Academic Coordinator that rotates every three years. We have been fortunate to have excellent lecturers in that position. Our current academic coordinator is Sonia S'hiri, language program coordinator for Arabic; our next one will be Lisa Little, who coordinates the Russian language program. In the last eight years, we have given travel support for 75 lecturers from 17 language departments to attend professional conferences. We have slowly built up a sizeable professional library located in 34 Dwinelle, and through the Professional Development Fellowships program, created in 1996, we have been able to grant 20 lecturers and 46 graduate students one-semester course release time to do pedagogically-oriented research.

There has been growing interest in our BLC fellowships program. Every semester we work together with a small group of three or four GSRs and one or two lecturers on research projects that range from the practical to the theoretical: a computer program for learning Chinese characters; use of the Internet to teach Welsh or Finnish, of Web logs to teach Russian; drama techniques to teach French and German; syllabus design for a course on business German and on multiculturalism in Germany; exploration of work done in German and American anthropology and its usefulness for conceptualizing communicative competence in a foreign language. We are most grateful to the Dean of the Graduate Division, the Dean of Arts and Humanities of the College of Letters and Science, and the Vice Chancellor for these one-semester fellowships that we are able to award every year on a competitive basis. The projects have led

to curricular improvements and even innovations within the respective departments on campus and to publications in professional journals.

So where do we go from here? While we can be proud of the interest that our lecture series and our fellowship program have generated, I feel that the deliberately loose structure of the BLC, that favors a smorgasbord approach to intellectual stimulation, may feel a little decontextualized for those who cannot attend the lectures regularly, or for those whose daily teaching and family responsibilities prevent from engaging in a research project, or even following up on the lectures through reading on their own. Furthermore, the attendance has been increasingly diverse–graduate students in Education or the Humanities, some with a strong knowledge of applied linguistics; senate faculty from various departments; non-senate faculty professional language teachers; visiting scholars; and scholars from other universities in the Bay Area. The lecture series has

...systematic and principled reflection on oneself and one's own pratice.

become a rallying point on campus for the exchange of ideas related to language teaching. Some of these ideas, however, may feel somewhat removed from the daily concerns of language teachers at UC Berkeley.

In the future, we plan to contextualize the BLC offerings in order to increase their relevance to the practitioner in the classroom. We will invite at each lecture a few lecturers to respond to the guest speaker from the perspective of the language they teach. We will also disseminate via email a rationale for each upcoming event and publish in the BLC newsletter a synopsis and discussion of the event.

While many graduate students and lecturers avail themselves of the BLC research fellowships, these are clustered mainly in the European languages, and in Chinese. We wish to encourage lecturers and graduate students in other languages to apply for these fellowships, as they give release time from teaching

to work on a particular project (deadline: March 7, 2005; please contact Claire Kramsch or Mark Kaiser). Furthermore, the presentations at the end of every semester by the BLC fellows have proven an invaluable pedagogical resource for all language teachers, irrespective of the language they teach. We also wish to encourage lecturers to apply for funds from the UC Consortium for pedagogic research.

In the future, we hope to improve not only the quality of academic life of all language-teaching lecturers on campus, but their sense of themselves as professionals. The BLC is offering language teachers another way of seeing themselves–not only as language teaching methodologists, but also as researchers in the field of language studies. I don't mean research in terms of laboratories and publications, but research as *systematic and principled reflection on oneself and one's own practice*. This, I have found, is the only way we can keep doing what we do for many years without getting bored. I believe language teachers can benefit from looking beyond the borders of the language and culture that they teach and get inspiration from teachers of other languages–not just as native or non-native speakers, but as the language educators that they are.

Have we made a difference?
by Mark Kaiser, Associate Director

If we look at what we have been doing in the broadest possible terms, for the past 45 years the Language Center, or speaking historically, the Language Lab, has attempted to provide students with materials in selected languages and information about their cultures. Forty five years ago, language-learning technology (the central tape console) had two of the functions that computers serve today: as presenter of material (the tutorial function) and facilitator of communication. Although the console was limited to pattern drills and, perhaps, audio readings from literature, and the main role was played by the teacher at the central console, today language labs provide a far greater variety of materials (many designed for purposes other

than language instruction). Technology serves more functions and the old ones are more highly developed. We use many more media–graphics, audio, video, and text–than we did when serving the needs of the audio-lingual method. More recently, we note the increasing use of the computer as a facilitator of communication, whether it be via text or audio chat, blogs, or more traditional forms such as email. The common thread in this historical progression is a more mimetic representation of the target language and culture. It is hard to imagine that anyone would argue that these materials, whether distributed in a university classroom/lab or for students' home use, have not contributed in a significant way to improved language learning.

When the BLC was founded in 1994, the Language Lab had just installed its first computer lab. Today we have three labs with state-of-the-art computers, a high-tech classroom, and a high-end network infrastructure. Our recording studio works almost entirely in digital mode, and we have created a Web-based searchable catalog of our language resources. By the end of spring semester, we will complete our migration to a tapeless circulation of media materials, with most materials supplied directly over the Internet.

The numbers speak of the importance of media to language learning and the widespread impact of the BLC: each semester we have more than 30,000 visits to our computer labs; our online audio lessons receive more than 15,000 hits; we circulate more than 2,500 media items; and the recording studio is involved in media productions for language classes 15 hours per week. We have been involved in the development of computer-based testing in Russian, French, and Arabic, and have assisted in the development or hosting of numerous Web sites. Today our catalog of holdings is available online, and we are in the process of digitizing for preservation the Audio Archive of Linguistic Fieldwork.

Where do we go from here?

Despite the accomplishments of the BLC over the past ten years in the area of technology, there is much work to do. We still need to find ways to improve training in the use of technology and to make it easier for lecturers and graduate students to develop computer-based materials. The tools keep getting better and more intuitive to use, but the ratio of 60 hours of development time to one hour of end-user time is still prohibitively high for most lecturers. And we need to work with campus technology providers such as ETS (Blackboard) to provide lecturers with "seamless" systems of support.

This semester I propose that we form a technology working group that could meet once a month to discuss pedagogical applications of technology in language classes–an opportunity for those with experience to share their successes (and failures), and for those who have limited or no experience, the opportunity to learn.

Two things seem certain. 1) Language instructors will continue to find new ways to apply current technologies, and as an example we could cite Renee Perelmutter's fall 2004 Fellow's Project on the use of blogs in upper-level writing

Language instructors will continue to find new ways to apply current technologies.

classes; 2) Technology will continue to advance, and those advances will impact the ways we teach. We can speculate on what it will mean to have computers that are programmed to respond to voice commands, or virtual realities recreating an art museum or the interior of a bakery, readily available to language learners. However, as exciting as these prospects might be, we all recognize that they will not replace the experience gained by living and traveling abroad, or the guidance provided by a knowledgeable teacher.

Language Lecturers as Academic Coordinators for the BLC

Sonia S'hiri,
BLC Academic Coordinator

"So, why would a lecturer want to take up the position of Academic Coordinator for the BLC?" This was the last question that a representative of a major East Coast University seeking to start its own language center asked me a few weeks ago. As I approach the end of my three-year tenure as Academic Outreach Coordinator for the BLC, I have often been in the position of explaining what I was trying to offer the language teaching community on campus on behalf of the BLC but never what the BLC was doing for me by offering me this pivotal position.

An Academic Coordinator for the BLC is a full-time lecturer/Language Program Coordinator who receives a three-year one-course relief to participate in the weekly BLC Fellows' seminar, to organize the language lecturers' meetings and the Language Program Coordinators' meetings twice a semester each, to help organize a special event in the spring, and finally to take part in the selection of the Fellows who will receive the BLC grants the following year. In my past two and a half years, for instance, the discussions I organized for language lecturers and Language Program Coordinators covered subjects that ranged from dealing with emotionally and psychologically problematic students; combating racial, gender, and other forms of bias in the classroom; raising students' cultural awareness of the target language; encouraging and modeling reflective teaching for our GSIs; launching or improving an intensive summer program abroad; training GSIs to handle the apparently growing wave of aggressive emails; and improving teaching for heritage learners. Reports about conferences, workshops, and lectures attended by colleagues and announcements about upcoming events are also circulated and exchanged at these meetings. In addition, colleagues have the opportunity to exchange information about practical issues and share best practices in a supportive environment. Finding a time that works for everyone remains a great challenge.

The responsibilities of the Academic Coordinator position are geared to complement the invaluable technological support that the BLC offers its constituency of language students and instructors on one hand, and the enriching theoretical and practical intellectual resource that the lecture series and the fellowships constitute, on the other. This

position comes out of the BLC's mission to foster an environment that supports and encourages the continued professional growth of all language instructors on campus and the need to acknowledge the existence of a language teaching community whose interests cut across the language specific apparent divide.

With very few exceptions, the faculty responsible for teaching languages on campus is made up of lecturers. Unlike other colleagues whose jobs require them to be involved in research, lecturers have a teaching work load that leaves little time for conducting or even being aware of research in the field of second and foreign language learning and teaching, or applied linguistics. Many language lecturers are the only "language" faculty in their programs or departments. The BLC thus helps fight the risk of isolation from recent developments in the field of language teaching and learning as well as the risk of professional frustration for lack of opportunity for professional and curriculum development. Coming from the field of applied linguistics into Arabic in a campus with no applied linguistics department, I found the BLC to be the refreshing resource that kept me stimulated and connected to the larger field.

Going back to the question that the East Coast colleague posed to me, I believe that the role of Academic Coordinator offers the language teaching community the chance to send a representative who will help shape the course that the BLC takes in that three-year period of their tenure. This experience provides more campus visibility to the language that the Academic Coordinator teaches in their home department and therefore a greater chance for better understanding of the different languages and cultures taught on campus. In my case, the BLC

> ...the chance to send a representative who will help shape the course of the BLC...

appointment coincided with the rising interest in Arabic and Arab culture as this language became one of the critical languages of the country. Thus, the conference I organized in April 2003 on "Language and Identity In the Modern Arab World: Implications for Language Teaching and Learning" turned into an opportunity for colleagues and students from outside the field of Arabic as well as the community at large to dispel some misconceptions and learn more about the language that I teach.

In turn, the Academic Coordinator's experience at the BLC may affect their own program and possibly other language programs in their department. This may partially answer the question of why would a department let go of one of its language program coordinators or language lecturers for those six courses especially if they come from a small program. Finding an adequate replacement can be tricky. Also, a lecturer prior to the six-year appointment may not want to risk being perceived as having "split loyalties" by working outside the department. However, it is important to keep in mind that this is an invaluable opportunity for the department, the lecturer, and the teaching community as a whole especially if the lecturer comes from a very small program with fewer resources or the so-called less commonly taught languages, as I do. The language lecturer in this position becomes sensitized to what is happening in other language programs while bringing his or her interests to the rest of the teaching community. Moreover, close exposure to and the chance to participate in the wealth of innovative research projects that the BLC funds every semester indisputably enriches the Academic Coordinator's professional experience at Berkeley and that of the GSIs and students that they supervise and teach.

This last fall semester, I held two meetings for lecturers and two meetings for language program coordinators. At the first Language Program Coordinators' meeting, Patrik Svensson, Director of the HUMlab at Umeå University in Sweden spoke about *Talking back: Virtual worlds, corpora, and blogs in language education.* Svensson shared with the group a number of computer-assisted activities that can be performed to complement the classroom in subjects such as Italian and English literature. Particularly interesting for language teaching and learning was the use of a "world" or space that looked like a fenced-in area where students are supposed to choose an avatar or a persona that best represents their personality. Students are then able to participate in discussions in Italian, as they stand in a circle, taking turns as one does in real life. The focus goes from student to student as they take turns speaking.

The second meeting for Language Program Coordinators addressed the issue of *Developing and Sustaining a Successful Summer Abroad Program.* Colleagues Cecilia Chu from Chinese and Armando Di Carlo from Italian presented to the group their experience and valuable insights in developing their respective programs abroad. Cecilia Chu indicated that she is now working on creating an intensive summer program in China specifically designed for heritage learners. Both colleagues may be contacted for further information.

At the first lecturers' meeting the discussion revolved around two main issues. The first concern had to do with the difficulty of organizing video conferencing to UC campuses that follow the quarter system. This incompatibility not only poses staffing problems on both ends but makes it harder for the student to follow simultaneously Berkeley's semester system and their own university's quarter system. The second issue raised at this meeting was the question of teaching standard vs. non-standard language. While this issue seems to be mild in relatively uniform languages such as Russian, the problems that it creates for learners and teachers of diglossic languages such as Arabic are hard to resolve. Teachers deal with the question of variation and the numerous geographical or social dialects by choosing a variety that is widely used or common to a wide constituency of native speakers. Students are thus left to learn a language that is marked for its formality or is book-like in nature and is removed from the "real language" spoken by "real people." Finding a balance between being prescriptive and offering sufficient "real language" exposure to our students remains a very controversial issue in some languages where literacy is entirely associated with the standard language.

The second lecturers' meeting centered around UC Santa Cruz colleague Victoria Gonzalez-Pagani's presentation on strategies for content-based, computer-assisted materials development for the less commonly taught languages. Victoria Gonzalez-Pagani demonstrated to the group a few of the inspiring materials that she had devised for Spanish at different levels with particular emphasis on materials from the distance learning course that she designed, *Spanish Without Walls.* The use of visuals such as paintings and film clips on the one hand, and reliance on Spanish-English cognates on the other, makes the course culturally rich while highly engaging to the student.

❧

BLC Language Teaching Resources Library
34 Dwinelle Hall

The Language Teaching Resources collection is comprised of books and some journals on language teaching methodology and SLA (second language acquisition). It also includes video recordings of the BLC Lecture Series–talks by experts in the field of applied linguistics theory and practice.

You may explore this small, but focused, collection of print materials by clicking on the Collections button at the BLC website, **http://blc.berkeley.edu**. Under Collections/Archives, click on Language Teaching Resources to access our searchable online catalog.

You are also welcome to browse the collection: simply find Victoria Williams, B-33C Dwinelle, between the hours of 8–12 pm and 1–5 pm, Monday through Friday, for access to 34 Dwinelle and for reference help.

Checking materials out is also straightforward: we add you to our circulation database and then check out to you up to four books for one month.

If you have any questions, special requests, or suggestions of titles to enhance this collection, please contact Victoria Williams by email at **victoria@socrates.berkeley.edu**, or by phone at 642-0767 ext 19.

University Classroom Language for IGSIs

by Ellen Rosenfield, Lecturer, Language Proficiency Program

My BLC project grew out of my desire for new, more authentic teaching materials for Language Proficiency 150 (Lang-Pro 150), an elective course offered by the GSI Teaching and Resource Center to newly appointed International GSIs (IGSIs). Enrollment in LangPro 150 is voluntary, attracting those IGSIs who really want to improve their language and teaching skills.

Who takes LangPro 150 and why? Students in LangPro 150 are generally science majors, leading discussion sections of freshman-level introductory science courses. Typically, these students have excellent reading and writing skills in English but lack familiarity and experience with the spoken language. They acknowledge their need for pronunciation practice and instruction in pedagogy–both topics are part of the LangPro 150 curriculum–but they also desperately want to increase their repertoire of colloquial English. They want to be able to make sense out of expressions like *I messed up* and *Go Bears!* They have been told that American university classrooms are more informal and interactive than the classrooms of their home cultures, but they do not know how to *be* informal. They are still so new to the culture that they are unable to simply pick up the appropriate idiomatic expressions, nonverbal cues, gestures, or body language used by native-speaker professors and GSIs. They need to see and analyze authentic examples of university classroom language in order to become more comfortable in their role as GSIs.

In the past, I had been unsuccessful in tracking down authentic classroom language in IGSI training materials. There are some videotaped training materials, but these employ actors to play the roles of teachers and students. I looked online at The Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English (MICASE), a huge collection of authentic transcripts of

university classes. It has rich data but no video component. Unfortunately, the few textbooks published for the IGSI audience focus more on describing skills to help IGSIs compensate for their lack of proficiency than on providing IGSIs with examples of authentic classroom language. My sense is that the IGSIs who choose Language Proficiency 150 do not just want to learn compensation skills, such as being told to speak more loudly or to enunciate more clearly–they want to learn what native speakers really say.

My BLC project has been to collect authentic classroom language by attending freshman-level science lectures and discussion sections, filming them, and creating a series of video clips with accompanying transcripts. Luckily, UC Berkeley now provides webcasts of many freshman-level lectures, making videotaping unnecessary. Through the webcast service, I was able to watch hours of lectures online. I focused on science courses such as Biology 1A and Astronomy 10, chose segments that exemplified successful teaching, and wrote transcripts for each segment.

I tried to choose segments that did not contain too much discipline-specific language and that illustrated a common teaching function. I then analyzed each segment and highlighted those areas most important for IGSIs to notice: Pronunciation features (word stress, intonation, phrasal stress, and rhythm) and discourse features, such as introducing a topic (*I want to say a couple of words about…)*, using introductory noun clauses for emphasis (*What I want you to remember is…*), and posing "monologic questions" to introduce or advance a topic (*What does getting burned mean? It means that…*). I also flagged informal language and analyzed its use within each segment.

I used a digital video camera to film four native-speaker GSIs. As I had done with the lectures, I chose meaningful segments from the videotapes, which I then transcribed and analyzed. Although I was only able to find four GSI partici-

pants, they exhibited a useful range of speaking styles and teaching behaviors.

Although my original purpose had not been to compare the discourse style of the lecture hall with that of the GSI discussion section, the data from these two environments yielded some unexpected insights into language use on campus. First, it became clear that the expected difference in register between what professors use in the lecture hall and what GSIs use in discussion sections barely exists. Both professors and GSIs wear casual clothes and use informal expressions such as *you guys*, *stuff like that*, and *whatever.* One can speculate as to the reasons for this: A societal shift toward informality, society's emphasis on "youth culture," or perhaps professors' desire to be less elitist and relate to their young audiences. Whatever the reasons, it is clear that IGSIs need to understand how informality functions in the university classroom.

I was also struck by the extent to which the GSI served as "mediator" between professor and undergraduate, especially in the areas of testing and grading. It is clear from the data that GSIs often function as coaches, cheering students on when they do well, clueing students in on what the professor might be emphasizing on the next midterm, and then commiserating when students get poor grades. However, GSIs are also put in the position of mediator or buffer between professor and undergraduate. In one case, a GSI had to defend a professor's ambiguous wording of a multiple-choice item. This is a tough psychological position for anyone. It is clear that IGSIs need to prepare for these challenging roles.

My goal next semester is to experiment with these video clips and transcripts in a number of ways: as data for my LangPro 150 students to analyze, as models for them to emulate, and as springboards for discussions on many topics connected to the role of the GSI at UC Berkeley. I am very grateful to the BLC for having given me the opportunity to explore this topic.

References

Axelson, Elizabeth and Carolyn Madden. "Discourse strategies for ITAs," in Madden, Carolyn and Cynthia L. Myers. (1994). *Discourse and performance of international teaching assistants.* TESOL Publications.

Bailey, K.M. (1984). "A typology of teaching assistants," cited in "Student questions*:* when, where, why, and how many*"* by Patricia Rounds, in Madden, Carolyn and Cynthia L. Myers. (1994). *Discourse and performance of international teaching assistants.* TESOL Publications.

Madden, Carolyn and Cynthia L. Myers. (1994). *Discourse and performance of international teaching assistants.* TESOL Publications.

MICASE, Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English. http://www.hti.umich.edu

Myers, Cynthia. (1994). "Question-based discourse in science labs: issues for ITAs," in Madden & Myers, 83-102.

Shaw, Peter. (1994). "Discourse competence in a framework for ITA Training," in Madden & Myers, 27-51.

Smith, Jan. (1994). "Enhancing curricula for ITA development," in Madden & Myers, 52-62.

Smith, J., Myers, C. and Burkhalter, A. (1992). *Communicate: strategies for international teaching assistants.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall/Regents.

Wennerstrom, A. (1991). *Techniques for teachers: A guide for nonnative speakers of English* [workbook and videotape]. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

❦

Teaching Mandarin Chinese as a Second Dialect

by Lihua Zhang, Lecturer, Chinese Language Program, Department of East Asian Languages and Cultures

I began teaching elementary Chinese for speakers of non-Mandarin dialects for the first time in 2004. A BLC fellowship enabled me to research the characteristics of Chinese dialect heritage learners (DHLs), their needs, and their learning style in learning Mandarin. I came to see that teaching Mandarin as a second dialect to Chinese DHLs in a non-Chinese-speaking country is a unique hybrid of second dialect learning, heritage language learning, and second language learning.

The Chinese language has seven major dialects, but Mandarin is the standard dialect spoken by over 70% of the population. It is taught in all schools and used in government. With the spoken and lexical varieties, dialects are mutually unintelligible. There are, however, features shared by all dialects. Chinese language is tonal, non-inflectional, and topic-dominant. Its basic word order is SVO, the modifier is placed before the modified, classifiers are mandatory after numerals, and the written form is unified. These features are important in second dialect learning. A literate Chinese dialect speaker, trained to read and write in the standard form using Mandarin vocabulary and grammar, is bidialectal in the sense that the diglossia functions along two channels, the native dialect for oral communication in informal situations and the standard dialect for reading, writing, and formal oral communication.

DHLs have similarities with MHLs (Mandarin heritage learners) in that their literacy education in Mandarin is interrupted during the schooling period in favor of the mainstream English language, although some have attended after-school programs for reading and writing. Thus, more than half of learners (61% of DHLs from a 2004 Survey and 81% of MHLs from a 2003 Survey) could recognize and write a few to more than 500 Chinese characters before their Mandarin course. DHLs and MHLs also have similar cultural knowledge. A cultural questionnaire with 16 questions dealing with aspects of Chinese etiquette, customs, and cultural attitudes and beliefs showed that DHLs and MHLs had approximately the same amount of cultural knowledge on 12 questions. While both groups need to develop Mandarin reading and writing skills, because of the differences in pronunciation among Chinese major dialects, they are not at the same starting point for listening and speaking skills. Since MHLs need to improve their listening and speaking, instruction is in Mandarin so they can listen and speak on topics in the language beyond what they have learned at home. In contrast, DHLs need to learn to pronounce Mandarin and to learn new listening and speaking skills in the second dialect. MHLs' word choice and grammar in reading and writing mirror what they say. This is not always the case with DHLs. DHLs, therefore, have needs similar to those of FLLs (foreign language learners).

Traditionally, DHLs and FLLs were in the same class developing all four skills in Mandarin. However, they differ in many respects. In addition to a varying knowledge of Chinese characters, the 2004 survey shows that even DHLs unable to write characters have been exposed to Chinese printed materials. When listening to Mandarin in an informal situation and watching Mandarin TV without subtitles, one third of DHLs who could not write characters could more or less understand spoken Mandarin. The survey also shows that in learning Mandarin, 90% of DHLs use a mapping strategy between the target language/dialect and the source language/dialect. For vocabulary and grammar, more DHLs tend to map between Mandarin and their dialect than those who map between Mandarin and English. Eighty percent of those who could neither write characters nor understand Mandarin also apply mapping strategies, and the percentage of those who map between Mandarin and their dialect is even higher. Dialect transfer gives them an advantage. In addition, DHLs have cultural knowledge and parental help. The learning environment in a mixed class is intimidating for absolute beginners because of the fast-paced progress of the DHLs. FLLs are often confused by DHLs' different pronunciation, vocabulary, and expressions, and this sidetracks the instructor. Nevertheless, DHLs' needs are neglected in a typical second/foreign language learning classroom.

DHLs have special language needs and special psychological and social needs. They need to know the differences between Mandarin and dialects in

pronunciation and in word choice and grammar, and they need help with transferring rules. They learn Mandarin to explore their background and maintain their cultural heritage as well as enhance future professional opportunities. These needs should be accommodated.

Teaching Mandarin as a second dialect benefits from a combination of second dialect learning, heritage language learning, and second language learning. I recommend that teaching goals include building on existing dialect skills and developing Mandarin skills, learning a variety of communicative tasks, and gaining confidence and competence in reading Chinese at home and in the larger community. I also recommend exploring and appreciating heritage culture, understanding the relationship between culture and language, and establishing a foundation for real-world use and continuous language training. Instructional materials for the first year Mandarin courses deal with 1) daily life; 2) self-identity and learning heritage language and culture; 3) cultural conflicts and social issues; and 4) language, dialects, history, and customs. For instruction, the communicative approach is employed with the use of interactive activities. The comparative and contrastive method as a monitor is incorporated to help DHLs identify mapping rules. Substantial time is allocated to developing listening and speaking skills. DHLs are encouraged to interact with MHLs and to reach out to the Chinese community. Teachers also need to develop an awareness of dialects. They need to become acquainted with DHLs' dialect background, language and social needs, and learning styles, and to distinguish between native dialect and English interference, and to respond appropriately. Finally, teachers need to become knowledgeable in the dialect most common among DHLs from books, journals, and students.

My BLC project builds a foundation for the development of the elementary Chinese course for DHLs. Hopefully, this research will spark further study in this area as well.

❦

The Impact of Collaborative Digital Storytelling on L2 Literacy Development

by Mark Evan Nelson,
Ph.D Candidate,
Graduate School of Education

Report on Work to Date:

The past several decades have seen the advent of what W.J.T. Mitchell has termed "the pictorial turn," a particular philosophical attention to imagination, imagery, and non-linguistic symbol systems, and a setting aside of the "assumption that language is paradigmatic for meaning" (1994:12). Moreover, this shift in focus is far from just an ivory-tower pursuit; rather, it is symptomatic of the ever-increasing salience and importance of non-linguistic forms of communication–especially visual/pictorial forms–in the lives of us all. This is perhaps best exemplified by the ubiquitous use of the Internet and other multimedia technologies which integrate language, image, sound, and other semiotic modalities in ways that more traditional print media cannot.

In an important sense, though, human communication itself cannot really be said to have become any more visual or "multimodal" than it hitherto has been. Gaze, gesture, etc. have always been virtually indispensable features of even the most ostensibly linguistic (oral) of interactions, as Kendon (1991), Lanham (1993), Finnegan (2002) and others have argued. Finnegan, in fact, categorically defines humans' ability to communicate as a necessary coordination of "their powers of eye and ear and movement, their embodied interactions in and with the external environment, their capacities to interconnect along auditory, visual, tactile and perhaps olfactory modalities, and their ability to create and manipulate objects in the world." (2002: 243.)

Consideration of this notwithstanding, the truth is that the multimedia texts with which we are now confronted–and, more crucially, which we are all more-and-more required to *create* are of a different species of multimodality than has been previously seen. The most vital implication of the shift toward this new multimodality, with its attendant complexes of means by which informa-

tion is organized and presented, is a need to understand multimodal *design* [New London Group (1996), Kress & van Leeuwen (2001), Kress (2003)]. For instance, as Kress (2003) explains, different modes have different "affordances" [after Gibson (1979)] for meaning-making: that is ideas encoded in imagery offer a different, more spatial and simultaneously apprehended kind of meaning than the same ideas encoded in language, which presents ideas in a sequentially, temporally organized way. Assuming that this is true, and more broadly that all modalities have their own peculiarities of logical organization, the million-dollar question becomes, "What happens when we put these modalities together?" This is the main question that underpinned my BLC project.

I began my project with the aim of investigating the potential efficacy of involving language learners in the process of "digital storytelling," the collaborative creation of multimedia narratives that, via computer, integrate text, imagery (still and video), and sound (voice and music). For my participant group, I chose five UC Berkeley undergraduates who identified themselves as non-native users of English and who were enrolled in non-native speaker (NNS) sections of Berkeley's compulsory freshman composition course. Each of these students undertook the project of conceiving, designing, and constructing an original digital "essay" over an eleven-week period. These essays related directly to topics the students were writing on in their composition courses, and relationships between language, culture, and identity were dominant themes.

We began the semester with some theoretical orientation toward the nature and implications of multimodal communication, drawing on the work of Gunther Kress, C.S. Peirce and others; the purpose of this was to give the participants a framework within which to reflect upon and discuss their own respective creative processes. However, as my own objective was to discern what kinds of semiotic effects may be organically attendant to the process of multimodal design, we did not over-emphasize theory. Rather, I preferred students to reflect throughout the creative process on the meanings they wanted to express in the work and how well they felt those meanings were com-

municated by the pictures, words, etc. (in isolation and combination) that constituted their individual essay "movies." I have collected these reflections in the form of students' written journals, individual interviews with participants, and recorded in-class interactions, and have analyzed them with reference to each student's body of essay-related artifacts, which I also collected at weekly in-process intervals.

I have not yet reached any final conclusions, as my informants are still working on their essay projects. Admittedly, in my initial plan I underestimated the amount of time it would take to complete the project of a five-to-six-minute multimedia piece. Nevertheless, as a result of preliminary analysis, I have identified some very interesting categories of effect that may emerge in the process of multimodal design, at least of the type that we practiced.

First, I noticed what might be called a "hyper-awareness" on the part of my students of the expectations of the audience. It seemed that the influence of the genre of film, invoked by the movie-like quality of the multimedia essay, gave students cause to feel that their essays should be "fun," regardless of the import or seriousness of the topic. This awareness was also evident in the students' expressed overriding desire to create image-language couplings that were conventional and "direct"–such as in showing an image of pizza to express "pizza"–as a means of appealing most directly to the viewer's interest and comprehension. A related finding was that students tended to consciously include language-image couplings in their pieces that presented stereotypes with which they did not particularly agree. One student offered an iconic photo of a large, white mansion in conjunction with the words "the American dream" despite her acknowledgement of this as being emblematic of a shallow stereotype. She knowingly allowed her own meaning to be displaced in favor of a popularly accessible–if inaccurate–one.

While the patterns presented above may represent impediments to authentic, intentional expression of multimodal meaning, there was also evidence of certain benefits that may accrue to the process of multimodal communication.

For instance, there was one participant who seemed to gain an increased meta-awareness of the semiotic value of text-*as*-image–the "topographic" quality of written language, to use Lemke's term. Further, in the case of each informant, the process of translating ideas from one mode into another and back, what Kress calls "transduction" (2003: 36), seemed to have given these authors access to deeper levels of expressional intent and meaning than they had in traditional writing. For example, one informant recognized the relationship of social connection to cultural identity as a consequence of prioritizing her collection of photos (as a means of "visually brainstorming" ideas for her essay). This process of transduction and the semiotic transformations that may accompany it are of special interest to me at this point in my work, particularly as regards L2-related issues, into which I have not yet adequately delved.

From here I intend to continue working with my students on finishing their projects. At the same time, I will complete my data set and analyze it carefully for more evidence of these and other patterns. Results will be forthcoming.

References

Finnegan, R. (2002). *Communicating: The multiple modes of human interconnection*. London: Routledge.

Gibson, J. (1979). *The ecological approach to visual perception*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Kendon, A. (1991). Some considerations for a theory of language origins. *Man 26:* 199-221.

Kress, G. (2003). *Literacy in the new media age*. London: Routledge.

Kress, G. & van Leeuwen, T. (2001). *Multimodal discourse. The modes and media of contemporary communication*. London: Arnold.

Lanham, R. (1993). *The Electronic Word: Democracy, Technology, and the Arts*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Lemke, J. (1998). Metamedia literacy: Transforming meanings and media. In D. Reinking, M. McKenna, L. Labbo, & R. Kieffer (Eds.) *Handbook of literacy and technology: Transformations in a post-typographic world*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Mitchell, W.J.T. (1994). *Picture theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

New London Group. (1996). Pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review, 66:* 60-92.

❧

Blogging to Enhance the Second Language Classroom

by Renee Perelmutter, Ph.D Candidate, Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures

The last four years have seen the emergence and rapid growth of personal online publishing. Personal websites with dynamically updated content, Web logs or blogs, were originally used for alternative journalism and technology discussions. Now that blogging has grown as a technological and sociological phenomenon, it embraces a wide variety of online publishing that revolves around the principle of community participation.

Recently blogs have been used in high school and college writing classes, as well as in various ESL programs. I am not aware of previous projects that have adapted the idea of blogging to the second language classroom. The goal of my BLC project, therefore, was to develop and test a community blog application that would enable advanced second-language learners to improve their writing in Russian.

My basic assumption was that writing in this format would help students improve their fluency, while boosting their enjoyment of the writing process. There is something powerfully performative about blog writing that can potentially be both exciting and intimidating. Exciting, because the student is no longer writing only for the teacher: she is addressing an audience of peers who will be informed and entertained by the writing. Potentially intimidating, due to the students' fears of being judged–not specifically on their proficiency in the second language (since all participants are "in the same boat"), but on the

content of their writing. To deal with the intimidating aspect of addressing an audience of peers, I planned to encourage writing under a pseudonym. I also expected to work closely with students to help them develop their ideas and online research skills.

To enable the students to write in a community blog, I chose the content management system ExpressionEngine[1], which was purchased and installed thanks to the BLC. I designed the Berkeley RussianBlog site[2] and recruited six advanced students of Russian to participate in a trial blogging course in fall 2004.

The course consisted of one in-class meeting a week, and of written assignments to completed at home and posted in the community blog. I set up the course in an iterative fashion. First, I asked the students to pre-write on a topic of their choice (e.g., music, politics, the presidential elections). Shortly before the meeting, I would post my own long entry on the topic that included links to other online sources such as newspaper articles, blogs by native speakers of Russian, etc. During the class, I would explain what I had written and give my students pointers and ideas for further research. After the class, the participants were asked to write a longer entry on the subject. This setup worked well for the students. For example, one student writes: "It helped to read the information, then hear it in class, then read it online again, and then write about it. These steps were very useful."

As I expected, my students' writing fluency improved. Students' first entries were short, mostly listing items they liked or disliked. Many students tried to use complex syntax, but it often seemed out of place in their short and simple entries. The pieces written after the first class meeting were significantly longer, and there was improvement in the way the subject matter was dealt with. The students' ability to develop their arguments improved significantly as the course progressed. They became more comfortable with using complex syntax and with "mirroring" real Russian constructions they hand observed in native speakers' writing.

Over the course of the project, I planned to experiment with subject matter. In regular classes, subject matter revolves around the students' personal experience–the autobiography, description of the places the students live in, plans for the future, etc. These topics are very useful for beginning students, but as the students' language skills progress, these recurring assignments do not leave a lot of room for experimentation or excitement. By the time the students are advanced, they will have exhausted the possibilities of this writing style. Writing on a "topic of interest" did not seem exciting enough on its own; I wanted to involve the students in the more controversial and thought-provoking aspects of their chosen topics. This worked as well as I had hoped, boosting excitement and prompting students to make strong and well formed written arguments. Students were even reluctant to leave an especially "juicy" topic and move on; the elections in Ukraine, for example, provoked much more writing and interest than I had anticipated.

Another idea I wanted to test was whether communal writing, with both the teacher and the students participating, would encourage the participants to do their best. This worked very well. One student writes that she especially benefited from: "reading [the entries of] our peers, others who are at the same place as we are in our Russian language skills, was helpful, encouraging and it inspired me to want to write more and explore more difficult ideas." In the communicative second language classroom, students learn to speak from each other, but also, importantly, from the speech of the teacher; this does not happen with regular writing setups. The "communicative writing" encouraged by the blog structure, as well as the example of the teacher's writing, was beneficial to the students' progress.

Working on accuracy was an important part of this project. At this stage, students are more in need of general correction of their syntax and style, as well as of selective correction of morphological mistakes. I tried two correcting styles. In the beginning I suggested corrections in comments; this did not work well, as the students were apprehensive about "reading other people's mistakes." Later, I decided to save a copy of the original uncorrected text and then to correct each published entry. This had three advantages: 1) students could read published corrected versions in good Russian, 2) the authors had access to both corrected and uncorrected versions which they could view side-by-side on their editing screens; 3) this did not impede the development of students' fluency: they could choose how much time to spend learning from their mistakes before moving forward.

This correction style was enabled by the medium itself; it would not have been possible in a pen and paper format. I was pleased to find that students found this correction style beneficial: "It was so helpful to write an entry and have you fix it so we could see our mistakes. It also greatly helped my development of proper syntax."

Conclusion

Blogging is a new and already well-established style of personal written communication. In the present-day world of new media, writing online is becoming an important part of literacy. Using blogging for acquiring written literacy in a second language proves very fruitful, successfully pursuing both goals of developing student writing and acquainting learners with Internet media in a target language. My approach, as outlined above, is only one example of a possible adaptation of the medium for second-language learners. I hope that more second-language teachers will embrace the medium and conduct experiments in adapting it to their classroom needs.

(Footnotes)

[1] http://pmachine.com
[2] http://www.language.berkeley.edu/russianblog/

Under the Textual Mask: Towards Alternative Strategies in Teaching Writing to Heritage Speakers

by Victoria Somoff, Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures

In the fall of 2003, I taught an introductory Russian language course designed for heritage speakers of Russian. The students in my class were able to speak and to understand spoken Russian with a fair degree of accuracy, but they were not able to read or write in the language. The students exhibited a distinct unwillingness to master writing skills. At the beginning of the course, they had written some very dry, done-for-the-grade essays on the set of topics traditionally assigned in first-year foreign language classes: an autobiography, a family tree, memories from childhood, journal writings, etc.

I decided to set up a different task. My idea consisted of writing an epistolary novel. I divided the students into two "families" and provided them with a list of *dramatis personae*. I then gave the class the following instructions: the action was to take place in the present in Moscow, and the plot was to follow the basic "Romeo and Juliet" story line–love between teenagers in the face of parental objection.

The project resulted in an epistolary novel comprised of eighty letters that featured a coherent plot, a variety of events, and the desired ending–the young lovers are reunited despite all the resistance they encountered. My students' writing skills improved dramatically during this project. The letters they wrote were remarkably different from their personal experience essays and routine journal entries.

For my BLC project, I researched a theoretical framework to analyze my experience teaching writing to heritage speakers of Russian. I hypothesized that the heritage learner had both a need and the potential to acquire writing skills in their heritage language according to the laws of first language acquisition. I suggested that college-age heritage learners' attempts to acquire reading and writing skills in their first language could be viewed as an effort to gain the literacy acquisition that they have never attained.

Current research into children's acquisition of language, both spoken and written, views the process as one of constant creation and recreation of the child's own constructions. Therefore, it can be suggested that in order to acquire writing skills in their first language, heritage speakers need to experience this stage of invention and creativity, crucial to a child's acquisition of written language.

I further argue that for heritage speakers the main obstacle in the process of going back in time consists, paradoxically, of the fact that these adult heritage learners did acquire literacy–but in their *second* language. They have, therefore, developed metalinguistic skills that enable them to make choices between correct and incorrect ways of saying or writing something.

The inner censor that develops in an individual who has achieved metalinguistic awareness can become a major inhibition in communication, especially in written language; even native speakers encounter problems when they find themselves torn between the need to express themselves in writing and the awareness that in doing so they must follow the rules of the language. College-age heritage learners have an even greater challenge. When they attempt to write in their first language, the incongruity between the powerful metalinguistic censor developed in their second language and the severely under-developed writing skills in their first one becomes unmanageable.

I suggest that an alternative strategy for teaching writing to heritage speakers would consist of attempting to suspend or to "jam the frequency" of the inner metalinguistic censor. This would allow heritage learners to come back to that stage in their first language acquisition where this process was interrupted, and to acquire writing skills as children do, without the paralyzing fear of making a mistake.

Certain aspects of the epistolary novel project demonstrated this alternative strategy at work. The first aspect is "under the mask" writing, or anonymity. The students did not know who was writing as which character until the novel was completed, and this turned out to be a crucial factor in the project's successful development. Anonymity minimized responsibility for authorship and, therefore, greatly contributed to the suspension of the metalinguistic censor that thwarts the heritage learners' efforts to acquire writing skills in their first language.

I would suggest, however, that the conflict between the two languages that heritage speakers have to deal with cannot be adequately addressed by means of anonymity alone. Heritage speakers need to be exempted from the need to remain faithful to any actual course of events or pre-existing viewpoint, be it experiences from their own lives or their personal thoughts on a particular subject. I envision role-play as a complementary strategy that provides the opportunity to become someone else, to paint a face on the mask. Anonymity, one of the obvious dangers of which is irresponsibility, becomes productive when balanced by the responsibility of assuming a new identity.

This responsibility is of a different kind than the obligation, imposed by the "narratives of the past" (Heath), to be true to an actual course of events. In role-play, the writer herself becomes the one and only source of authority. The writer who puts on a particular textual mask does not have to look for the right words to match an already given true account; instead, she generates both the account and the words.

Thus, I suggest that the combination of role-play and anonymity provides a unique way of dealing with heritage speakers' linguistic insecurities brought about by the extraordinarily strong–due to the conflict between the first and the second languages–presence of the metalinguistic censor. I view these strategies as extremely efficient in enhancing heritage speakers' acquisition of literacy in their first language.

❧

ucb-language

ucb-language is a moderated listserv for the Berkeley Language Center (BLC). It is used mostly for conveying information about BLC events, conferences, and topics of interest to the language learning and teaching community at UC Berkeley.

Subscribe To subscribe to the list, send email to **Majordomo@listlink.berkeley.edu** with the following command in the body of your message: subscribe ucb-language

Unsubscribe Similarly, to remove yourself from the list, send email to **Majordomo@listlink.berkeley.edu** with the following command in the body of your message: unsubscribe ucb-language

Post If you wish to post a message to the list, send an email message to **ucb-language@uclink.berkeley.edu**. As this is a moderated list, your posting will not appear immediately. (The list is moderated to remove spam and mistakes in posting.)

If you have trouble subscribing or unsubscribing, or have questions about the listserv, send email to the list owner, Victoria Williams, at **victoria@socrates.berkeley.edu**. For information about the Berkeley Language Center, visit our website at **http://blc.berkeley.edu**.

gsi

Graduate Student Instructor
Teaching and Resource Center
Graduate Division

GSI Teaching & Resource Center
UC Berkeley Graduate Division
301 Sproul Hall • Berkeley, CA 94720-5900
510-642-4456 • gsi@uclink.berkeley.edu

Spring 2005
GSI Workshops On Teaching

All workshops will be held in 331 Sproul, unless otherwise indicated.

Time: 12–1:30 pm
Location: 331 Sproul Hall

February 1 **Time Management for GSIs**

February 16 **Conducting Discussion Sections to Maximize Student Participation**

March 3 **Unlearning Racial/Gender Bias in the Classroom**

March 14 **Teaching Critical Reading across the Disciplines**

March 29 **Facilitating Research-based Learning**

April 14 * **Developing a Statement of Teaching Philosophy**

April 27 * **Teaching and the Academic Job Search**

* To be held in 370 Dwinelle

SPRING 2005 COLLOQUIUM

Teaching Foreign Languages in Multicultural Settings

Saturday, February 12, 2005

Section I - 9:00 am-12:30 pm - Language and language learning in a multilingual perspective

Monica Heller, University of Toronto
Who gets to define what counts as language? Ideology and interest in language teaching

Robert Train, Sonoma State University
Ideologies and realities of language and foreign language education in the U.S.: A critical perspective on the Native Standard Language

Daniel Véronique, Université Paris III
Transferability, transfer and the transferable: Aspects of the teaching and learning of foreign languages and cultures

Leo van Lier, Monterey Institute of International Studies
Self and identity in multilingual settings: An ecological-semiotic point of view

Section II - 2:00 pm-6:00 pm - Multilingual learning environments

Dominique Charbonneau, Université Paris III
Studying and teaching French literature in France and the U.S.

Patchareerat Yanaprasart, Université de Fribourg
Professional mobility and the intercultural speaker

Gudrun Ziegler, Université Paris III
Categorization and category formation: A basic need in language learning environments?

Anna Livia, UC Berkeley
The return of translation

Sunday, February 13, 2005

Section III - 9:00 am-12:30 pm - Acquisition of multiliteracies

Danièle Moore, Simon Fraser University
Pluriliterate practices and literacy development at home and at school

Richard Kern, UC Berkeley
Multiliteracies and foreign language learning

Guillaume Gentil, Carleton University
If only teachers of English and French talked to each other: Bilingual students' challenges in developing academic and professional biliteracy at the university

Edith Cognigni, Università degli Studi di Macerata
Co-constructed language biographies: English as a 'resource language' in the learning of Italian as an L2

Nazario Pierdominici, Università degli Studi di Macerata
Self-representation and sense of belonging in Italy today

Section IV - 2:00 pm-6:00 pm - Teacher development in plurilingual settings

Geneviève Zarate, INALCO
From 'one' to many: New developments in the training of teachers of French as a foreign language within a European framework

Aline Gohard-Radenkovic, Université de Fribourg
The different levels of plurilingualism and principles for the construction of a plurilingual didactics at the university level

Francisco Alarcón, UC Davis
Teaching the multilingual, multicultural student in California schools

Thao Tran-Minh, Université Paris III
The notion of syncretism: Identity and language

Alastair Pennycook, University of Technology, Sydney
Teaching with the flow: Plurilingualism and permeable classrooms

Date: February 12-13, 2005   Location: 370 Dwinelle

BLC

FELLOWSHIPS

Berkeley Language Center
Instructional Research Fellowships
For 2005–06

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 2005–06.

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 Kramsch, 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 Kramsch, **ckramsch@socrates.berkeley.edu** or Mark Kaiser, **mkaiser@socrates.berkeley.edu**.

Berkeley Language Center
Professsional Development Fellowships
For 2005–06

For Language 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 2005–06.

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 Kramsch, 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 Kramsch, **ckramsch@socrates.berkeley.edu** or Mark Kaiser, **mkaiser@socrates.berkeley.edu**.

**A fellowship application form is available in the BLC office, B-40 Dwinelle Hall
or can be downloaded at http://blc.berkeley.edu/fellowship.htm**

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 Kramsch
Berkeley Language Center
Fellowship Program
B-40 Dwinelle Hall, MC #2640

Deadline for Application: Monday, March 7, 2005

BLC LECTURES

CONFERENCES

**Saturday & Sunday,
February 12-13**

COLLOQUIUM: TEACHING
FOREIGN LANGUAGES IN
MULTICULTURAL SETTINGS

9–6 pm, 370 Dwinelle Hall

❧

Tuesday, February 15

LANGUAGE POLICY AND
THE ECOLOGICAL TURN

Alastair Pennycook

Professor
Language in Education,
Faculty of Education
University of Technology, Sydney

5–7 pm, 370 Dwinelle Hall

❧

Wednesday, March 16

FIFTY PROBABLY TRUE AND
USEFUL FINDINGS FROM SLA

Richard Schmidt

Professor
Second Language Studies
University of Hawai'i-Manoa

4–6 pm, 370 Dwinelle Hall

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

Tuesday, April 19

LINGUISTIC AND CULTURAL
IDENTITY IN STUDY ABROAD

Richard Kern

Associate Professor & Director,
French Language Program
UC Berkeley

4–6 pm, 370 Dwinelle Hall

❧

Wednesday, May 4

AT THE INTERFACE: DYNAMIC
INTERACTIONS OF EXPLICIT
AND IMPLICIT LANGUAGE
KNOWLEDGE

Nick Ellis

Professor & Research Scientist,
English Language Institute
University of Michigan

4–6 pm, 370 Dwinelle Hall

❧

Friday, May 13

INSTRUCTIONAL
DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH
PROJECTS

BLC Fellows:

Anna Livia
Jeremy Ecke
Robert Schechtman
Natasha Azarian

3–5 pm, 370 Dwinelle Hall

March 24-26, 2005
DigitalStream 7th Annual Conference: Theory and Practice: Foreign Language Pedagogy with Evolving Technology. SWALLT, The South-West Association for Language Learning Technology (http://www.humanities.uci.edu/hirc/SWALLT/), will hold its spring meeting in conjunction with the conference.
California State University,
Monterey Bay,
Seaside, CA
http://wlc.csumb.edu/
digitalstream/2005/index.html

March 30-April 2, 2005
TESOL's 39th Annual Convention and Exhibit: Teaching Learning, Learning Teaching: A Nexus in Texas
San Antonio, TX
http://www.tesol.org

July 24-29, 2005
The 14th World Congress of Applied Linguistics, hosted by the American Association for Applied Linguistics
Madison, WI
http://www.aila2005.org/

December 27-30, 2005
The 121st Annual Modern Language Association of America (MLA) Conference
Washington, DC
http://www.mla.org/convention

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.

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

Change Service Requested

Non-Profit Org.
US Postage
PAID
UC Berkeley

BLC

SPRING 2005 NEWSLETTER