

LANGUAGE TEACHING AT BERKELEY

VOLUME NO. 20 ISSUE NO. 1 FALL 2004

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
victoria@socrates.berkeley.edu

GRAPHIC DESIGNER
Orlando Garcia
space@uclink.berkeley.edu

BERKELEY
LANGUAGE CENTER

Claire Kramtsch
Director
510.643.5136

Mark Kaiser
Associate Director
510.642.7221

SERVICES
510.642.0767
Administrative Services ext 10
Classroom Services ext 19
Duplication Services ext 29
Library Services ext 24
Recording Studio ext 12

IN THIS ISSUE

Conversation with
Gunther Kress 1

Notes from the Director... 5

Fall 2004 Enrollments 5

Notes from the
Associate Director 6

BLC Outreach 7

BLC Fellows' Reports 8

Announcements 13

Calendar 15

In spring 2004, Professor Gunther Kress, Institute of Education, University of London, was interviewed by Mark Evan Nelson, a Ph.D. student in the Graduate School of Education at UC Berkeley.

MN: Professor Kress, we're very happy to have you here. Your work is important to many people—it's been a particular inspiration to me. Would you talk a bit about the people whose work has inspired and directed your own?

GK: I, too, am happy to be here. Influences? Colleagues with whom I've worked over many years have influenced me greatly. A direct and telling influence is the work of Chomsky because at one stage, as for many others, I had to be a transformationalist. I was interested in *Syntactic Structures* and *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*, and, for maybe ten years, in the ideas of transformational grammar. I was interested in transformational grammar and at the same time uneasy about it, especially the treatment of deep and surface structure and the separation of syntax and semantics.

I came to the work of Michael Halliday and for some reason, and maybe the reason is not "some" reason but has

to do with my own biography—being bicultural and bilingual, his ideas immediately felt right. Connection between the social and the representational is a central issue for me. His work spoke to me: I could see in Hallidayan linguistics that there was a connection of meaning and form. Overtly, that's how the system is arranged, with a real connection between the social environment and the linguistic form. There was also a place for the use of the representational resources in the sense that the system includes a *chooser* of options. I did a post-graduate course at London when Halliday was professor there, got infected by the virus, and haven't been able to shake it. It's like malaria; it stays in your blood and you can control it, but you can't get rid of it.

I was at East Anglia, a university that prided itself on interdisciplinary studies, during the 1960s and 1970s, and was affected by colleagues

in literary studies, philosophy, and sociology there. In that context, I was attempting to make linguistics telling for students who were doing interdisciplinary courses. I was beginning to work on a form of linguistics that would make sense to them. If somebody were a history major, why should they be doing linguistics? If somebody were a literature major, what would linguistics offer to them that was more than a merely formal stylistics account? So, many of the colleagues with whom I worked in that enterprise were important for me, in different ways—Bob Hodge, David Aers, Tony Trew.

At that time, I was influenced by the work of Chomsky and Halliday. From Chomsky I took the notion of transformation. However, I was taking it, by then rather unfashionably, to be a real process, a process with mental reality that did affect meaning. There had been a debate in the preceding ten years over whether transformations were merely formal processes that left meaning unchanged—Chomsky's position—or whether they

did in fact change it. I took a realist notion of it and then married that to Halliday's thinking and out of those—and in intense collaboration with Bob

Hodge—came the book *Language as Ideology*.

An influence on *Language as Ideology* was that at East Anglia in the early 1970s everyone took part in reading groups on Marx. My literary colleagues were reading Marx in order to understand literary works, and I wondered if one read Marx, would it have an effect on how one understood language. In Marxian terms, the assumption can be that language is a super-structural category that rests on the economic/social organization of the society of those who fashion language. It's a semiotic account of language: it says that the linguistic forms—in terms of the sign—are reflections directly of the economic organization of the social. I read Marx, and Marxists like Althusser, and people who weren't directly Marxist like Foucault. People at that time were beginning to read Voloshinov and Bakhtin, although they didn't make much sense to me at that time. They made

A CONVERSATION WITH PROFESSOR GUNTHER KRESS

by Mark Evan Nelson, UC Berkeley

sense to me when I had discovered for myself the issues they were addressing. So that's the bundle of people whom I've found important.

MN: Great, thank you. You said that you grew up in a bicultural/bilingual situation. Could you give a two-sentence explanation of that?

GK: Well, I didn't grow up in it. I grew up in Germany and learned German culture, being, and identity. Then in my mid-teens I was transported—one of the last people to be transported to Australia—and then learned, or attempted to learn, a new culture and its representational forms. Therefore, for me representational form and cultural and social practices are utterly connected. I can't imagine thinking of them separately. However, in that connection, there's also the question of what one calls subjectivity or identity. How we form ourselves is dependent on the social and representational resources that we use to shape ourselves.

MN: You presaged many topics that would become extremely important. Identity and related subjects are huge topics now.

GK: Yes, they're huge topics because the social conditions have changed. Immigration of the 19th-century variety, which stopped roughly in the 1950s, didn't elicit those questions or allow them to emerge. You were supposed simply to switch from one place to another and in a sense forget the one place when you had moved to the other. Of course, it didn't happen like that, but officially, there was no place to express what the former place continued to be in the new place. The facts of nation-states and citizenship meant that you changed your citizenship, and with citizenship, you changed identity. The effects of all that by the 1960s and 1970s were multiculturalism, multilingualism, and multi lots-of-things. When the severe constraints of the Cold War broke up, these things could find their expression. There was a new concession towards those who had less social power. A notion of equity in a kind of social trade became possible or seemed necessary. Multiculturalism of the 1960s and 1970s started from the position that "we" are the dominant group but "you" who have come here shall share in that which we have and may express that which you have

brought with you. I think that has led to the intensity of that issue now in its various and continuing transformations.

MN: Central to your work is the concept of multimodality. Can you give us a definition of that? How you define it for yourself?

GK: I define it as a recognition of the presence of always-more-than-one means of representation in any context of representation or communication. It's the acknowledgement that there's a co-presence of a number of means of representation, differently shaped or different in their characteristics, at the same time—all used in what colleagues of mine and I have called *orchestrations*. The rhetorical task is not merely to choose the best possible means from one resource but to bring a number of different resources together in orchestrating the representational means that you have in relation to the rhetorical task, that is the audience and your understanding of the audience, and of course that which you wish to communicate.

For me representational form and cultural and social practices are utterly connected.

Multimodality is more than simply recognizing that we humans sometimes use gestures and sounds, or that we use actions or spatial positions that can be termed non-verbal (as in psychology) or considered forms of expression, representation (as in anthropology). Multimodality attempts to bring everything together in one coherent theory of representation. In this, it does away with the notion of the non-verbal, the extra-linguistic, which has language in the center and these other things peripherally arranged around it.

MN: The idea of verbal and non-verbal is a binary, structuralist way of looking at things.

GK: Yes, it is binary, with the linguistic mode as central, and all the other modes regarded as one set of diverse phenomena, as the non-linguistic.

MN: Why did you choose an essentially Hallidayan systemic functional framework to describe the grammar of visual design as opposed to talking about pictures in terms of linguistic grammatical elements? Why couldn't you talk about the nouns and

verbs of a pictorial space or why couldn't you, as many people did in early study of visual literacy, talk about grammar in terms of compositional elements like line, form, and point?

GK: That's a big question. I suppose the way you conceive of that which becomes your field of inquiry depends on where you start. If you start from a position that separating meaning from form is a distortion of how human semiosis works, then you wouldn't want to look at structural elements alone and then concoct, as in linguistics, another sort of semantics, another field in which you look at what these things mean. At the same time it may be that if you're an art historian or practitioner of design you *are* interested in what these resources are and therefore you might want to have a description of what the available resources are in that field. If, however, you want to account for how humans make meaning—that may not be a good starting point.

As many other people, I found the Hallidayan system plausible. Of course, it's plausible in the way that Jakobson's or Bühler's systems are plausible, starting not from form, but from function, and saying that people do things for reasons of social use rather than for reasons of wishing to instantiate structures. I don't know what would have happened if one had chosen a kind of Jakobsonian or Bühlerian functionalist approach. The functionalist approach is important. The Hallidayan approach, as you know, comes from Malinowski and it seemed plausible and sufficient.

What we took from Halliday, Theo van Leeuwen and I, were two things: firstly, the general semiotic shape of the conception of human semiosis—that it is always focused on social purposes, functions—and secondly, that it is a system of resources which has an inner organization. It's not simply there for you to pick and choose from as you want, but it has an organization. In other words, culture, over its history, in social arrangements, has provided organization in that resource. In Hallidayan linguistics, that's expressed as a system network.

Now for me, the social-semiotic aspect of the Hallidayan model is, first, the

three functions and working with those meta-functions. I want to see what happens assuming that any fully functional human semiotic system would need to be able to fulfill the textual (being able to form texts coherently internally and with the environment); the ideational (representing those things which humans wish to represent about their experiences in the world); and the interpersonal (making expressions about state, standing, or relation to other participants in the social situation of communication). Maybe all semiotic systems need to be able to express these things to be fully functioning semiotic systems. That was the basis. I'm not sure that the system network is for me a completely plausible account of how human semiosis works, although it captures regularities that you can demonstrate, but whether it's a completely plausible account, I don't know.

Above all, we wanted to say that the materiality—moving away from abstractions like language or the language system—of the resource itself means that how signs are shaped or made will be specific through that materiality. It will be specific because the materiality of the resource is different from instance of mode to instance of another mode. Speech, depending on sound as it does, will be different from images, depending on graphic material as they do, markings on a surface. It's simply a different resource and therefore you cannot blithely import the categories you've developed in relation to the materiality of one resource to the description of another resource that is materially entirely differently constituted. I'm not sure whether that answers your question.

MN: It answers it perfectly. A theme that runs through a lot of your work involves the graphic or pictorial mode gradually eclipsing the written. I think the phrase you use is "pushing it off the page."

GK: Yes, it's a center and margin metaphor for me. What's in the center and what contestation is about interest me.

MN: How and why do you think this has been happening and what do you think the implications might be? I know those are big questions.

GK: I frankly don't know. Why it might be happening is a big and important

question. We've had a century of screen-as-medium running alongside page-as-medium. For some reason, in the West or maybe in the sphere of influence of the West, humans have found the screen a very attractive medium for communication, either receptively or productively. Humans have communicated via screens before: we've called them canvases, walls, frescoes, paintings. There's nothing new about representing on a surface graphically. As for why it has happened now, I don't know. Is it the advent of the technology of the screen, or of various kinds of screen? We also know, however, that technologies don't get adapted unless the social conditions are such that there is a reason for them to be adapted. Sometimes they are shifted, shaped, and even skewed. Text messaging, for instance, wasn't meant to be what it has become.

In part, I think it has to do with democratization in the sense that writing requires greater effort initially than image in terms of engagement with a means of communication, and so within

Speech, depending on sound as it does, will be different from images, depending on graphic material as they do.

a society the visual offers a more equitable means of communication. Certainly in relation to textbooks that's one of the major driving forces. You wanted in science to be able to speak to a group, and as schools were opened to mass participation from the 1950s on, that is schooling beyond the age of 14 or 15, you wanted that new population that came into the school to have access to science. Maybe it seemed that image offered an easier route. Maybe also, with democratization, and with the changing in the school population from an elite to the mass, the confidence of those who taught began to diminish about whether they could actually enforce communication, that is teaching, the didactic means, through language alone, through writing alone, but had to be open to other forms. For instance, the gender issue of boys and girls in science. One wanted not to exclude young women from science. So I think there's a whole range of social factors: multicul-

turalism makes it impossible to rely on language easily as the only means of communication. None of them strikes me, certainly not by themselves, as satisfactory. I don't know whether any of those conjoined begin to provide an account. I simply don't know.

MN: It's a very important point that you make that considering multiculturalism, language cannot be relied upon as the sole mode. I'm thinking about standardized testing and the kinds of criticisms that people level against it, things like asking someone a verbal analogy or taking for granted that a kid understands that a saucer goes underneath a cup when questions like that may be beyond the realm of some people's experience. It seems like the visual mode is an important way to overcome situations like that.

GK: I think that's a huge field that we ought to understand because without understanding the forces that are at work, it's difficult to predict what the future will hold. The past world won't tell us how the future will pan out, but it might give us some clues as to how it might.

MN: What do you think about that? Some of the kinds of texts that you've traced the development of over that last 50 or 80 years have been newspapers and science textbooks. What do you think a science textbook might look like in 20 years? Or sound or feel or smell like? Do you think the book is on the way out?

GK: Well, the first thing I would say is that the book isn't a stable entity. The book, the sequence of sounds *book*, is something that has shifted as a signifier throughout its history. That which is now called a textbook would not have been called a textbook 40 years ago. Now textbooks, in many school-subjects, tend to be collections, between more or less hard covers, of worksheets, in which the central aspects of information—the curriculum—is presented increasingly through image, whereas before, 30 or 40 years ago, textbooks were systematically developed and set out bodies of knowledge presented predominantly in the mode of writing. We still call these objects *book*. Modally, the book used to be dominated by print absolutely. Modally, the book now, the same kind of

book, let's say the textbook, is just about dominated by image, modally speaking, but we still call it *book*. We allow ourselves to be caught by a little deception stemming from a former theory of language about words, that words are stable entities of meaning, so that book remains book.

MN: Would you say that even though the physical format of the book has not really changed that it has become functionally more interactive?

GK: Representation in the book—that has changed. If the textbook is now a collection of worksheets between covers, then of course, in terms of the relation of book to reader we have a profound change. Of course, there are books other than textbooks, and that is a different issue yet again. I notice, for instance, the startling use of banal images in the novels of W.G. Sebald. You ask how a book might sound or smell. There are children's books where you push something and it squeaks, or push something else and it squirts. I don't know where that will go. I suspect that if you look at science textbooks in the period of the 1970s and early 1980s what you see is utter confusion and madness. It looked as though book designers had collectively lost their heads: what they had actually lost was a sense of confidence about their audience. Before 1950 or 1960, a science textbook was written by a single author. The science textbook of today is written by a group, a design group—it's designed by a group of people. You usually don't start from the written text, but you start from issues that are to be put forward and then design decisions are made about how that should be done.

In the 1970s and 1980s what you see is that the use of image is chaotic because it wasn't clear what the images were meant to be doing. Were we putting images in to attract these people's attention, to keep their attention, or to make the thing more memorable, or more entertaining? Or was it perhaps, even, that certain things in science, or in history, could be much more aptly represented in image than in word? There was confusion of all of those motives and I think that confusion will abate. Over

the next decade, what you'll see is that those who make these books, who design these things, will sort out how one starts in any case. The curriculum will be primary, and decisions about which aspects of the curriculum are best represented by which mode will decide how things are represented and the pedagogic aspects will decide whether you use visual or verbal modes. I think you'll come into a period of stability in which the visuals will largely have one kind of task and the verbal will have other ranges of tasks. Moreover, the relations between them will settle down.

The person with whom I had done three projects in science education, Jon Ogborn, who was professor of science education at the Institute of Education in London, was afterwards employed by the Institute of Physics to design a new A-level syllabus. The new syllabus pushed visualization right up to the A-level, the

The media is already subject to control, massively, because where there is power, you have contestation and the powerful are loath to give up power.

matriculation level in the English system. It is a seriously visualized book. We had jointly been working on these issues. It would seem clear from what he was doing, thinking, and saying that many aspects of physics are more amenable, are more aptly represented in image than in writing. Some of the attempts where now you have textbooks in certain subjects which are becoming visual because it seems to be the thing to do, maybe they'll retreat in certain ways from visuality and that will settle down, too.

MN: Have you drawn on the work of people like Edward Tufte?

GK: I think he's one of the most intelligent as well as most skilled representers of these things. What I think he does is show you what needs to be attended to and incorporated into a semiotic theory. I wouldn't have any criticism of what he's doing because he's not attempting to do that: integrate those things into an

overarching semiotic theory. But, yes, certainly, I've drawn on him.

MN: We can think about the idea of multimodality as not being a new idea. Writing is multimodal—kinesthetic and visual—as are ritual dances performed with colorful masks, movement, and choral response. Incredibly cohesive multimodal texts were created. Would you say, then, that the screen is the only thing that distinguishes the sort of multimodality that has been practiced for thousands of years from the kind of multimodality that you're talking about now?

GK: I don't quite know how to answer that. What distinguishes the kinds of things Ruth Finnegan talks about in her book, *Communicating*, that she published two or three years ago with Routledge—about forms of communication in Africa—from *our* situation where “our” means a Western-influenced sphere, is that we're moving out of the dominance of the book and print. We're coming out of that period and moving into the dominance of the screen and of the image. The transition from that state to another state is what's important. Another thing of importance is the facility that the new technologies allow every one of us who has access to the technologies to participate in the production of these textual forms in ways that weren't possible before. This is the source of the utopian projects or predictions about the effect of the new technologies. The historical shift is important.

MN: How do you feel about those utopian predictions, about what's possible now because everyone has these new technologies at their disposal? Do you really think that the potential for self-expression is really as hopeful as many people would believe it is?

GK: Well, the first thing to say is what everybody says—not everybody has access. But if one left that aside and assumed it was a world in which everybody did have access, then the moment representational power moves to a new mode or media, then the representational police will come along and will bring back, first of all, order. Then there will also be a battle about who should have control over representational power. Power will always be an area in which

NOTES FROM THE DIRECTOR

In the name of the Berkeley Language Center, I wish to welcome all of you to the new fall term! Since our lovely end-of-the-year picnic in Tilden Park on May 12, many of you have been abroad and have renewed contact with the language and the culture you will be teaching. I'm sure you will have lots of the latest stories from the field to tell. Your students will be fortunate to get, through you, a feel for the large world out there of speakers of languages other than English.

We welcome home Professor Richard Kern, who has returned from his two-year directorship of the EAP program in Lyon. We also welcome new colleagues in various departments: Desiree Pries is the new lecturer and program coordina-

tor for second-year French. Inez Hol-lander is lecturer in Dutch Studies teach- ing all levels of Dutch. Kajal Chatterjee is lecturer in South and Southeast Asian Studies and will be teaching Bengali.

The BLC will continue to serve you this year with its rich fare of guest lectures and colloquia, its library and its language media center, its financial support for professional travel, and its research fel- lowships program. Sonia S'hiri continues this year to serve as the BLC Academic Coordinator. She will meet with lectur- ers and language program coordinators in various ways throughout the term. Mark Kaiser and I remain available for consultation on any issue related to lan- guage teaching and learning. Watch out for the monthly announcements of our

by Claire Kramersch, BLC Director

Lecture Series, and keep in mind two important deadlines: November 1 for travel funds for language teaching lectur- ers and March 1 for application for BLC research fellowships for next year. Feel free to contact me <ckramersch@socrates. berkeley.edu> or Mark Kaiser <mkaiser@ socrates.berkeley.edu> for details.

We look forward to hearing from you with ideas, tips, suggestions, and desiderata for library acquisitions. We hope to see as many of you as possible at the BLC events every month and at the BLC picnic next May.

My very best wishes for a great fall semester!

Fall 2004 Enrollments in First-year Language Courses at UC Berkeley

Compiled by Mark Kaiser and Victoria Williams

As of September 14, 2004, first-year language courses had the following enrollments:

Armenian	11	Hungarian	4	Serbian/Croatian	5
Arabic	80	Italian	222	Spanish	283
Bengali	8	Japanese	289	Heritage	22
Chinese	320	Khmer	9	No previous exposure	261
Mandarin heritage	115	Korean	109	Swahili	28
Other dialect heritage	94	Heritage	60	Swedish	19
No previous exposure	111	No previous exposure	49	Tagalog	76
Czech	6	Latin	111	Tamil	10
Danish	8	Malay/Indonesian	16	Thai	37
Dutch	8	Norwegian	6	Tibetan	12
Finnish	12	Persian	44	Turkish	10
French	316	Polish	12	Urdu	19
Georgian	4	Portuguese	129	Uzbek	2
German	175	No previous exposure	18	Vietnamese	67
Greek (Ancient)	37	Other Romance language	111	Welsh	12
Greek (Modern)	10	Punjabi	19	Yiddish	5
Hebrew	34	Russian	62	Total:	2,711
Biblical Hebrew	15	Heritage	10		
Hindi	50	No previous exposure	52		

NOTES FROM THE ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR

by Mark Kaiser, BLC Associate Director

I am writing to report on a number of initiatives underway at the BLC that will have a major impact on the way that the BLC delivers instructional materials to students of foreign languages. The impetuses for undertaking these changes have been a technologically deteriorating infrastructure and continuing reductions in our operating budget, as well as some good news from Washington. As you read this report, please think about the consequences to your language program and I encourage you to send comments to mkaiser@socrates.berkeley.edu.

The 27 eight-year-old computers in 135 Dwinelle Hall (our largest lab) were replaced this summer. The four-year-old computers in 33 Dwinelle Hall (the high-tech classroom) and the computers in 134 Dwinelle Hall (the smaller computer lab for audio recording) are scheduled to be replaced this fall. With two-year-old computers in B-21 Dwinelle, our computer labs will now house technologically adequate machines.

Unfortunately, fast advanced computers are only as good as the network infrastructure, when using any application on the Internet or when working with a local server. Currently the BLC relies on a 10Base-T shared network, which is proving woefully inadequate to our needs. A 10Base-T shared network is limited to 10 MB of data to all computers on any one node. Due to the ever-increasing demands on our network, including widespread use of video and audio files, the NEH grant (see below), and copying program and media files from one computer to another, the performance of our network is noticeably affected. CNS is proposing a 100Base-T switched network, which would increase the capabilities to 100 MB for each computer on the network (in other words, computer A could be passing a 100 MB file to computer B at the same time that computer C is passing a 100 MB file to computer D). However, the cost of the upgrade is significant, due to the maintenance costs that CNS builds into

their pricing structure. Moreover, CNS's pricing structure is such that for every new computer that we hook up (see below), we will be charged approximately \$10/month for the connection. If we add 25 computers over the next few years, we're facing \$3,000 annually in connection charges. It is also unclear how long a 100Base-T switched network would prove adequate.

Alternatively, the BLC could "go private." This would involve installing our own network and no longer relying on CNS for maintenance and support. The initial outlays are significantly less, and when we expand the number of connections, there would be no monthly service fee. Moreover, we could build an infrastructure that would have 1 GB T lines to key network components (file server, web audio server, audio archiving machines). But the BLC is a small operation, and maintaining our network by ourselves could involve considerable personnel resources and potential inconvenience to faculty and students when the network fails. We have, therefore, accepted the CNS proposal for a 100Base-T network upgrade that should be completed by October 10.

Due to budget cuts, the BLC had to lay off its electronics engineer, one of whose responsibilities was the maintenance of our analog tape machines. His departure has forced us to accelerate the transition from analog to digital. Consequently, effective at the end of this academic year, the BLC will no longer provide facilities for listening to analog audiotape and will cease circulating analog tape of materials for at-home use. Instead, we will be relying on Internet-based distribution of materials from the Online Lessons page of our website. Students will have access to these materials either from their own computers or by using the computers in BLC labs. We will continue for the time being to sell on both tape and CD those items for which we have copyright permission.

BLC staff has been very busy this summer redesigning the BLC website. We hope you will find the new site more intuitive and easier to navigate. Please have a look at <http://blc.berkeley.edu>

I am pleased to announce that the BLC has been awarded a two-year, \$209,000.00 NEH grant to digitize its analog tape archive of linguistic field recordings of Native American and other endangered languages, and where appropriate, to make the recordings available from the BLC website. The project, designated one of ten *We, the People* projects, is directed by Professor Leanne Hinton of the Department of Linguistics.



This last spring semester, I organized two meetings for lecturers and two meetings for language program coordinators. At the first lecturers' meeting, Carla Trujillo, Director of the Graduate Opportunity Program, opened the discussion by presenting her research on gender, race, and other forms of bias in the classroom and offering guidelines on how to enhance greater equity among students. Trujillo's research shows that professors ask more complicated questions of white students than of students of color, push white students to better their responses to professors' questions more than they do students of color, and spend significantly more time responding to the questions of white students than to those of students of color. In response to an end-of-semester survey, professors also indicated that they had lower expectations of students of color compared to white students, yet responded in the affirmative when asked if they treated their students in the same manner. Trujillo offered some useful tips for creating a more inclusive classroom atmosphere that can be found at http://engineering.ucdavis.edu/pages/publications/gender/gender_hand7.html. She also encouraged instructors to be particularly conscious of their own biases and to work actively on changing their behaviors if they could not change their attitudes. The discussion that ensued tackled the issue of whether the language classroom might face biases different from those encountered in other disciplines and then went on to address some of the language-specific biases raised.

At the second lecturers' meeting, we examined the question of so-called "heritage speakers" in our language classrooms. There are programs with separate heritage tracks at UCB, such as Chinese, Persian, Russian, and Korean, as well as programs with heritage and non-heritage students in mixed classes, such as Arabic, Armenian, and Hebrew. Although the majority of instructors reported adhering to a proficiency-based definition in the placement and assessment of their heritage students, some challenged this definition as dismissive and neglectful of the heritage students' cultural literacy and

sense of identity. The group also shared some best classroom practices designed to improve heritage students' learning experiences.

The first language coordinators' meeting focused on the repercussions of the implementation of the Graduate Council's *Policy on Appointments and Mentoring of GSIs* on the quality and nature of 300-level courses (teacher-training for GSIs) offered within language programs on campus. The coordinators present painted a picture that varied greatly across language programs. A few did not have a 300-level course at all or were in a program that included various unrelated languages, each placing different constraints on the 300-level course that must now be designed in accordance with the new policy. Most, however, have had a course in place for many years, but needed clarification on the new GSI Teaching and Resource Center online course component and its implications for the workload of both GSIs and coordinators. Concern was also voiced regarding the fact that GSIs from smaller programs (four GSIs or fewer) may no longer have the option of receiving training within their own programs because of budgetary constraints and the possibility of their teacher training courses being taken over by larger programs. Linda von Hoene, Director of the GSI Teaching and Research Center, who attended the final part of the meeting, noted the coordinators' concerns in order to pass them on to the Committee for GSI Affairs.

The second coordinators' meeting focused on how to encourage GSIs' self-reflection in a constructive manner. First, the discussion addressed the issue of training GSIs in the development of teaching portfolios to ensure their competitiveness on the job market. Although most program coordinators recognized the value of helping GSIs build and describe their teaching effectiveness and construct a more rounded image of themselves through the portfolio, they also admitted being slow in catching up with this trend. The reason for this lack of enthusiasm seemed to emanate from

either the students' or the coordinators' resistance to the sense of marketing associated with this endeavor. Second, the meeting explored the various ways in which to instill the habit of critical reflection in GSIs under training. This was envisaged not only as a component of the 300-level course curriculum, but also as a particularly important aspect of the modeling role that the coordinator plays. The coordinators' willingness to engage in critically reflective teaching themselves, and therefore serve as a model that inspires the GSI to do the same, is an important factor in developing this long-lasting skill.

The spring semester culminated in a beautiful picnic in Tilden Park, thanks mainly to Claire, who prepared much of the exquisite food herself.

The fall semester will start with a reception for all language lecturers on September 14, from 3:30–5:00 p.m., in 34 Dwinelle Hall. Also, please mark your calendars for two meetings for language program coordinators (from 12:00–2:00 p.m. on Thursday, September 29 and Tuesday, November 9), and two meetings for lecturers (from 12:00–2:00 p.m. on Wednesday, October 20 and Tuesday, November 30) in 288 Barrows Hall.



BLC FELLOWS' REPORTS

Yiddish-language Heritage and Teaching in the 21st-Century

by Sarah Bailey, Ph.D. Candidate,
Department of German

Yiddish, a Germanic language written in Hebrew script, was first spoken by European Jews over one thousand years ago. Because the vast majority of the world's Yiddish-speaking population fell victim to the Nazis in the 20th-century only a fraction of the most traditional Jews speak Yiddish today. The world's secular Yiddish-speaking population is even smaller, and yet, remarkably productive. Yiddish language courses are benefiting from increased enrollments and original Yiddish literature and songs are being created by non-native speakers. Given the innovations of the non-native speaking population, it is remarkable that the preferred Yiddish language textbook of today was published in 1949. Roman Jakobson, the author of the textbook's original preface, speaks to the force of its strict grammar-only approach, writing: "There cannot be approximate knowledge of a literary language for its users. Full mastery or illiteracy, *tertium non datur*." Jakobson's statement blatantly denies what Second Language Acquisition (SLA) research calls "interlanguage," refusing recognition of today's Yiddish learner's goals and products. At the same time, the statement essentializes Yiddish as a purely literary language. While Jakobson's statement responds to a historically situated desire to preserve Yiddish as a language of high culture after the Holocaust, his words are now anachronistic at best. His statement, however, inspired the question which guided my research for the semester: How can a Yiddish-language pedagogy be imagined which recognizes the possibility of Yiddish and its learners being in dialogue with concepts circulating in SLA research today?

Today's research on heritage languages seemed an appropriate place to find support for such a pedagogy; after all, for most American Jews, Yiddish is not simply a literary language, but one that

is bound up in their cultural identities. Guadalupe Valdés gives the most productive definition of a heritage language learner. Valdés states that "a heritage student is one who is raised in a home where a non-English language is spoken, who speaks, or merely understands the heritage language, and who is to some degree bilingual in English and the heritage language." With this definition in mind, I created a survey for Berkeley's Yiddish students. The survey substantiated that most students had been exposed to Yiddish in familial homes, and had even retained vocabulary items from that experience. Despite their affinities with Valdés' definition, however, these students were far from bilingual. At the same time, given their cultural, even emotional attachment to the language, most Yiddish learners cannot be considered L2 learners. Investigating Yiddish in the context of heritage language research lays bare ambiguities in the field that extend beyond the definition of heritage language learner, however. These ambiguities, which affect SLA as a whole, include locating a perfect native speaker, and the determination of a specific speech community. Because the situation of Yiddish foregrounds these issues, developing a pedagogy suitable for Yiddish in the 21st-century could serve as a productive model for instruction in all languages.

Recently, the question of the perfect native speaker has been called into question. The perfect native speaker is part of what many researchers see as the unsatisfactory rigidity of the communicative approach—an approach which still teaches dictionary meanings and sentence-based grammar instead of encouraging students to recognize the opacity of the language-system they are learning. The problem of a standard language around which to develop a pedagogy is at its most acute in the case of Yiddish. Yiddish has never been a national language; it has also never functioned independently of the other languages amongst which it finds itself. Yiddish speakers have always been multilingual-speaking, sometimes reading, and writ-

ing one or more of their neighbor's languages, as well as speaking and reading the religious language of Hebrew. With such a diversity of dialects, cultures and histories, to which "heritage" do many of today's Yiddish students feel committed? Moreover, now that the world's native Yiddish-speaking population is vanishingly small, against which standard can students now be held in any event?

The idea of a speech community is similarly problematic for Yiddish. An immigrant language with no particular country (and indeed, multiple, simultaneous countries) of "origin," and, at the same time no claim to indigenous status anywhere, Yiddish continues, even in the face of an aging, secular, native-speaking population to wind its way into "all-American" speech via intonation patterns and lexical items like *Oy, vey* and *tukhas*. Too often, it seems, heritage or ancestral languages are overburdened with the shared imagined experience of one particular group, so that revitalization projects seem catalyzed by melancholy—the language is perceived as almost or already irretrievably lost. Yiddish stresses, by virtue of necessity in its own case, not only the creation and maintenance of a connection with the past, but also a large amount of playful self-reflexivity about that past and about the language's future for the student in the classroom community. The notion of preparation for a trip to, or an immersion experience within, "Yiddishland" has always been metaphorical for the student of Yiddish.

The differences the Yiddish classroom is forced to maintain may help to focus attention on notions that the heritage language classroom and the foreign language classroom too often take at face value. The notion of a "perfect native speaker" in foreign and heritage classrooms is one good example. Investigating this notion leads quickly to a string of questions: Why is it considered prestigious to speak in this particular way? What institutions have sanctioned which method of speaking and for what reason? The history and current situation of Yiddish force students to consider

these questions, challenging teachers and students to rethink their reliance on the shared imagined experiences which reinforce not only the concept of heritage languages, but also the territoriality and nationality that have become all too transparent in much of L2 teaching today.



Translingual Practice: Writing the Tropical Germany

by David Gramling, Ph.D. Candidate,
Department of German

In the national literature curricula of US colleges and universities over the past fifteen years, multiculturalism and migration have emerged prominently as topical areas for a cultural studies approach to literary study. With the partial dismantling of Cold War style “area studies” concepts and the foregrounding of political questions of representation throughout the 1980s, humanities departments were prompted to undertake a revision of their object of study in terms of citizenship, social positionality, and various axes of difference and distinction.

The newly unsettled bricolage of national literary studies in the US academy yielded a fruitful, troubling set of questions that demanded more than a philological view of literary competence. Although these questions accrued broad significance in seminars and conferences on literary and cultural topics, they were conspicuously withheld from language curricula, where even specifically multicultural topics remained enframed within a relatively monoglossic habitus. In the interest of a communicative approach, textbooks represented the German languages of Silesian high school students, Swabian grandmothers, Viennese executives, German Turkish lawyers, and Polish German restaurateurs as essentially non-variant. Paradoxically, linguistic and cultural difference remained the pedagogical jurisdiction of the literary curriculum.

Meanwhile in 1980s West Germany, fields such as Intercultural Germanistics and German as a Foreign Language began to play a pivotal role in promoting and adjudicating literature and

film by migrants and second-language speakers in a framework of sociological positivism. These institutional movements—from the Goethe Institut to the Berlin Senate to Second German Television—established prizes, competitions, and reading series soliciting contributions from migrant writers. These humanistic efforts tended to de-aestheticize and functionalize migrant cultural production as a resource for the public dissemination of an authentic story-world of migration experiences. As new forms of xenophobia quickly emerged after the 1973 discontinuation of the West German Guest worker program, the publishing category “Foreigner Literature” was established to close the gap “between two worlds” and ameliorate social tensions.

But as the governmental migration logic of “rotation” and “return” began to lose credibility in the 1980s, and a new generation of indigenous migrant youth claimed German-ness, the obsolescence of the category “Foreigner Literature” came to exemplify the problematic of West German citizenship law and its logic of blood heritage. From Emine Sevgi Özdamar’s short story *Career of a Cleaning Lady* to Sten Nadolny’s novel *Selim*, or *The Gift of Speech*, the 1980s yielded a new critical tradition that called state-sponsored multiculturalism to task. Writers and filmmakers enacted a stylistics of alienation and appropriation that claimed the German language unequivocally as its own performative field. There was, after all, no absent “other world” to represent, only an indigenous and transnational one, conditioned by axes of travel, third spaces, diasporic affiliations, and multilingualism in its broadest sense.

Most of our students in college-level national literature and language programs were born in the midst of this sea-change, and a large plurality of them have already lived much of their lives within these new globalizing, vernacular, and cosmopolitan proportions of “home.” Discrete spheres such as L1 and L2 are increasingly untenable for our students as linguistic subjects, and for sociolinguistic research as well.

How is the multilingualism of our students to be reconciled, on a psycho- and sociolinguistic level, with the monolin-

gual classroom habitus of a unitary target language? What range of German and German-ness are we equipping ourselves to teach? And what can the linguistic work of German-language writers of migration or multilingual backgrounds offer us in terms of teaching resources?

Translingual subjectivity is the fulcrum of a wide array of German-language texts, from the language-learning narrative of Elias Canetti’s *The Salvaged Tongue* to Franz Kafka’s conceptual refiguration of interlanguage in *The Sorrow of the House Father*, from Osman Engin’s deontic linguistic mimicry in his novel *Kanaken-Gandhi* to Kemal Kurt’s strident reinscription of the European high modernist intertext in *Yes, Says Molly*. As texts are produced along linguistic borders, they are particularly attuned to the meaning, process, and social dynamics of language acquisition and linguistic power.

The Berkeley Language Center supported a research and curriculum development project for spring 2004, in which I developed an annotated syllabus for a fifth-semester German language class which I have called “Translingual Practice: Writing the Tropical Germany.” Along with the questions above, the course had a number of goals:

1. To engage intermediate-advanced students of German in intensive stylistic and sociolinguistic analysis of very short canonical and non-canonical passages and texts. Short texts (3-5 pages) allow the beginning student of German-language literature to attend to the linguistic resources (speech genres, ranges of registers and lects, etc.) that produce the narrative, rather than seeking to overcome the language on the way toward a clear understanding of the plot.
2. To foreground the spectrum of semiotic and stylistic practices in migration or multilingual writing as instances of tactical linguistic design, and to engage in a critical comparison among various forms of linguistic migrations, including those in the language classroom.
3. To commit effort to exploring “German” as a multi-glossic, multi-genre field of symbolic capital-in-use-in-scribing class and gender positions.

4. To encourage students to recognize, analyze and produce in a wide variety of speech genres, from academic German to hip-hop German to regionally specific forms and border/contact dialects.
5. To investigate the history of linguistic diversity in Germany from the Annolied to Luther to Leibnitz, as well as the rise of monolingual ideology in the 19th-century.

The idea for such a course proceeded on the assumption that fifth-semester German students benefit from intensive critical work with linguistic diversity, and from a focus on the way stylistics attend all social interaction. It is my hope that such an approach to advanced language and literature study will contribute to students' erudition in High German, as well as their capacity to comprehend the dynamics of a living language. I am very grateful to the Berkeley Language Center for its generous support for this endeavor, and would be happy to share my syllabus with interested students and teachers. My email address is gramling@berkeley.edu.



Multilingualism Matters: Researching Multilanguage Acquisition in the Italian Classroom

by *Stephanie Hom Cary, Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Italian Studies*

Introduction

As more students enter college with knowledge of one or more foreign languages, the dynamics of the foreign language classroom are rapidly changing from a situation of second language acquisition (SLA) to one of multilanguage acquisition (MLA). In the case of Italian, previous knowledge of Romance languages, especially of Spanish, is the most notable source of cross-linguistic influence.

During my experience as a GSI for Italian 1, I encountered a sort of Spanish interlanguage almost daily, as my multilingual students created such phrases as "Quando ero molto joven" [When I was

very young; *joven* = Spanish for "young"] or "Sono arrivata muy temprano" [I arrived very early; *muy temprano* = Spanish for "very early"]. As I worked to correct these "errors," I became interested in why my students, the majority of whom were native speakers of English who had learned Spanish in high school, were falling back on their L2 instead of their L1. I also began to question how this phenomenon seemed to fly in the face of SLA pedagogy, which assumed that students were monolingual.

For the majority of Berkeley students Italian was not a second language; it was a third, often a fourth, sometimes a fifth, sixth, or even a seventh language. The aim of my BLC project was to explore the specificities of the multilingualism that shapes the Italian classroom, as well as the complexity associated with MLA. Furthermore, I intended to raise awareness about multilingualism and MLA among GSIs, by developing two three-hour lessons on those topics for use in a 300-level pedagogy course.

Lesson #1: Portrait of the L3 environment

The first of my two lessons outlines the "linguistic environment" of the Italian classroom at UC Berkeley. To create an accurate map of this "environment," I enlisted the help of my colleagues in the Italian Studies department to administer a survey to all 338 students enrolled in an Italian language course in the spring of 2004; 174, or about 51%, were returned. The goals of the survey were threefold: 1) to compile "demographic" data on the students taking Italian, 2) to understand their main motivations for studying Italian, and 3) to assess their levels of multilingualism.

The most interesting result of the survey was that the majority of students enrolled in Italian had some knowledge of at least one language other than English, which for more than 90% of the students was a Romance language, most commonly Spanish. Only 11 students claimed to be "monolingual," that is, they were learning Italian as an L2.

According to both students and GSIs, the perceived language distance, or lack thereof, between Spanish and Italian, lent an immediate advantage to Spanish speakers learning Italian. As one student

noted on her survey, "Those who have a background in Spanish seem to be learning Italian more quickly and easily. This seems to be a common trend."

The "errors" caused by the cross-linguistic influence of Spanish were almost exclusively lexical. Building on Christine Bouvy's (2000) research into cross-linguistic transfer, these "errors" could be classified as: 1) direct borrowing or gap-filling, 2) phonological interference, 3) spelling interference, and 4) lexeme copying. There were also some morphological "errors," such as morpho-semantic code mixing, but these were much more rare.

Spanish as the heritage language of Italian

In all of these cases, the majority of students were not falling back on their L1, which was almost always English, but instead, borrowing from their L2 (usually Spanish). More interestingly, many claimed only superficial knowledge of Spanish, yet relied more on this cursory knowledge of the L2 when learning Italian, than on their "native" L1.

This recourse to the L2 creates a linguistic environment conditioned by a sort of "heritage language," what is different in the case of Italian is that Spanish functions as its heritage language. Furthermore, it is not a heritage language as defined by Guadalupe Valdés and others, but a "heritage" fostered in the high-school classroom rather than at home among family and friends.

While there has been much research done on the relationship between SLA and heritage language acquisition, the phenomenon I observed in the Italian classroom thus calls into question both the notion of "heritage," and the heretofore unexplored relationship between MLA and "heritage" language acquisition.

Lesson #2: Multilanguage acquisition and pedagogical recommendations

The goals of my second lesson are two-fold: 1) to give an overview of the scholarship on MLA, and in particular, the research on Italian and multilingualism, and 2) to outline some pedagogical recommendations that draw on theories of heritage language acquisition and to

challenge the GSIs to create their own teaching strategies for the multilingual classroom.

There has been little research to date on the relationship between MLA and Italian, much less the relationship between Spanish and Italian. With the exception of one master's thesis that explores the linguistic "interference" between French and Italian in a small sample of students from Georgia, there has been no scholarship that addresses the questions and challenges posed by MLA for Italian language learners.

Given that Spanish is the principal "heritage" language of Italian, and that it is a constitutive condition of the Italian classroom, what kind of learning environment would best facilitate language acquisition in this multilingual context? The most obvious pedagogical recom-

mendation would be to design an Italian course specifically for students with a background in Romance languages. Yet, given the vast numbers of students who enroll in Italian already knowing Spanish or French, almost every Italian class should to some degree be treated as "Italian for Romance Language Speakers."

Borrowing from pedagogies of heritage language acquisition, I would recommend that teaching strategies should facilitate vocabulary acquisition, spelling, oral skills applicable to formal situations, and reading comprehension. I would then brainstorm with the GSIs about types of exercises that could meet these goals, and give two examples of my own: 1) the development of a deductive language diary, which combines all four elements, and 2) the implementation

of free reading, which would stress oral skills and reading comprehension.

In sum, my BLC project explored how multilingualism and MLA, especially the peculiar role that Spanish plays as a new heritage language of sorts, complicates both the pedagogy and the "linguistic environment" of Italian. Yet, the creative interlanguage produced by my students continues to serve as a reminder of the wonderfully rich malleability inherent in language itself.

Reference

Bouvy, C. (2000). "Towards the Construction of a Theory of Cross-linguistic Transfer," *English in Europe: The Acquisition of a Third Language*. Eds. J. Cenoz and U. Jessner. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, pages 143-156.

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>. Then click on 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.

Conversation with Kress cont

there are battles, so I don't imagine for a moment that there won't be battles over control of either the media or the modes of representation. The modes will become regularized again in all sorts of different ways that are impossible to predict, but they are regularized in the direction of the ideologies of those in control. The media is already subject to control, massively, because where there is power, you have contestation and the powerful are loath to give up power.

MN: So that much hasn't changed?

GK: I think that much we can rely on!

MN: When I was looking back over your books and trying to formulate these questions, I came across in the recent book, Multimodal Discourse, which you wrote with Theo van Leeuwen, a passage where you draw on Walter Ong. You say that the new technologies' emphasis on multimodality, three-dimensionality, and interactivity can be seen as a return of many of the things that were lost in the transition from orality to literacy, as a secondary orality, in other words. In light of all that's been asserted over the last 40 years, since Jack Goody and Ian Watt, in 1968, about the connections, or lack of connection, between mode and mind, what do you think the consequences, to borrow their term, of a secondary orality, might be?

GK: I have to say that I don't quite know what secondary orality is, but leaving that aside, I, unfashionably and politically-incorrectly, do think that there are absolute relations between the mode through which one represents and the resulting forms of representation. Over time, especially when surrounded by power, these relations will lead to habits, habituations, and habitus which will have their effects on how we come, in a naturalized fashion, to see engagement with the world, what the potentials are, and what is possible and not possible.

This is not to say that culture doesn't always work against the constraints of nature. With speech, although it's situated in time and temporally organized, you can attempt to do things that are spatial, construct a virtual spatiality in speech, as the complex narratives that all cultures have developed have done. And by putting images in succession,

in whatever way you do, you can create a new form of temporality with image. It's not to say that there is an absolute limit. More semiotic work needs to be expended in order to do the kinds of things that are not within the affordance, or the ready affordance, of the mode.

To address the last part of your question, what are the consequences of that? I am asking myself whether the affordances, for instance, of speech or of writing and temporality among other things, say in Indo-European languages, but maybe in other languages too, bring with them notions of causality. Representation with still image certainly does not bring with it notions of causality. What you have there is the question of causality. A mode which, whether you wish or not, brings with it an epistemological position which makes causality simply there, present. Whether it's central or not is another question. Each mode has or brings with it certain kinds of epistemological commitments. The dominance of a particular mode means the dominance of certain epistemological commitments, a-causal or causal. Those are really fundamental issues: Whether we will see the world as less causally organized if we move to an image-dominated culture than we have in the past.

MN: I completely agree with you. I like how you summarized this the other day: You either think mode matters or you don't. It seems like many people who've thought about these things have approached it tentatively. People like Olson or even Michael Cole, saying that in some situations, if the circumstances are right, then maybe there's some impact of certain literacy practices. I don't understand how people can't make braver statements about that.

GK: Brave statements are for foolhardy people because statements of that kind bring with them certain kinds of penalties or dangers of penalties. In Western science, and as an academic, you're meant to make statements that are verifiable. Moreover, whatever verifiability means, it has meant and still means that verifiability doesn't apply to statements of the kind: "mode has conceptual and maybe cognitive consequences." As Whorfians have known for a while, you can't prove it to the satisfaction of those who don't wish to be convinced. I take a kind of joint Whorfian and Vygotskian position on that. While I try not to use the con-

cept of 'mind,' I do think that what Vygotsky calls mind is the result of the social made internal, and representation is entirely social. If we take a social semiotic multimodal approach, it becomes impossible not to accept that representation has profound effects for 'inner resources,' and hence on identity and subjectivity, on who we are in the world.

MN: Thankfully, it seems like the neo-Whorfians are having their way again, at least in some circles.

GK: Yes, I think among other things, the facts of "multi-ness," as you say, and multimodality among them, is forcing people into rethinking meaning and the conditions of making meaning in a quite fundamental way. It comes out in lots of different things. Cognitive linguistics is one dominant form here.

MH: Can you talk a little about where your work is going now? Where are you headed at this point?

GK: Well, specifically where it's headed is that I would like to say one last thing about language before I leave language alone. I would like to produce—and this is a megalomaniac kind of attempt—a social semiotic theory of language in which language is re-contextualized from that perspective. I would also like to work more systematically on developing the theory of multimodality, not in order to impose an orthodoxy because I think it's far, far too early to do that and would be quite unproductive, but to "have my spoon in the bowl."

More specifically, because I work in an educational context now, I would like to develop, as part of a new theory of meaning, a new theory of learning. Unless we have a new theory of learning, I think school will be stymied by the constraints of the 19th-century and what is left for education and for all of us are entirely inappropriate and damagingly limiting theories of what learning is, what human semiosis actually is, and what being human can mean.

MN: Great. Thank you very much.

GK: Thank you.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Instructors of European Languages

The Institute of European Studies (IES) receives Federal funds under the Title VI Grant from the U.S. Department of Education for the promotion of European languages and cultures. Some of those funds are earmarked for “support for faculty, staff, and student travel in foreign areas, regions, or countries, and for the development and support of educational programs abroad for students.” They also support domestic travel for events, workshops, courses, and conferences devoted to improving and extending the use of European languages. For more information, refer to the IES website at <http://ies.berkeley.edu/> or write ies@uclink.berkeley.edu

**ATTENTION
LANGUAGE LECTURERS**

**The BLC deadline for new materials for spring 2005 is
DECEMBER 1, 2004**

Contact Marianne Garner at LL-Lib@socrates.berkeley.edu, 642-0767 ext 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 ext 19.

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>.



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 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 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 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
or can be downloaded at <http://bhc.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 Kramersch
Berkeley Language Center
Fellowship Program
B-40 Dwinelle Hall, MC #2640

Deadline for Application: Monday, March 7, 2005

2004-05 CALENDAR

B L C L E C T U R E S

C O N F E R E N C E S

Friday, September 24

INSIGHTS INTO SLA FROM
LESS FAMILIAR SETTINGS

Leslie Moore

Postdoctoral Fellow
Center for Informal
Learning & Schools
UC Santa Cruz

3-5 pm, 370 Dwinelle Hall



Friday, October 15

HETEROGLOSSIA IN FOREIGN
LANGUAGE CLASSROOMS:
RESEARCH, DEBATES,
AND ISSUES

Patricia Duff

Associate Professor
Department of Language and
Literacy Education
University of British Columbia

3-5 pm, 370 Dwinelle Hall

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

Friday, November 5

Panel Discussion:
GESTURE IN LANGUAGE
LEARNING

•

EMBODIED COGNITION
AND SEMIOTIC ACTS IN
LANGUAGE TEACHING

Irene Mittelberg

Ph.D. Candidate in Linguistics
Department of Linguistics
Cornell University

GESTURE AND LANGUAGE:
REASSESSING TRADITIONAL
BOUNDARIES

Eve Sweetser

Professor
Department of Linguistics
UC Berkeley

3-5 pm, 370 Dwinelle Hall



Friday, December 10

INSTRUCTIONAL
DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH
PROJECTS

BLC Fellows:

Ellen Rosenfield (Lecturer)
Lihua Zhang (Lecturer)
Mark Evan Nelson (GSR)
Victoria Somoff (GSR)
Renee Perelmutter (GSR)

3-5 pm, 370 Dwinelle Hall

November 13, 2004

*Foreign Language Association of
Northern California (FLANC)
Fall Conference*
UC Berkeley
<http://www.fla-nc.org>

November 19-21, 2004

*The American Council on the
Teaching of Foreign Languages,
ACTFL 2004: Celebrating our
International Spirit*
Chicago, IL
<http://www.actfl.org>

November 26-27, 2004

*South West Association for Language
Learning Technology (SWALLT)
Fall Conference*
Brigham Young University Hawaii
<http://lc.byuh.edu/swallt/>

December 27-30, 2004

*The 120th Annual Modern Lan-
guage Association of America
(MLA) Convention*
Philadelphia, PA
<http://www.mla.org>

March 30-April 2, 2005

*TESOL's 39th Annual Convention
and Exhibit: Teaching Learning,
Learning Teaching*
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/>

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.

2004-05 BLC ADVISORY BOARD

Robert J. Blake	John Lie
Barbara Davis	Christina Maslach
Ralph Hexter	Mary Ann Mason
Mark Kaiser	Daniel Melia
Claire Kramersch	Linda von Hoene

2004-05 BLC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Ana Arteaga	Marilyn Seid-Rabinow
Mark Kaiser	Sarah Roberts
Richard Kern	Sonia S'hiri
Claire Kramersch	Bac Tran
Lisa Little	Chantelle Warner
Ignacio Navarrete	Victoria Williams

2004-05 EDITORIAL BOARD

Mark Kaiser
Sarah Roberts
Victoria Williams

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



FALL 2004
NEWSLETTER