Keynote Address at UC Language Consortium’s Debut Conference

On March 8-9 at UC Irvine, the Consortium hosted the first UC Conference on Language Learning: Theoretical and Pedagogical Perspectives. The following are highlights from the keynote address given by Professor Heidi Byrnes of Georgetown University. Professor Byrnes is also a member of the Consortium Board of Governors. The full text of the address may be found at www.georgetown.edu/faculty/byrnes under manuscripts.

What no methods course means: Toward an ethnography of foreign languages in higher education

Some textual deconstruction

The first part of the two-part title – “what no methods course means” – refers to [a 1983] article by linguistic anthropologist and educational linguist Shirley Brice Heath, “What no bedtime story means: Narrative skills at home and at school.” I made this linkage because the methods course, just like the bedtime story, initiates the next generation into an entire world, here the world of teaching in foreign language departments. I make it as well because the faculty member who teaches the course seems to be the primary caregiver, much like the bed-time story reader, and uses the methods course as the site for socializing as members of a profession. But just like the bedtime story, the methods course requires being coherently embedded, and nurtured for further growth by an entire professional community.

The wording “Toward an ethnography of foreign languages in higher education,” also echo’s a title, “The way we think now: Toward an ethnography of modern thought,” [another 1983] article written by the eminent cultural anthropologist Clifford Geertz. Geertz observes two concurrent and seemingly opposing trends in the social sciences regarding the nature of thought. He refers to a process meaning which he associates with psychological phenomena, and a product meaning, which he associates with sociocultural phenomena inasmuch as “thought” can also designate the whole of culture. In a quite remarkable parallelism, the issue for us as for anthropology is that “what formerly was seen as a question of the comparability of psychological processes from one people to the next is now seen . . . as a question of the commensurability of conceptual structures from one discourse community to the next”, realizing all the while “that thought is spectacularly multiple as product and won-

‘The notion of genre could serve to expand currently existing notions of task.’

drously singular as process” (151). That paradox leads us to puzzling about the nature of translation, interpretation, intersubjectivity, cultural hermeneutics– and not, or at least less so, about fixed rules in order to capture

Continued on page 2
Language, our professional credo says, is the quintessential meaning system that allows us to do that. But such proud professing becomes empty assuming we do not make it a lived reality in the context of foreign language education. So, with a final twist to my intertextual madness, I suggest that one way toward wholeness and authenticity is to begin to recover the missing other here represented by the missing half of my two conjoined titles: In the case of “What no methods course means,” a paradigmatic replacement of the bedtime story, we need to recover “narrativity” or, more broadly, “literacy.” In the case of “Toward an ethnography of foreign languages in higher education,” we need to recover Geertz’ concern with thought, by linking it to language, or better, the multiplicity of languages being used.

A first important step is an ethnographic exploration of foreign language departments in higher education and three ethnographic sites, the methods course, the role of literacy, and the relation of language and thought that characterizes our field. More specifically, I take the methods course to stand in for the possibility of discussing language learning and teaching with a literacy orientation. I take literacy to stand in for the possibility of developing a curricular context which can provide the kind of robust intellectual foundation that justifies the continued existence of foreign language departments as independent and encompassing academic structural units in colleges and universities. Finally, I take a rich understanding of the relation of language and thought to underpin all of this work, including quite emphatically the work of socializing existing and future faculty, that is, graduate students, into the field in order to achieve a kind of freely chosen internal accountability.

Toward an ethnography of foreign languages in higher education

1. Motivating a literacy orientation

While many of us here, and I include myself among them, have been concerned about “good language teaching” or even “better language teaching,” and have bet on the communicative horse to accomplish that, I suggest that, without better recognition of the dynamics of our academic environment, we may thereby also endanger entire FL departments as valued members of the academy who foster in-depth engagement, through the medium of another language, with another linguistic and cultural area. Put bluntly, others -- including modern technologies -- can provide basic communicative language learning more cheaply, more on demand, and more flexibly for diverse learner populations and for a greater range of languages than can collegiate FL departments. This verdict holds the more language learning and language teaching are reduced to oral communicative “skills” at a personal level with little attention to its rich intertextual and intratextual, that is, its literate dimensions in a variety of public fora.

We must develop a principled and coherent understanding of the relation between language, language use, and socio-culturally and linguistically constructed knowledge. We must do so by specifying the content areas a foreign language department as a collegiate academic unit might wish to pursue in relation to what we know about adult second language learning. Finally, our proposal must lay out in detail how both our legitimate content interests and our necessary language acquisition interests will support efficient and effective second language learning toward high levels of performance in the L2.

II. Developing multiple literacies through an integrated curriculum

[Let me give] some direction to what the term “curriculum” might mean for us. The initial goal is to develop principles for a curriculum that recognize the long-term nature of second-language learning by supporting it throughout all four undergraduate years.

Let me specify things a bit further in three areas:

1. The centrality of meaning in adult instructed foreign-language learning

The first and most important set of considerations revolves around the centrality of meaning in adult instructed foreign-language learning. Here contemporary theorizing aids our work since it sees language as a culturally embedded form of human meaning-making. Because of that characteristic one can then begin to look for patterns of language forms being tied to patterns of situated language use.

Among many consequences of such a stance, the most far-reaching is likely to be the need for a textual or a discourse focus, a focus that links language to social life and thought.

2. Making content the foundation of collegiate language curricula

Accordingly, our second principle is that of making content the foundation of collegiate language curricula. This would happen if the notion of genre could serve to expand currently existing notions of task. The first expansion would be to consider task not only in interactive or transactional terms, but also as text-based, where both bases are considered to be real-world, meaning-driven forms of human language behavior. The second expansion I suggest is to contextualize tasks, by positioning them at a particular stage in the curriculum. In that fashion, the construct of task might be able to provide crucial insights into how we should guide students through a balanced development of accuracy, fluency, and complexity over long instructional sequences (Byrnes 2002).

3. Reconsidering curricular content and pedagogies through genre

Arguing for the fact that being a competent user of a language is being a competent performer with and navigator of its genre, Bakhtin rightly observes that “to use a genre freely and creatively is not the same as to create a genre from the beginning; genres must be fully mastered in order to be manipulated freely” (Bakhtin 1986, 80). If that is so then foreign-language instruction is about teaching learners to make meaning-driven choices within the framework of genres. Learners who can make such choices can gradually find their particular voices and identities in those second-language genres. As a result they can celebrate their status as multicompetent speakers in the other language.

III. Professional Socialization in the New College Foreign Language Department

A key consequence of comprehensive curriculum construction with a literacy focus is that it allows graduate departments to acknowledge and to acquit themselves competently of a two-fold responsibility that they hold with respect to their students’ socialization into the profession: They are to educate them to make valued, long-term contributions to the work of departments, insti-
On February 22-23, the Berkeley Language Center hosted a colloquium on the Oral Proficiency Interview. The impetus for the colloquium, which was funded by the College of Letters and Sciences and the Title VI Area Studies Centers, grew out of the discussions and concerns of language coordinators of how to implement Title VI's call for quantifiable assessment of student learning in foreign language study. The coordinators identified the OPI as the only nationally recognized instrument for assessment of oral language skills and decided that they wanted to investigate the OPI further. Their goal was to learn more about the OPI test itself, its potential as an instrument of placement as well as program assessment, its relationship to the Foreign Language Standards, and implications for the curriculum. Finally, the coordinators wanted to hear from the critics of the OPI.

In her welcoming remarks, BLC Director Claire Kramsch traced the history of the OPI, noting its importance in moving the profession to feature communicative competence as the hallmark of the educated language learner.

Chantal Thompson (Brigham Young University) noted that a good OPI has the appearance of a casual conversation, but in essence consists of a warm up, ongoing level checks, designed to determine the lowest level of sustainable performance, and probes, used to determine the level at which the interviewee experiences linguistic breakdown, and finally a wind down. Another component of the interview is the role play, itself a type of level check or probe. Thompson outlined the OPI scale (novice, intermediate, advanced, superior) and described the basic characteristics of each level, in particular stressing that the ability to use language functions (description, narration, supported opinion, etc.) is at the heart of OPI taxonomy.

Ray Clifford (Defense Language Institute) commented on the national movement to replace process-based accreditation with one based on quantifiable learner outcomes, predicting that there will be more testing in future years. He elaborated on Thompson’s description of the OPI, comparing achievement testing (mastery of pieces of a curriculum), performance testing (creative use of language in a restricted domain) and proficiency testing (demonstration of language abilities across contexts). Rafael Salaberry (Rice University), while citing numerous benefits of the OPI, including a greater awareness of testing issues and ACTFL’s professionalization of the testing process was critical of the validity of the OPI from several viewpoints: 1) there is no theoretical or empirical basis for the hierarchy of language functions as described in the OPI guidelines; 2) the OPI is not a conversation, but has elements of two kinds of interviews: sociolinguistic and survey/research; 3) the concept of the “educated native speaker” as the norm to which the test subject is being compared is highly problematic; 4) there is a danger of dialect discrimination. Salaberry recommended a wider variety of instruments to test oral communicative skills.

June Phillips (Weber State University) described the national Foreign Language Standards and their relationship to the OPI guidelines. Within the goal for communication, three skill areas have been defined: interpersonal communication, interpretive communication, and presentational communication. The OPI could be used to measure only the first of these. Phillips described how various sample texts could be used to facilitate the acquisition of advanced level functions by an intermediate level speaker, while at the same time providing learner growth in the other goal areas of the standards such as Cultures and Connections.

Ben Rifkin (University of Wisconsin) argued that the proficiency guidelines provide a coherent framework for the articulation of a foreign-language curriculum and a common ground for collaboration across languages, disciplines and institutions. Rifkin presented learning outcomes data based on the OPI and proficiency-oriented tests of listening and reading comprehension in a number of languages and showed how these data could be used to develop reasonable expectations and goals for foreign language learning.

Leo van Lier (Monterey Institute for International Studies) focused on the ecological validity of the OPI. He raised concerns about the numerous ways in which the OPI deviated from the characteristics of genuine conversation. For example, conversation is unplanned - the process is more important than the product; conversation is unpredictable in terms of sequence and outcome, whereas the OPI has set components (probes, role plays, etc.); typically a conversation is not managed or controlled by one of its participants. Finally, van Lier contended that an individual’s ability to communicate orally could not be reduced to a single rating.

The conference generated much discussion on the Berkeley campus in the following week. South and Southeast Asian language instructors from several UC campuses met one week after the conference and discussed the OPI extensively. In their discussions two issues came up that had not been breached at the OPI colloquium. They noted that their classes often have a high percentage of heritage learners, and the OPI guidelines would not be appropriate for them. A second concern was the cultural appropriateness of the OPI for Hindi, for example, where the speech of the educated speaker is heavily influenced by English, and where many superior language activities would entail the use of English rather than Hindi.

Video tapes of the Berkeley OPI Colloquium are available from the BLC (http://blc.berkeley.edu) at cost.
The Language Consortium’s charge stipulates that it provide a framework for studying how technology can be used to meet pedagogical goals and expand educational delivery across the UC system. Thus, the Consortium has been working with individual instructors on the campuses to explore uses of technology for a variety of purposes, such as enhancing how students acquire a second language and increasing access to instruction in the less commonly taught languages. For years, a problem that the UC system has faced is how to expand access across the language instruction that is concentrated at only a few campuses. Students don’t always have an opportunity to study the language of their choice or proceed to an advanced level of instruction because not all of the campuses have the requisite resources to offer a full range of courses.

However, with current events underscoring the importance of proficiency in less commonly taught languages, such as Arabic, there is a pressing demand for providing greater access to these languages. This groundswell of interest builds upon previous efforts to expand access to language instruction.

In the early-1990s, UCLA developed the Language Materials Project (www.lmp.ucla.edu/), a database for sharing information and educational materials in the less commonly taught languages (typically referred to as those other than the principal European and Asian languages). UC language faculty also experimented with videoconferencing technology to distribute instruction in Greek and Hebrew and other less commonly taught languages from the larger campuses to the smaller ones.

Although new digital technologies and the Internet are commonly considered the wave of the future for remote instruction, present-day challenges prevent them from becoming reality. Transferring credit from one UC campus to another still remains an obstacle, as does the high cost of developing and delivering distance-learning courses.

An example of a project that seeks to test the practicality and effectiveness of distributing a language course from one campus to another using new technologies is the Arabic Language Distance Learning Project, led by UCSB professor Dwight Reynolds.

With a small planning grant from the UC Teaching, Learning & technology Center (TLtC), Reynolds has proposed that faculty at UCB, UCLA, and UCSB develop a mechanism to offer Arabic language instruction to the remaining UC campuses. Reynolds hopes to tap into the already established organizational structure of the over 100 faculty on UC’s campuses who are engaged in teaching and/or research on the Middle East.

Reynolds is seeking funding to build on existing packages of textbooks, audiocassettes, and videotapes to develop and implement web-based instructional materials that will be used in conjunction with a limited amount of teleconferencing. His goal is to create a model for remote delivery that could then be adapted for use in other less commonly taught languages in the UC system.

The full TLtC proposal can be found on the TLtC website at: http://www.uctltc.org/funding/2001.02/arabic.htm

Language Links

The UC Teaching, Learning and technology Center (TLtC)
http://www.uctltc.org

Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition (CARLA) at the University of Minnesota
http://carla.acad.umn.edu

National Association of Self-Instructional Language Programs (NASILP)
http://www.councilnet.org/pages/CNet_Members_NASILP.html

National Capital Language Resource Center (NCLRC)
http://www.cal.org/nclrc

Language Acquisition Resource Center at San Diego State University
http://larcnet.sdsu.edu

The Language Materials Project at UCLA

teaching resources for less commonly taught languages
http://www.lmp.ucla.edu

Center for Language Education and Research (CLEAR)
http://clear.msu.edu

UCLA’s Olga Kagan Receives Book Award

Olga Kagan, Director of the Language Resource Program at UCLA and a member of the UC Language Consortium Steering Committee, received the 2001 award for the Best Contribution to Language Pedagogy from the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages. Kagan was honored at the December national conference in New Orleans, along with her co-editors Ben Rifkin and Susan Bauckus, for the collection of essays The Learning and Teaching of Slavic Languages and Cultures (Slavica 2001)
Since arriving at UCSB in 1992, I have been involved in the development of CALL (computer-assisted language learning) materials for improving second language reading comprehension and vocabulary learning. Concurrently, I have conducted empirical research on the effectiveness of these multimedia and hypermedia materials with hundreds of students, both at UC campuses and at other U.S. universities. It is exciting to observe that this field of inquiry has been expanding quite rapidly. In this article, I will summarize the findings of a decade of research and development.

CyberBuch (St. Martin’s Press, 1997) is a multimedia CD-ROM containing two German short stories (one by Nobel laureate Heinrich Böll and the other by Bertolt Brecht). For each of the stories, the program provides readers with an advance organizer in the form of a videoclip, a narration of the entire story, multimedia glosses for selected words (in the form of English translations, German definitions, pictures and videoclips), comprehension exercises, and vocabulary tests.

In the first study conducted with 103 students in 1993/1994 at UCSB, UCLA, and Stanford, we found that vocabulary learning was best when learners looked up both definitions and pictures of unknown words (as opposed to looking up only definitions or definitions and videoclips). The results of this study are reported in a 1996 article in the Modern Language Journal.

As a follow-up to our 1996 study, we re-examined the data from the 103 learners and found that learners remembered German vocabulary items best when they had looked up the combination of visual (picture or videoclip) and verbal (translation) annotations rather than when they had looked up only one type of annotation and worst when they had not looked up the word at all. This research was reported in a 1998 article in the Journal of Educational Psychology.

In the 1998 article, we also analyzed the preferences of learners for visual and verbal information based on their lookup behavior. Of the 103 students, 39 were classified as visualizers, 35 were classified as verbalizers, and 29 were classified as showing no strong preference. The results of a vocabulary test indicated that visual learners were aided in L2 vocabulary acquisition by graphic information and did not learn as well when they did not receive information in their preferred mode. For reading comprehension, verbalizers recalled propositions containing only verbal or both verbal + visual annotations, but visualizers recalled propositions only when they received both visual + verbal and not verbal alone. These data suggested that individual differences on the visualizer-verbalizer dimension play a role in determining the effectiveness of multimedia learning materials.

In a subsequent study with 152 students at UCSB, the University of Pennsylvania, and the University of New Mexico in 1996/1997, we again sought to determine when multiple representations of lexical information help L2 vocabulary learning and when they hinder learning. Instead of allowing learners to freely select as many of the annotations as they wished while reading, learners were assigned to one of four treatment groups: no annotations, verbal annotations, visual annotations, or both for 35 key German words. The main focus of study, reported in a 2002 article in Computers in Human Behavior, was on the effects of specific instructional treatments for high- and low-ability learners. We found that students learned more German words when they looked up both visual and verbal annotations than when they looked up only one type of annotation or no annotations. However, a closer examination revealed that multimedia information can have potentially deleterious effects depending on the individual differences of the learners, in particular with regard to verbal and spatial abilities. For example, when low-ability learners must process both verbal and visual information, the resulting high cognitive load may lead to insufficient cognitive resources for making connections between the verbal and visual information, which then results in decreased vocabulary learning and overall comprehension.

A study on the effect of the advance organizer (videoclip) on comprehension was reported in 1996 in System and revealed that when learners viewed the videoclip before reading the story, they recalled significantly more main ideas in the story than when they did not watch the advance organizer.

In a longitudinal study reported at the AAAL conference in 2001, I analyzed data collected over a nine-year period (1993-2001) from students at UCSB. Statistical analyses showed that there were significant differences between years in lookup behavior for text, visual, and total number of glosses selected. There was a “peak” in the usage of glosses by learners in the years 1996 and 1997, particularly visual glosses. Before 1996 and after 1997, students preferred text annotations to visual annotations. Regression analyses suggested learner trends toward looking up more English (L1) glosses but fewer German (L2) glosses and fewer visual glosses (videoclips).

This trend of preferring L1 glosses was supported by a recent study I conducted with UCSB students who used netLearn, a Web-based program centered around the theme of a virtual year of study abroad. Learners read two texts on the Web, one which provided L1 translations for selected words, and the other which contained no glosses but which provided access to an online dictionary. Learners looked up many more words for which L1 translations were provided than words which had to be looked up in an online dictionary. In addition, in think-aloud protocols, learners noted that simply clicking on glossed words to learn their meaning disrupted the reading process less than looking up a word in the online dictionary.

In summary, mixed results have been obtained with regard to which types of mul-

‘In some cases, multimedia information can actually hinder learning.’
Every summer for more than twenty-five years the Linguistics Language Program at the University of California, San Diego has offered intensive language courses. Professor Sanford Schane, the current director of the LLP, initiated a summer-abroad program in 1973 for French and Spanish. Participants spent two weeks studying on the San Diego campus, after which they departed for Paris or Madrid for five weeks of study abroad. The program took its own instructors overseas, and classes were held in the residence halls where the students and staff were housed. Due to a declining dollar, European inflation, and the proliferation of competing programs abroad, it was decided in 1988 to discontinue the overseas program and instead to offer intensive summer coursework on the UCSD campus.

Since 1991, in cooperation with Summer Session at UCSD, the LLP regularly has offered first-year courses in French, German, and Spanish. The program is open to all qualified participants—students from UC, students from other institutions, as well as nonstudents desiring an intensive language experience. There are three 2-week sessions. Classes meet 5 hours a day, 5 days a week; hence there are 50 hours of instruction per session. Each session is equivalent to one quarter of language instruction during the regular academic year. Students may enroll for one, two, or three sessions. Thus, it is possible for a student to complete one year of college-level language in 6 weeks. These summer courses are quite popular for those students having to satisfy a language requirement.

Summer enrollments are not large, so students typically find themselves in classes having an excellent teacher-student ratio. During the summer 2001 the LLP offered four languages with the following enrollments: American Sign Language 7, French 9, German 11, Spanish 35. Other programs on campus now provide intensive summer work in other languages. Enrollments for 2001 were: Chinese 21, Italian 6, Japanese 14, Korean 5, Latin 5, Spanish literature 24.

UCSD Report on Intensive Summer Language Classes
contributed by Sanford Schane, UC San Diego, and member of the Consortium Steering Committee

All UC Language Statistics
contributed by Nathan Legakis, Web Developer for the Consortium

The Consortium has collected language enrollment statistics for eight UC campuses and has made these statistics available on its website. Included are class enrollment, degree, and language major figures. With the Fall 2000 data now available, it is possible to look up, for example, how many students majored in Spanish at UC Davis. Another option compares class enrollment figures among all the UC campuses. Until now this information was difficult if not impossible to obtain. The data listed by the Consortium are direct figures provided by Registrars’ Offices. Data for Fall 2001 will be posted soon. The statistical search page is located at http://ucclt.ucdavis.edu/Stats/searchstats.cfm

UCLA: Language Across the Curriculum

The Center for European and Russian Studies at UCLA
http://www.international.ucla.edu/euro/
has initiated curriculum that incorporates a 2-unit language component into area studies courses.

Margaret Jacob, “History of the Low Countries: Dutch Society in the 17th Century”
J. ArchGetty, “Revolutionary Russia and USSR”

Geoffrey Symcox, “Italian Literature in Historical Context: 1559-1848”
Ron Rogowski, “Basic themes in comparative politics: Germany as illustration”
Heritage Language Journal to Debut

Plans are under way for a new online journal that will provide a forum for discussion and a venue for publishing research in the fast developing field of heritage language acquisition. The Heritage Language Journal will be co-edited by Olga Kagan, Director of the Language Resource Center at UCLA and member of the Consortium Steering Committee, and Kathleen Dillon, Associate Director of the Consortium. Many prominent specialists in the heritage area have agreed to serve on the journal’s editorial board, including Joy Peyton (Center for Applied Linguistics), Scott McGinnis (National Coalition for Less Commonly Taught Languages), Catherine Ingold (National Foreign Language Resource Center), Guadalupe Valdés (Stanford), and Maria Polinsky (UC San Diego). The journal hopes to involve the spectrum of fields that deal with heritage language - psychology, sociology, education, languages, linguistics. Kagan and Dillon expect the first issue of the journal to appear by January 2003.

Pre-Register for the Heritage Language Institute

The Consortium is sponsoring its second annual summer workshop for UC language faculty. The Heritage Language Institute, directed by Olga Kagan, Director of the Language Resource Center at UCLA, will be held from June 22-26, 2002 at UCLA. The first two days of plenary presentations are open to the public at no charge. Funding is available for the full five-day institute for UC faculty. Application and pre-registration are available now at the Consortium website http://uccllt.ucdavis.edu.
Under the direction of Professor Robert Blake (UC Davis), The UC Consortium for Language Learning and Teaching is a system-wide initiative designed to make the most effective use of UC’s vast linguistic resources and expertise at a time when foreign language enrollments are increasing dramatically. The consortium fosters collaboration among and across the language programs at the UC campuses with an eye to increasing student access to language study through a combination of the best classroom practices, technological enhancements, and EAP programs.
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