



CULTURA: Web-based Intercultural Exchanges
LLCMC Pre-conference Event / 2nd Cultura Conference
National Foreign Language Resource Center, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

CULTURA @ UH

Cultura is a Web-based, intercultural project situated in a language class that connects American students with other students in different countries. Designed and created in 1997 by a team from the French Section at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (Gilberte Furstenberg, Sabine Levet and Shoggy Waryn), it was originally created as an exchange between American and French students. *Cultura* has since been adapted to other schools and languages, connecting students in the US with students around the world.

In 2008 the NFLRC held its *Online Cafés for Heritage Learners* Summer Institute, where different language teams developed online language cafés adapted from the *Cultura* model and suited to their own collective goals and purposes:

- Filipino Community Café (connecting advanced Filipino language students at UH with Filipino heritage language students in the University of California system)
- Japanese Culture Café (connecting advanced Japanese language students at Moanalua High School in Honolulu with English language students at Tezukayama Gakuin Izumigaoka High School in Osaka, Japan)
- Samoan e-Pathways Café (connecting advanced Samoan language students at UH, Samoan language students at American Samoa Community College in Pago Pago, and Samoan language students at Farrington High School in Honolulu)
- China-USA Business Café (connecting Business Chinese MBA students at UH with Business English MBA students at Guangzhou's Sun Yat-Sen University)

Most of the cafés blossomed (except for the Japanese café, which ran into logistical problems stemming from its design). It was clear that we had a lot of good experience and expertise to share, and we decided that the Language Learning in Computer Mediated Communities (LLCMC) Conference in October 2009 would be the appropriate venue. During the planning of LLCMC, we decided to have a special pre-conference event focusing on *Cultura* and its many worldwide adaptations, including ours, with Gilberte Furstenberg & Sabine Levet leading the charge. This event would also effectively serve as their 2nd *Cultura* Conference.

The first Cultura Conference took place at MIT on October 2007 to celebrate the 10th anniversary of the project and was attended by 35 people who came from all corners of the world. The second Cultura Conference/LLCMC pre-conference event (entitled *CULTURA: Web-based Intercultural Exchanges*) took place at the Hawai'i Imin International Conference Center on the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa campus on October 10-11, 2009.

Its goal was to bring together teachers who have implemented a *Cultura*-like exchange as well as those who are curious to find out more about the project itself and serve as a place for sharing goals, materials, methodologies, tools, and classroom practices. The event program was structured to include an overview/tour of the classic Cultura model at MIT, followed by a presentation of the Cultura Exchange Tool and six panel sessions that focused on different aspects of the design and implementation of web-based intercultural courses, cafes, and exchanges, representing a wide array of Southeast Asian, East Asian, Pacific Island, and European languages.

This free event was co-sponsored by the MIT Contemporary French Studies Fund, NFLRC, the UH National Resource Center East Asia (NRCEA), the UH Center for Southeast Asian Studies (CSEAS), and the UH Center for Pacific Island Studies (CPIS), with tech support provided by the UH Language Learning Center (LLC).

WELL CONCEIVED, WELL RECEIVED

The pre-conference event drew 142 attendees, the majority also attending the LLCMC Conference on the subsequent days (October 11-13, 2009). They represented language educators and students, high schools and postsecondary institutions, local participants and travelers from around the globe.

The pre-conference program, in the short space of a day and a half, gave a broad overview of Cultura, its applications and possibilities. Attendees new to Cultura were surprised and interested in its potential for intercultural interaction and language learning. Attendees already familiar with Cultura were pleased with the multi-faceted coverage of topics from design to successes & failures to classroom practice to assessment. If anything, attendees from both sides wanted *more* – more in-depth discussions, more time for questions and answers, more opportunities to network. All in all, the *CULTURA: Web-based Intercultural Exchanges* pre-conference event/2nd Cultura Conference received outstanding reviews on all aspects of its organization and presentation, as evidenced by the data from the evaluation forms received at the end of the event (see summary, starting on page 3).

EVALUATION FORM DATA SUMMARY

We received a total of 39 Cultura evaluation forms from the 142 attendees who came for the conference (a 27% rate of return). The data from it is compiled below, along with short summaries for each question.

Did the conference meet your expectations? If yes, in what way? If no, explain why.

Summary: 37 attendees (95%) said "Yes," one attendee said "In some way," and one attendee said "No," so overall, the Cultura pre-conference event was a great success, meeting the vast majority of the attendees' expectations. For those who knew about or had prior interest in Cultura, the event provided them with a much appreciated, broad exploration of it from a variety of angles. For those who were totally new to Cultura, they were pleasantly surprised and found the concepts and models discussed to be enriching and exciting.

Typical comments:

- "Yes. I've never given web-based class so today I've got information about it."
- "Yes, motivating – helped me to generate new ideas & see connections. It reassured me that cultural exchanges are gaining popularity."
- "Yes. I was looking for an overview of Cultura with some examples of successes & struggles. Conference was on target."
- "Yes. I was not sure what to expect when I signed up for this conference. It is a very useful and practical information of resources to incorporate culture in my class."
- "In some way"
- "Yes. I now have a broad view of Cultura, and of a variety of relevant points about its use in instruction. The balance of success stories and cautions was very helpful."
- "I thought that the conference might be too long, but now I realize that the time allotted was not too long – the time flew by very quickly."
- "Yes, actually it surpassed my expectations. The quality of the presentations was uniformly excellent."
- "Yes because it helps me to understand better how to do language teaching"
- "It's definitely interesting. Presentations are dealing more with cultural generalizations. I'd like to see more in-depth, more sophisticated teaching/learning of culture (e.g., How can we not make/perpetuate cultural stereotypes?)"
- "Yes, I learned a lot from the different presentations and even gaining more experience on developing online communities for language learning."
- "Yes, very well organized. Well-prepared speakers. I really like that presenters explain clearly speaking to audience using examples, too."
- "Yes. It provided me with new ideas and information that will help me formulate my own intercultural exchange."
- "Not really. It brought up more questions than answers. I expected to hear about innovations in language learning. Language was not involved much. Rubic Cube silent video an example. Sentence completion is a low order thinking skill"
- "Yes. I had read quite a bit about Cultura before the conference, but the presentations supplied a lot of valuable information."
- "I did not have specific expectations as I did not know much about Cultura to begin with. So in that respect, I learned about the project & how I might use it or adapt similar strategies for intercultural forums in my own class."
- "Yes, I was really interested about how we can evaluate our students and the presentation at the end was good!"

Which panels were the most useful to you?

Summary: In general, attendees appreciated all of the panels, but particular ones got special mention. Panel 4 (Guth), a Skype-delivered presentation, received the most, due in great part to its useful handout and its organized, concrete presentation style. Many found the Samoan groups work inspirational and engaging (Panel 5), and many appreciated the inclusion of assessment/evaluation issues (Panel 6) and not only the successes but also the pitfalls (Panel 1) of doing Cultura intercultural exchanges. And, of course, Gilberte Furstenberg & Sabine Levet's Cultura overview/tour at the very beginning got things off to a great start, giving attendees a good grounding in what Cultura was all about before moving on to the other panels.

Data compiled from evaluations:

- Overview/tour (Furstenberg & Levet) – 11
- Presentation of the Cultural Exchange Tool (Levet) - 6
- Panel 1: Designing a web-based intercultural exchange: challenges and pitfalls (Chun & Tsuji) – 10
- Panel 2: What language to use for communication (native vs. target)? (Hiple, Gasmen, Robotham, Domingo) - 6
- Panel 3: What makes for a "successful" intercultural forum (Kellogg, Furstenberg) - 7
- Panel 4: The tools: which seem most appropriate for intercultural exchanges? Do different tools lead to different types of interactions? (Guth) - 18
- Panel 5: What happens in the classroom? = the roles of teachers and learners (Crapotta, Ah Sue, Fo'ifua, Lam Yuen, Feleti, Wade) – 12
- Panel 6 – Evaluating online intercultural understanding: the different modes (Tschudi, Jiang, Levet) – 13

Typical comments:

- "Sarah Guth's handout & presentation gave a wonderful practical application of using Cultura in the language classroom. The presentation from Samoa gave a wonderful model of doing it in high school & university."
- "Panel 4 – Sarah Guth's presentation was very informative & well-organized. Panel 5 – presenters spoke with passion & motivated me."
- "The plenary sessions with Gilberte and Sabine were very useful, because the 'original' Cultura model is such an important point of reference for all other exchanges in the Cultura 'universe.'"
- "Each panel contributed to the overall success of the Cultura Conference. They are like indispensable pieces of a jigsaw puzzle that without one piece, the whole picture would not be complete."
- "Overview & problems (Sat). Assessment (Sun)."
- "Definitely panels 4 & 2"
- "Guy Kellogg + Sabine and on their separate panels as well as the 2 Skypes & the Samoans"

Were there topics which you would have liked to see covered but were not? Please specify.

Summary: The panels provided a wide-ranging overview of Cultura and its possibilities, but if it were to all be done again, the message is clear – “More!” Suggestions for topics that they would have liked to see covered included having more examples (or hands-on experience) with what goes on in the classroom when using Cultura, more emphasis and explicit connection to language teaching, and more examples and further exploration of assessment in the Cultura model. Interestingly enough, a number of their comments suggest avenues for future research with the Cultura model.

Typical comments:

- “Perhaps a hands-on session to learn how to use the Cultura website would have given some participants more confidence in trying it on their own.”
- “Negative points of using web tools, such as how to deal with negative comments from students.”
- “More examples of how cultura is used in your classrooms such as film clips”
- “More feedback regarding intercultural competence/communication & also more (specific) information about evaluation”
- “SLA and Cultura & Tech. What is in it for language teachers”
- “Language teaching”
- “How to use Culture in the classroom or integrate it into a larger lesson plan – how to avoid fossilization”
- “I would like to know if there is a link between student achievement and development of cultural awareness”
- “More on assessment; relationship of CMC, culture, interaction to learning.”
- “They did cover assessment of the student’s exchange in the forum but illustrate w/examples from the actual writing of the students, I find wanting.”
- “None – Topics that were covered were enough and provided a lot of insights on skills & technological tools that are useful for online language education.”
- “More examples of data analysis (both qualitative & possibly quantitative)”
- “Cultural awareness is extremely important. Target language skills development should be more incorporated.”
- “How do you define & assess cultural awareness in the cultura model?”
- “Dealing with issues of different levels in L2. Platforms, software, student/teacher issues”

What were the best parts of the Conference?

Summary: Comments here ran the entire gamut but showed that the way the Cultura pre-conference program was designed was exceedingly well done – be it the informal atmosphere conducive to discussion, the wide range of content and languages covered by the presentations, or the event organization, for they all contributed toward making the event memorable and motivating for its attendees.

Typical comments:

- “Gilberte’s & Sabine’s insights”
- “Information of web-based classes in worldwide viewpoints.”
- “Networking – gaining new ideas from others”
- “To hear the experience of other instructors with their students. Sometimes it feels I’m the only one struggling with mine.”

- "See what is going on in language learning – see what/how I can incorporate new things in the classroom"
- "Reflections on successful and unsuccessful project components"
- "Knowing different levels (high school, college, univ.) can collaborate (Samoan presenters)."
- "The informal atmosphere was very agreeable. The technical and logistic support were superb."
- "The variety of the chosen panel topics and the variety of projects/languages that were represented."
- "Panel 4"
- "Seeing the wide range of projects, the honesty (informality) of the presentations."
- "Professional, welcoming, relaxed, productive."
- "The emphasis on authenticity & real learning; critical thinking & the openness & generosity of the organizers in sharing what they have developed over the years in the service of educating & honing the critical faculties of participants/students in the cultura project which I hope would translate to better citizens of the world."
- "Presentation of Japanese, Filipino, Chinese, & Samoan projects"
- "Professional, enthusiastic teachers"
- "Practical ideas for how to conduct a successful exchange; motivation to try again after a couple of failures in my own teaching experience; learning that we can use the Cultura template"
- "I know about Cultura, but didn't know that it was this widely disseminated. So, all the presentations that followed the main Cultura presentation were helpful to me."
- "All the wide range of topics from planning, implementation, management, outcome, best practices, & pitfalls to avoid. How to use technology to advantage to drive language learning. Now I am convinced I can use skype in teaching & testing. Time management, making everyone feel comfortable, at ease to share."

What were its weakest parts?

Summary: Of course, events are never totally perfect. There is always room for improvement. Attendees would have liked to have more presenters provide handouts to go with their talks and reduce unnecessary repetition. In terms of the flow of the presentations, there were complaints about time management, particularly that there was not sufficient time for Q&A in the panels and for breaks between sessions.

Typical comments:

- "No handout...except in Panel 4"
- "Some panel presenters rambled, repeated unnecessarily, spend too much time reading slides & not giving substantive, transferable information."
- "Overly extensive descriptions"
- "It was not always easy for individual panelists to hew to the topic areas as originally designed by the conference organizers."
- "Time management, not enough/no time for questions"
- "Identity politics, politically correct answers, and jargon"
- "Not enough time for questions"
- "Lack of in-depth reflection; a wrap-up session of each conducted at the end of the exchange. Share the result with students for summary to give students a holistic view about what's been discovered."
- "It is not very clear to me how the classes work if the exchange was for a grade."

- "Time Management – most presentations went over time. But I think that's really not a weakness because there were unforeseen circumstances that made this happen. On the other hand, there are really 'no' weaknesses."
- "Sometimes very long without any breaks"
- "No weak parts noticed."
- "It would have benefited, if there were meta-level questions asked across the projects, on top of project-specific findings."
- "I thought there was a bit too much repetition of similar student comments."
- "If there were theoretical background presented, the practices would be more convincing, maybe."

Other comments/Suggestions (for another Cultura Conference)

Summary: Comments here echoed what was said in previous sections. A number of good suggestions for future Cultura conferences were given, but the one that was mentioned the most was to create an additional session where attendees and presenters could network to possibly plant the seeds for future Cultura projects and collaboration.

Typical comments:

- "A chance for participants to share how they are using or considering using Cultura would have been great – facilitated by some of the presenters."
- "Some presenters need more guidelines, I think, on what to include in their presentations. Samoa Panel #5 too long because of Evelyn Wade's absence I know. Sat 1:30-3:00 session seemed rushed & 3:15-3:45"
- "Create a session or panel for networking – for teachers to find partner classes & arrange collaborations"
- "Probably more interaction with some high school students planning to go to college and use this website as a source for AP classes."
- "Participants raised the issue of endangered language and culture"
- "Thanks for a great set of presentations. I felt that my time was well spent!"
- "Webcast of the conference, since travel is becoming ever more prohibitive."
- "This was an impressive & awesome conference!"
- "Conference is nicely organized! Thank you!"
- "Include application of cultural model to non-roman script languages as the 'target' language."
- "Conference was fantastic – Thank you for the good host and I like to see more conferences like this one in the future."
- "Include a mini-workshop for the next Cultura Conference"



NATIONAL FOREIGN LANGUAGE RESOURCE CENTER
University of Hawai'i

CONFERENCE EVALUATION REPORT

ANOTHER SUCCESSFUL CONFERENCE

The Language Learning in Computer Mediated Communities (LLCMC) Conference, a natural outgrowth of the NFLRC's many successful distance education projects & programs, was held on October 11-13, 2009 at the Hawai'i Imin International Conference Center on the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa campus. Highlights included a plenary talk by Gilberte Fustenberg (MIT) on "Virtual Communities = Real Communication?", 16 paper sessions, a special e-poster session showcasing online cultural exchanges based at UH, and the free pre-conference "CULTURA: Web-based Intercultural Exchanges" event (see separate report). Additional special social and educational events included an opening reception with live Hawaiian music and hula following the opening plenary and talks by Naomi Losch on the Hawaiian language and its people to close out the conference. The conference was generously co-sponsored by the UH National Resource Center – East Asia (NRCEA), the UH Center for Southeast Asian Studies (CSEAS), and the UH Center for Pacific Island Studies (CPIS), with technical support provided by the UH Language Learning Center (LLC)

The LLCMC Conference drew a total of 138 attendees, and though slightly smaller than previous NFLRC-run conferences, it received glowing reviews particularly for its excellent organization, its friendly and helpful staff & volunteers, its welcoming and warm atmosphere, and its diverse and inspiring presentations. Many attendees commented on how they were reinvigorated to try incorporating more technology into their language courses or programs and sharing what they learned in personal, professional, social, and printed forums back home. For a summary of the data and comments from the conference evaluation forms, see page 3.

SOME BACKGROUND INFORMATION

In the field of language education, computer mediated communication (CMC) enables students to interact with one another free of space and time constraints and to participate in communities of learning with their counterparts in the target culture. The Language Learning in Computer Mediated Communities (LLCMC) Conference was created to explore the use of computers as a medium of communication in language learning communities in both research and practice.

Despite utilizing the very same avenues (flyers, listservs, emails, etc.) to publicize our event that we had used for larger conferences, the response to our Call for Proposals was unusually small (only 24 proposals). We attribute this to two factors: 1) the downturn of the U.S. economy in 2009 and the resultant dearth of available travel funding for conferences and 2) competition with other larger, more prominent, technology-focused language conferences such as CALICO.

LLCMC Conference Chairs David Hiple (NFLRC), Stephen Tschudi (NFLRC), Gilberte Furstenberg (Massachusetts Institute of Technology), and Dorothy Chun (University of California, Santa Barbara) were responsible for the conference program, including the vetting and selection of the paper proposals received and the scheduling of sessions. Ultimately 16 sessions (including some that were invited) were selected for the eventual conference program. Though a smaller line-up than usual, the conference still drew a sizeable crowd and very high marks all around (see page 3), and a number liked the fact that they only had to choose between two concurrent sessions instead of four or five like at other conferences. The smaller nature of the conference also created a more informal and intimate conference atmosphere, which attendees appreciated. LLCMC Organizing Chair Jim Yoshioka (NFLRC) saw to conference logistics (website, communications, social events, lodging, transportation, registration, and so forth), making sure that both presenters and attendees were welcomed, well informed, and well taken care of.

But don't take our word for it. Please see the summary of LLCMC Conference evaluation data for statistics and comments from attendees.

EVALUATION FORM DATA SUMMARY

We received a total of 42 LLCMC Conference Evaluation forms from the 138 attendees who came for the conference (a 30% rate of return). The data from it is compiled below, along with short summaries for each question.

PART I

1. How did you find out about the conference?

Summary: Most attendees learned about the LLCMC Conference via the internet (e.g., listservs, email, websites, etc.) or from colleagues.

Data:

Journal/Newsletter – 3 (7%)

Flyer – 0 (0%)

Email/WWW – 24 (57%)

Conference – 3 (7%)

Colleague – 17 (40%)

2. The information I received about the conference prior to coming was adequate for my needs.

Summary: NFLRC got high ratings for the information provided on its website and for its email communication with presenters and attendees prior to the event.

Data:

Strongly Agree – 26 (62%)

Agree – 10 (24%)

Neutral – 6 (14%)

Disagree – 0 (0%)

Strongly Disagree – 0 (0%)

Typical comments:

- “The website was comprehensive in hotel, transport, etc.”
- “Jim’s e-mails were very informative.”

- “Continuous emails from NFLRC providing details concerning the conference before coming to UH Manoa helped me prepare!”

3. The conference was well organized and well run.

Summary: Attendees all agreed that the conference was a very well-organized event that ran smoothly, and they appreciated the informal and friendly environment it created.

Data:

Strongly Agree – 32 (76%)

Agree – 10 (24%)

Neutral – 0 (0%)

Disagree – 0 (0%)

Strongly Disagree – 0 (0%)

Typical comments:

- “Wonderful”
- “Professional, welcoming, productive”
- “I appreciate that you maintained the schedule and talks began on time”
- “I truly enjoyed the informal environment in which the conference took place.”
- “Extremely well organized”

4. The staff was helpful.

Summary: Conference support staff and volunteers received the highest rating during the conference with attendees reporting that they received immediate and friendly assistance.

Data:

Strongly Agree – 35 (83%)

Agree – 7 (17%)

Neutral – 0 (0%)

Disagree – 0 (0%)

Strongly Disagree – 0 (0%)

Typical comments:

- “Especially the tech team!!! Very helpful”
- “Jim Yoshioka is conference organizer extraordinaire!”
- “Accessible and friendly too”
- “All my questions were answered immediately and with enthusiasm”

5. The facilities and technical support were adequate.

Summary: The conference venue's beautiful and convenient features and the tech team's expertise and preparation were greatly appreciated, and both achieved very high marks.

Data:

Strongly Agree – 32 (76%)

Agree – 7 (17%)

Neutral – 1 (2%)

Disagree – 0 (0%)

Strongly Disagree – 0 (0%)

Typical comments:

- "Thank you, Richard {LLC IT Specialist}, for everything"
- "Very nice. The rooms (Pacific/Asia) are great for presenting"
- "Technicians were well prepared and were ready to respond every time."

6. The length of the conference was appropriate.

Summary: Most attendees thought the length of the Cultura pre-conference and LLCMC main conference events (4 days in total) were right on the mark. A number, however, wished that the conference period were either longer or shorter.

Data:

Strongly Agree – 21 (50%)

Agree – 15 (36%)

Neutral – 3 (7%)

Disagree – 1 (2%)

Strongly Disagree – 0 (0%)

Typical comments:

- "I felt the length of a presentation was too long."
- "I would have like 1 extra day."
- "'Short and Sweet'. The last 4 days were filled with good ideas and good learning."

7. The presenters were knowledgeable.

Summary: In general, all attendees thought the presenters were knowledgeable in their given topic area. However, a number felt that the quality of presentation and level of expertise sometimes varied markedly among the different presenters.

Data:

Strongly Agree – 15 (36%)

Agree – 26 (62%)

Neutral – 0 (0%)

Disagree – 0 (0%)

Strongly Disagree – 0 (0%)

Typical comments:

- “Some obviously more expert than others.”
- “It varied. 😊”
- “Some are really good, some topics are very narrow.”
- “Most presentations were too academic, wanted to see more practical hands-on stuff for classroom use. I learned many useful websites, though.”
- “They all had enthusiasm and were very knowledgeable in their topic/area.”

8. The range and diversity of the presentations was good.

Summary: Attendees really liked the range and diversity of the presentations offered at the LLCMC Conference. As evidenced by comments listed later in this report, however, a number of attendees felt there might have been too much diversity in the presentation topics or too small a pool of presentations (the latter was true considering the number of proposals received).

Data:

Strongly Agree – 14 (33%)

Agree – 21 (50%)

Neutral – 7 (17%)

Disagree – 0 (0%)

Strongly Disagree – 0 (0%)

9. Overall, my expectations of the conference were met.

Summary: Attendees on the whole had a positive experience with the LLCMC Conference and felt that they went away with resources, knowledge, or ideas they could use toward better utilizing technology in the classroom or curriculum through online learning communities.

Strongly Agree – 15 (36%)

Agree – 21 (50%)

Neutral – 5 (12%)

Disagree – 0 (0%)

Strongly Disagree – 0 (0%)

Typical comments:

- “Everyone was helpful”
- “I would definitely attend next year.”
- “Very productive and I learned many things that will inform my practice as an educator involved with online communities for language learning.”

PART II

1. Please describe your most valuable learning experience(s) at the conference (e.g., specific presentations, conversation with a presenter/another participant, etc.).

Summary: Attendees specifically mentioned certain presentations to be the best or most helpful, including ones by Furstenberg (plenary), Morioka (Japanese videoconferencing), Gonzales and Lin (LiveMocha), Cetto (dynamic assessment), Zheng (Second Life), Tschudi (language cafés), Cripps (Moodle), and Chun (intercultural exchanges), and many really appreciated the inclusion of Naomi Losch’s special talks on the Hawaiian language and people. Finally, apart from the formal presentations, numerous attendees commented on how the conversations they had between and after sessions also contributed toward their professional growth and enjoyment of the conference.

Typical comments:

- “Presentations by Maria Cetto, Guy Kellogg, Stephen Tschudi, Mark Freiermuth, Tony Cripps, Dorothy Chun, and Naomi Losch (what a fabulous part of the conference!). I was very impressed too with how very cordial and communicative Gilberte & Sabine were. It was such a special treat to have conversations with them”
- “I learned a lot from Prof. Akemi Morioka’s presentation.”
- “Conversation outside of the conference was most valuable. I’ve been to a conference that was especially designed for between conference interaction. So it might be useful to have a longer break between sessions.”
- “The Q&A sessions were useful.”
- “Learning about livemocha.com”
- “For me the contact with the Samoan teachers was the most valuable on a personal level. On a professional level the opportunity to hear and speak with those using technology to support language teaching was very helpful.”
- “Videoconference for Japanese language curriculum, language cafes, language learning communities via social robotics & videoconferencing”
- “Networking & personal connections – I learned many things from my conversations w/people between sessions. Of course, the presentations were both informational & motivating.”
- “I believe that my most valuable learning experience was the ability to interact with experts in the field. This interaction answered many questions and allowed for the exchange of ideas for future research/projects.”
- “I especially like the plenary speech at the opening and the presentation on Second Life”
- “Learning the different resources available”

2. What effect will the conference have on your teaching/professional development?

Summary: The conference served as a catalyst for many conference attendees – some being inspired to try incorporating new technology/methods in their classrooms or programs, some being reinvigorated to continue their old projects with a technological twist, some being motivated to pursue further study and research into CMC work. (The only group that found it difficult to apply many of the ideas at the conference, which tended to lean more toward postsecondary applications, were the groups of local high school teachers who attended the event. As mentioned later in this report, some of them wished for sessions that were more high school-focused and more hands-on.)

Typical comments:

- “Excellent catalytic agent – look forward to following up reading & exploring more about what has been presented here and then to implementing.”
- “Ideas for future language learning programs/curriculum, as well as problems to plan for before launching programs”
- “I would like to try videoconferencing in my classes.”
- “I am more convinced that I would like to continue pursuing LLCMC projects, possibly a dissertation.”
- “New research ideas”
- “I will use my position to further interest in the use of technology in language teaching, speaking with more knowledge and conviction that I had before.”
- “Try to use word association/sentence completion, infuse more cultural components in teaching, investigate more inter-cultural opportunities”
- “Some conference sessions generated considerable discussion and new ideas among my colleagues who attended. We will incorporate some of these ideas in our online course development.”
- “I plan to implement several new techniques in my own teaching & will also share w/colleagues.”
- “Hard to say. High school DOE. No funds to implement.”
- “Re-inspired me to tweak my projects and reinitiate some projects with overseas partners.”
- “I have a broader, more open view of how telecollaboration and Cultura-like programs can be designed. I did hook up with one person & we plan on coordinating a Cultura-like program between our schools. In general, I leave with a renewed & heightened interest in participating in a telecollaboration.”

3. How do you expect to share/disseminate what you have learned with colleagues at your home institution?

Summary: Many said they would go on to discuss what they’ve learned with colleagues and students, in Twitter and blog postings, in reports for their institution, or in future conference presentations, so the knowledge learned in this conference would be further spread and have further impact.

Typical comments:

- “We will have a meeting with my colleagues, as well as an article in our newspaper. It will also be part of a presentation at our conference.”
- “I will write a short written report.”
- “Incorporate it into an online professional development course”
- “Summarize some of the presentations and use our listserv to disseminate the info and wait for ‘fish to bite.’”
- “I will make a presentation at Tech Teachers’ conference in Osaka.”

- “Will share my personal notes with interested colleagues. Share twitter feed with colleagues.”
- “I will look more into using technology to motivate students. Chats & conferencing probably not a reality due to liability, responsibility of monitoring high school students, time difference and tech issues.”
- “We will share ideas with our online course development teams. (Most of our teams had representatives who attended at least part of our conference.)
- “Word of mouth”
- “I’ll share my LLCMC experience with my colleagues and research students through a faculty/dept seminar.”
- “I’ll report on the most realistic & useful presentations”
- “Prior to coming to Hawaii, our School Press Officer said that we will work on a press release concerning this conference so that not only our school will know it but everyone in American Samoa.”

4. What could we have done better at the conference?

Summary: Suggestions for improving the conference included asking all presenters to have handouts, having a record of the conference presentations (either in an online archive or as proceedings), doing a wider call for proposals and advertising prior to the conference, avoiding time delays (within or between sessions), having more hands-on sessions, and creating more opportunities for networking and discussion during the conference.

Typical comments:

- “1) healthier snacks – grapes, bananas cut in segments, etc.; 2) perhaps ask all presenters to have handouts; 3) give guidelines to presenters at pre-conference workshop (Dorothy Chun’s presentation with 3 main points & support for those points, for example, was, in my opinion, FABULOUS. Some others, however, rambled.); 4) opening plenary too rushed – don’t say redundant. Would’ve been fine with no comments.”
- “I think you should urge presenters to follow the time frame. Some started 5 min later, some presented more than 40 min, so that discussion time was cut off short.”
- “Record each session and post it on the website so that more people will have access to the presentation copies. Invite people from literacy studies, educational technology to broaden the focus of LLCMC.”
- “Perhaps wider pre-advertising (& calls for papers) might have attracted better papers. Then again maybe the economy is to blame. The papers were in a way too diverse.”
- “Thematically, the pre-conference could have been not as similar to the actual conference. The pre-conference should/could have been the conference.”
- “There are always time delays because of various reasons, which is unavoidable. But maybe we can try to do a better job.”
- “Perhaps since this was such a small group of people, it would have been great to have opportunities (e.g., working lunch) to talk based on our expertise/interests.”
- “Proceedings”
- “More handouts – online to save paper also okay. More opportunities to network – discussion groups or tables”
- “No suggestions – it was well organized”
- “The names on the name tags were rather small. They should be bigger. I would like to have seen more ‘what didn’t work’ ideas (to know to avoid those techniques in the future).”
- “Most of the sessions were excellent but there was overlap in sessions involving chat. Turn down the air conditioning!”

- “1) Including some hands-on sessions will be good. 2) Including some local cultural visits will be a bonus, e.g. Bishop Museum & Polynesian Village.”
- “Had more information targeted towards school-aged children for high school teachers instead of just focusing on older students.”

5. What did we do particularly well?

Summary: Comments listed here reflected the high ratings and enthusiastic comments listed previously in this report, and a couple called for a second LLCMC Conference.

Typical comments:

- “1) organization; 2) selection of presenters; 3) variety; 4) enforcement of time lines. Thanks for the nice variety of teas too.”
- “Again, I thought the schedule was well maintained. Snacks and social time was good.”
- “Very well organized. Technology team is very responsive. Excellent job!”
- “The organization, website, venue were superb.”
- “I particularly enjoyed the inclusion of Hawaiian culture in the conference.”
- “Very organized, well timed, engaging presenters”
- “Program (I didn’t have any conflicting sessions), relaxing breaks (w/food and coffee/tea), diversity of topics & technology. Please do have LLCMC 2!”
- “Very open exchanges and diversity in conference attendees and participants”
- “Wide variety of presentations w/great keynote anchors!”
- “The sharing of information about the conference (technical & administrative). Also, the volunteers did a tremendous job...they should be highly commended.”
- “Jim is highly commendable for disseminating information timely and efficiently. Mahalo nui loa, Jim!”
- “Everyone was helpful in terms of informing the presenters. Technicians provided good technological assistance. Coordinators were accessible at all times when presenters needed to ask questions. NFLRC staff members were also attentive to/in serving their guests.”
- “Very well organized!! Presenters very well prepared! Well chosen”
- “Aside from the academic, your were very hospitable and welcoming. I greatly appreciate the informal nature of the conference. A formal, stuffy atmosphere would have been very counterproductive. I think participants felt quite comfortable and relaxed, resulting in a high degree of discussion & interaction.”

**Evaluation of the Fourth Summer Heritage Research Institute, June 21-25, 2010
Held at the University of Hawaii at Manoa
Sponsored by the National Heritage Language Resource Center (NHLRC) at the
University of California at Los Angeles and Co-Sponsored by the National Foreign
Language Resource Center (NFLRC) at the University of Hawaii at Manoa**

The cornerstone project for the National Heritage Language Resource Center is an annual research institute, established to support the center's principal mission of developing the research base for heritage language education.

The 4th Summer Heritage Language Research Institute, “Heritage Speakers: Linguistics and Pedagogy” was directed by Professor Maria Polinsky (Harvard) and focused on current linguistic research and the implications for heritage language instruction. It was co-hosted by the National Foreign Language Resource Center at the University of Hawaii, the location of the 2010 institute.

Applications were invited from linguists, language instructors, post-doctoral fellows, and doctoral students currently actively involved in heritage teaching and research.

Summary of participant evaluation forms:

1. How did you learn about the institute?

- “The NFLRC.”
- “Directly from Prof. Polinsky.”
- “Maria Polinsky introduced it to us.”
- “From the UCLA CSEAS email listing.”
- “Email from NFLRC”
- “From emails at my University.”
- “Dr. Maria Polinsky.”
- “Through 1st International Heritage/Community Language Conference at UCLA.”
- “At the UCLA 1st International Conference on Heritage and Comm. Languages (Feb. 2010)”
- “At my University.”
- “Previous institutes.”
- “On the website”
- “From a panel organizer.”
- “I learned about the institute from the Hawaii HFLRC.”
- “Through HALT.”
- “Web.”
- “Website.”
- “Announcement by email.”
- “Institute web site.”
- “Searched online for heritage languages.”
- “Jim Yoshoka – HALT.”

2. Did the institute meet your expectations? (5 being the highest score)

Rating	Total #
5	15
4	5
3	1
2	0
1	0

3. How would you rate the organization of the institute? (5 being the highest score)

Rating	Total #
5	17
4	3
3	1
2	0
1	0

4. How would you rate the overall quality of the institute? (5 being the highest score)

Rating	Total #
5	14
4	6
3	1
2	0
1	0

5. Was it valuable to you to make new connections and reconnect with colleagues? (5 being the highest score)

Rating	Total #
5	16
4	3
3	1
2	0
1	1

6. Which discussion section did you attend in the afternoon?

Discussion Section	Total # of Students Attended
White Paper on Linguistics	6
Pedagogy Workshop	12
Some of both	1

7. How would you rate the quality of the afternoon discussions (see # 6 above)?

Rating	Total #
5	13
4	7
3	0
2	0
1	0

8. What was the most important aspect of the institute? Please explain.

- “The discussion/workshop sessions.”
- “Discussion groups missing fundamental questions.”
- “Drawing experts and researchers together to exchange the latest findings and views on heritage language acquisition. Bridging theory and practice. Research and pedagogical applications can be integrated.”
- “The most important aspect was the wrap-up! I enjoyed seeing how everyone’s presentations connected to the overall goals of this institute. I also benefited a lot from the pedagogy workshop because we had a set time to dialogue and brainstorm together!”
- “The scientific approach of the researchers. The variety of topics.”
- “Meeting colleagues. Being introduced to new research results, ideas, and trends.”
- “Hearing/reading others linguistic research, learning about the state of the field, collaboration w/colleagues on HL issues.”
- “To learn the state of the art research in HL.”
- “Excellent presenters from a wide variety of fields (Ling, Edu. Lit, ect.), languages, special needs, approaches. Excellent opportunity to network and learn. Kudos for Dr.

Kimi Koudo's panel. Sumi Chang's presentation was excellent, too! Pls. Let them know."

- "The unique way pedagogy and linguistics were integrated. Linguists, applied linguists and practitioners made an effort to exchange knowledge, to share their concerns and to seek ways of better surveying heritage-speakers communities."
- "Ability to network, exchange ideas, opportunity to discuss own research and receive valuable input in an informal setting."
- "Getting exposed to research and pedagogical practices in order to; getting familiarized with the field of Heritage Language Teachings, bringing them to the classroom and getting motivated to do research in this field."
- "Because its focus is on heritage learners."
- "The exchange of information. It's a great opportunity to find about new works, new approaches. I learned about linguistic theories, which is something I will use to improve my instruction. It's a wonderful one-stop shopping of all things related to Heritage and language instruction & acquisition."
- "Helped one to identify their needs of HSS, Letter, therefore I can be better prepared to facilitate the more effective teaching curriculum to meet the HSs' needs."
- "It was good to see linguists and educators try to understand each other for the betterment of HL."
- "Discussion of new ideas."
- "Meetings with researchers and teachers. Hearings from community members. Learning about new research and teaching methods."
- "Pedagogy of teaching HL."
- "A wide variety of languages, topics and speakers kept things interesting. Research is current and cutting-edge."
- "Opportunity to share knowledge & Ideas."

9. What component was the least valuable to you? Please explain.

- "All good – except for a couple of panel presentations that were short on content."

- “In principle bringing researchers and teachers together should be valuable, but I saw disappointingly few examples of this working in practice.”
- “It was all valuable.”
- “Too much emphasis on research and little on pedagogy.”
- “I’d like to see more “talk” between the researchers and the “educators”. Although the theme (ling. and pedag.) aimed to put these two groups together, there was a clear/distinct divide during the presentations and afternoon workshops. While the research is interesting and useful, some were highly theoretical and I couldn’t follow. I’d have rather attended a different session (if available).”
- “I cannot think of any negative or weak point of this institute. I believe that the organization might consider having fewer hours per day by 3 pm most of the participants were exhausted.”
- “Some of the presentations on pedagogy and minority languages.”
- “The talks about Cantonese as a Heritage language by lip and matters. It was extremely dense and – even though it was useful in providing information about certain important basic differences, it was extremely language-specific.”
- “Enough time to give a talk and have a Q&A session.”
- “None. If any, some sessions may have run slightly too long.”
- “None, every presenter has brought a great deal of research results and knowledge that are very applicable to share.”
- “The panel on Wednesday (Asian LGS).”
- “It was all useful.”
- “Linguistic part.”
- “Too much time devoted to workshops – two meetings were enough to cover relevant aspects of “Pedagogy” and “White paper.”

10. What suggestions do you have for the next institute in summer 2011?

- “Longer workshop/discussion session based on the talks/presentations and/or previously announced theses. Lectures should not be longer than one hour.”
- “? Raise specific research/discussion questions on the web page in advance.”
- “Move in-depth discussion of specific topics and issues that are of interest to particular research groups e.g. relative clauses, morphology, pragmatics etc.”
- “I would enjoy seeing more so linguistic research. It would be great to see video clips of teacher’s classes so that way linguists can see how some topics are taught

and can offer insight and suggestions. Also, the presence of more HL teachers from all levels (elementary, H.S., college) as well as community endeavors in maintaining the HL and culture.”

- “I think this year struck a nice balance between linguistic and pedagogical emphasis, I’d like to keep that in future years.”
- “Having more dialogue between researchers and educators; including socio-cultural approaches to HL in the institute (e.g., HL Learners lived experiences at home, school and broader society.)”
- “I’d like to attend, but can’t afford a hotel. Dorms rates were great in Hawaii. I hope you can find affordable lodging. Thanks! Great idea to have the recommended readings available online. Can you add a few book titles as well? Some participants would like more general introductory. Readings. Please let us know ASAP the days for 2011 so we can make plans. Thanks you for this great opportunity.”
- “If the organizers decided to offer the afternoon pedagogy, I suggest that: purposes of the workshop should be made clear since the first day, more details about the process and the target audience (why/what are participants trying to convey? To whom?)”
- “Ice-breaking activity in the morning of Day one. So that everybody felt at home, not just those who have come to previous institutes and already know other people. And not just going around the room and introducing ourselves. Ice-breaking games (twister; try to untwist using only non-English languages or something like that.) Once during the Institute have lang. specific groups get together from discussion or presentations, formal networking and perhaps evaluation of the fields of HL for that particular language.”
- “Presenters should limit the time try devote to “self-promotion”. A couple of presentations went over the limit!”
- “Hope to see the conference schedule (detailed, e.g. topics or titles) ahead of time.”
- “I would like to learn from colleagues how to find funding for new projects involving heritage learners. In addition, there was use of free wave, hot potato, etc, at the sessions. Therefore, demonstration of how to incorporate near technologies is desirable.”
- “Keep up the excellent work, thank you!”
- “Having diverse LGS. represented in linguistic side!”
- “More attendance.”
- “It would be useful to develop templates for research and teaching. It would be great to have more student presenters.”
- “More panel discussions for creating content and hand-on classroom instructions.”
- “Provide bios and short bios of all participants online prior to the Institute. Have one or two language-specific treatment groups for 1- 1 ½ hours at a time to share common problems. Have a ½ day program on Wed, with a common excursion for everyone – promotes networking in the future.

11. Will you recommend the next Institute to your colleagues and graduate students? (5 would be most likely to recommend.)

Rating	Total #
5	17
4	4
3	0
2	0
1	0

12. Do you have any other comments or suggestions? Please include topics you would like to see discussed in future institutes.

- “A more explicit attempt to bring together the linguists and the pedagogy people to discuss collaborative work on particular critical projects.”
- “Maybe a workshop on methodology in which specific methods would be demonstrated and discussed.”
- “Interdisciplinary perspectives on heritage e.g. acquisition – neurocognitive approaches, clinical studies of heritage speakers with impairment.”
- “I appreciated and want to acknowledge the organizers for a smooth week. The hospitality of Jim and the NFLRC staff was very comforting! I learned a lot from this institute and hope it’s available for many years because it’s such a rare space for important dialogue to take place. Thank you so much!”
- “The institute was very well run. Special thanks to people who took care of lunches, snacks and beverages. They did an excellent job.”
- “Include a graduate student panel. This was an extremely fruitful and productive institute which was organized very well.”
- “More ethnographic research. More semantic/pragmatic and phonology research—so much syntax and morphology this year!”
- “More presentations on K-12 setting.”
- “Practical strategies for mixed classrooms pedagogy/research (L2, HLL + native speakers). Model programs (great idea). I really like to see what other programs are doing. Most programs/presentations are about HLL students in top Universities. What about less prestigious programs, comm., colleges, average students...? More info. On funding for HLL research/programs creation. More info. On other training, faculty development opportunities. Training in outcomes/assessment.”
- “I believe that this year topic should be repeated in the near future. Interest in assessment seems to be a commonality among presenters and participants.”
- “International perspectives if possible (HL researchers from Europe) more sociality studies of HL. I would not be including endangered minority languages in HLL, there really seems to be a different agenda/focus with these languages, and they are a different type of “heritage” language.”

- “I feel fortunate I am a participant at this summer institute. Heritage Language Teaching and Research is a field grad students do not usually have the chance to explore at our institutions, so I appreciate the opportunity for learning reconnecting and connecting with new people.”
- “More on pedagogy sessions.”
- “How to encourage heritage students to pursue the target language to the advanced level. How to reach heritage learner’s families, and convince them of the importance of providing a good learning environment at home.”
- “Developing corpora for research and teaching.”
- “Make points of presentations available online, especially references. (Still do-able for this summer’s inst). Use clip on name badges. Lavalier type fill row to allow others to read the name easily. Include a hard cheese or other protein source for morning – e.g. peanut butter, yogurt, for those watching, glycemic intake.”

Thank you very much for providing this valuable input. It will be part of our report to Title VI.

- “Thank you so much to the most hospitable host at the University of Hawaii at Manca. The institute runs very efficiently and smoothly. Jim Yoshinka has done a tremendously great job of providing us with all the necessities and convenience.”
- “Great Job!”

Report on the 2nd International Conference on Language Documentation and Conservation

Overview

The 2nd International Conference on Language Documentation and Conservation (ICLDC) (<http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/ICLDC/2011/>) was held in Honolulu from February 9-13 this year. The theme of the 2nd ICLDC was “Strategies for Moving Forward,” with the aim to build on the strong momentum created at the 1st ICLDC (<http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/ICLDC/2009/>) and to discuss research and revitalization approaches yielding rich, accessible records which can benefit both the field of language documentation and speech communities.

Conference planning and organization

Conference planning began in the fall of 2009 and was led by the following committee:

Yuko Otsuka (Co-chair; Linguistics, UH Mānoa)
Victoria Anderson (Co-chair; Linguistics, UH Mānoa)
Kenneth L. Rehg (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)
Nicholas Thieberger (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)
Lyle Campbell (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)
Larry Kimura (College of Hawaiian Language, UH Hilo)
Richard Schmidt (NFLRC, UH Mānoa)
Jim Yoshioka (NFLRC, UH Mānoa)

Conference organization involved a 15-membered Student Steering Committee.

Erenst Anip (Library and Information Science, UH Manoa)
Laura Berbusse (Linguistics, UH Manoa)
Katie Butler (Linguistics, UH Manoa)
Rebecca Clifford (Linguistics, UH Manoa)
Akiemi Glenn (Linguistics, UH Manoa)
James Grama (Linguistics, UH Manoa)
Cheng-Chuen Kuo (Linguistics, UH Manoa)
Huiying Nala Lee (Linguistics, UH Manoa)
Ayumi Oiwa (Linguistics, UH Manoa)
Ai-Yu Tang (Linguistics, UH Manoa)
Kaori Ueki (Linguistics, UH Manoa)
John Van Way (Linguistics, UH Manoa)
Aaron Waldrip (Linguistics, UH Manoa)
Mary Walworth (Linguistics, UH Manoa)

Yuko Otsuka taught a seminar “Professional Development in Linguistics” in Fall 2010 with the assistance of Jim Yoshioka (NFLRC) to provide the students with hands-on training in conference organization.

We also took advantage of the social media sites Facebook and Twitter to keep in touch with interested parties. The Facebook page (<http://www.facebook.com/icldc>) and the Twitter account (http://twitter.com/ICLDC_HI) were updated at least weekly from October 2010 through the conference, including the calls for volunteers, reminders about conference deadlines (e.g., pre-registration), and facts about language documentation and conservation. Currently, they continue to serve as a way to inform conference fans of important resources and opportunities related to language documentation and conservation as well as news of the 3rd ICLDC Conference planned for 2013.

Sponsors

The 2nd ICLDC received generous support from the following agencies. Key among these sponsors, the NFLRC provided not only financial assistance, but also critical technical and organizational support. NFLRC Program Coordinator Jim Yoshioka provided invaluable logistical support for all aspects of conference implementation before and during the event.

UH Department of Linguistics
UH National Foreign Language Resource Center (NFLRC)
UH Center for Southeast Asian Studies (CSEAS)
UH National Resource Center - East Asia (NRCEA)
UH Center for Pacific Islands Studies (CPIS)
UH College of Languages, Linguistics, & Literature (LLL)
Ka Haka 'Ula O Ke'elikōlani College of Hawaiian Language (UH Hilo campus)
National Science Foundation
Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig

Outcomes

The 2nd ICLDC exceeded the 1st ICLDC (2009) in sheer numbers and ambition. The number of participants increased by 15% from last time, with 383 people attending the conference.

We received 221 abstract submissions (46% increase from last time). Our Advisory Committee, consisting of 22 recognized experts in the field from Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Japan, US, and UK, together with graduate linguistics students from UH anonymously reviewed and accepted 111 (for a 50% acceptance rate), resulting in a program with up to six parallel paper sessions and 27 poster presentations. Selected papers are being solicited for the NFLRC-sponsored online journal *Language Documentation & Conservation*, and audio recordings/materials of the presentations will be archived and made publicly available.

Conference highlights

In addition to some 100+ presentations, three plenaries, and three invited colloquia at the main conference (11-13 February), the 2nd ICLDC offered a variety of additional pre- and post-conference events. The full schedule, with abstracts, can be seen here:

<http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/ICLDC/2011/program.html>.

Pre-conference workshops:

Nicholas Thieberger organized the optional pre-conference workshops (9-10 February) to provide technical training for language documentation, which was funded by a grant for the National Science Foundation. There were training workshops on software such as ELAN, FLEX, Toolbox, LEXUS, and VICOS as well as topical workshops on psycholinguistic techniques for the assessment of language strength, video/film in language documentation, archiving challenges and metadata, and language acquisition for revitalization specialists. More information about the workshops can be found here: <http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/icldc/2011/workshops.html>.

Pre-conference film screening:

There was a free screening of short films in and about endangered languages on the evening before the main conference. Rozenn Milin (Sorosoro Foundaton) and Melissa Bisagni (Smithsonian Institution) selected short films from Canada, Brazil, Tonga, Australia, Norway, and Wales.

Plenary talks:

There were three conference plenaries, all of which were well received by the audience.

Keren D. Rice (University of Toronto) talked about documentation as a joint enterprise by academic and community researchers as a crucial part of community strengthening in her talk “Strategies for moving ahead: Linguistic and community goals” with special reference to projects involving two indigenous peoples of Canada, Anishinaabemowin and Déline.

Wayan Arka (Australian National University/Udayana University) discussed strategic issues in language management with special regard to minority languages in Indonesia in his talk “Language management and minority language maintenance in Indonesia: Strategic issues.”

Larry Kimura (University of Hawai‘i at Hilo) gave an intimate account of the Hawaiian language revitalization efforts over the past three decades in his talk “A journey of beginnings: The Hawaiian language revitalization efforts, 1970's forward.”

Invited colloquia:

One of the following three colloquia was offered daily, which were enthusiastically attended by conference participants:

- *Dictionaries and Endangered Languages: Technology, Revitalization, and Collaboration* (Organizer: Sarah Ogilvie)
- *The Use of Film in Language Documentation* (Organizers: Rozenn Milin and Melissa Bisagni; sponsored by a grant from the National Science Foundation)
- *Grammaticography* (Organizer: Sebastian Nordhoff; sponsored by the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig)¹

¹ This colloquium on grammar writing had originally been announced as a separate conference by the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig, for the same time as the 2nd ICLDC. As several people asked the organizers there to switch times so they could attend the 2nd ICLDC, it was later relocated to coincide with ours as an invited colloquium upon Sebastian Nordhoff's suggestion.

Office hours:

The following institutions and/or programs held office hours during the conference to provide the conference participants with an opportunity to meet their directors/editors and ask questions: National Science Foundation, Endangered Languages Archive (SOAS), Endangered Languages Documentation Programme (SOAS), and Language Documentation & Conservation Journal.

Evening receptions:

Two evening receptions provided a wonderful opportunity for the conference participants to network as well as enjoy Hawaiian music on the first night and a Balinese gamelan music and dance performance on the second.

Recovering Voices Exhibition Development: A Working Session

On the afternoon of the third day of the main conference, immediately after the closing ceremony, there was a discussion session organized by the members of the core team of Recovering Voices, a new initiative of the Smithsonian's National Museum of Natural History, National Museum of the American Indian, and the Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage, where they presented initial plans and solicit feedback for the exhibition. This heralded the beginning of important collaborative work between the UH Department of Linguistics and the Smithsonian Institution.

Hilo Field Study:

Following the very successful field trip in Hilo at the 1st ICLDC, we offered another optional field study on Hawaiian language revitalization in Hilo on 14-15 February, immediately following the main conference. This field study, *Living Hawaiian Language: To Know The World Through The Hawaiian Language*, was organized by Ka Haka 'Ula O Ke'elikōlani College of Hawaiian Language, University of Hawai'i at Hilo, Hawai'i and featured visits to Hawaiian immersion schools, Hawaiian classes at University of Hawai'i at Hilo, and 'Imiloa Astronomy Center of Hawai'i, as well as a number of panel discussions.

Languages discussed

Amarasi, Acazolco Otomí, Ahtna, Alutor, Amis, Arandic, Arapaho, Archi, Aymara, Baba Malay, Balingshan, Blackfoot, Chalkan, Cham, Chamoru, Cherokee, Chimiini, Chochoan, Choguita Rarámuri, Chuukese, Chuxnabán Mixe, Dela-Oenale, Dene, Dinka, Dzongkha, Gaelic, Gamilaraay, Gavião, Goshute, Guwamu, Isthmus Nawa, Iñupiaq, Ixhil, Jaqaru, Jarawara, Kairak, Kalaallisut, Kanakanavu, Kawki, Keres, Khanty, Khinalug, Kiksht, Kinyindu, Kurtöp, K'wak'wala, Longgu, Lusoga, Malgana, Mansi, Mayangna, Māori, Marshallese, Matlatzinkan, Mayan, Miami, Michif, Mi'gmaq, Mije, Mutu, Nawa, N'kep, Nivkh, Oneida, Ojibwe, Omaha, Otuho, Paiwan, Panau, Passamaquoddy, Pazih, Puebla, Purari, Rapa Nui, Riung, Ryukyuan, Saaroa, Salish, Sauk, Secwepemctsin, Shiwilu, Sholaga, Seneca, Siraya, Shoshone, Sierra Nawa, Siouan, Sokean, Tanana, Thao, Truku Seediq, Tuscarora, Wadeye, Wiyot, Yiddish, Zapotec, Zulu, and Zuni.

A summary of comments from the evaluation form

Feedback from participants has been overwhelmingly extremely positive. Below is a summary of the responses provided in the evaluation forms. 92 participants returned their evaluation forms.

Proposal submission procedures

	strongly disagree	disagree	agree	strongly agree
The online abstract submission system was easy and convenient to use.	0	0	24	33
The proposal deadline was reasonable.	2	0	22	33
My proposal was judged in a timely manner.	0	0	24	33
I was generally satisfied with the proposal submission process.	0	1	20	36

Pre-conference publicity, communication, registration

	Strongly disagree	disagree	agree	strongly agree	n/a
Conference publicity was good.	4	2	39	35	9
Response to email was timely.	3	1	20	51	12
The registration fee was reasonable.	3	1	35	40	7
The conference website was informative and helpful.	2	1	26	54	4

Conference organization

	Poor	fair	Good	Excellent	n/a		poor	fair	good	excellent	n/a
Check-in process	0	0	32	55	1	Transportation	0	8	26	28	25
Conference packet	0	2	38	48	1	Conference length	1	2	37	40	5
Technology & tech. support	0	7	29	44	10	Program schedule	0	7	37	35	5
Conference facilities	0	1	21	62	4	Accommodation (availability/convenience)	0	14	23	35	12
Boxed lunch	0	11	26	33	16	Accommodation (cost)	0	9	33	29	11
Coffee service	0	2	20	63	2	Topics	2	4	26	44	10

Conference events

	poor	fair	good	excellent	n/a
Plenary Talks	4	8	44	31	4
Colloquia	0	2	24	37	22
Paper sessions	2	3	31	47	4
Poster sessions	0	6	31	40	9
Social events	1	3	38	41	5

Proposal submission

- It was a painless and timely affair.
- Although my proposal was not accepted the procedure was very well done.
- I was disappointed to learn that it was reviewed by only two people. Particularly as this conference becomes better known and more prestigious, abstracts should have at least three reviewers.
- It was not clear whether an author could appear on 2 papers.
- I missed the deadline by a few days, a little flexibility would have been appreciated on the part of the organizing committee.

Events

- I would have liked more space at posters.
- Have poster session some other time than during lunch.
- Plenary in the morning set the tone for the day, after 9 sessions it was hard to be enthusiastic about a long talk [plenary at the end of the day].
- Really would like for the plenaries to be "moving the field forward" type papers.
- Make closing plenaries more dynamic.
- There is enough show and tell papers as part of the main program.
- Most of the talks were very thought-provoking and the awesome initiatives well-articulated.

Most useful and enjoyable aspects of the conference?

- Networking, meeting people, social events (25):
 - I met one colleague that made the whole conference worth it!
 - All day coffee/ tea in foyer and lounge were great to meet people.
 - Downstairs meeting and eating area and entertainment.
 - The ongoing refreshments service was great if you wanted a break and a great way to network or catch up with someone in particular.
- Pre-conference workshops (10):
 - The preconference workshops on videography and psycholinguistic testing were very good - I appreciated their very practical orientation.
 - Workshops were great!! more of them please!
 - Workshops were great but books out too soon.
- Diversity of topics (9)
- Paper sessions (9):
 - Talks were excellent.
 - I enjoyed the papers more than the colloquia/consortium.
- The program booklet (5)
 - The program was organized well in that it was very easy to follow.
 - Very informative and helped plan the days.
 - Very helpful, especially having all presentations at a given time appear on the same page-making it easy to choose. (If next time, the colloquia could be included in this list, it would be even better.)
- I really like the colloquia (5)
- Variety of speakers/places/situation (4):
 - People from indigenous communities.
 - Nice mix of people, not just academics.

- 2009 had more indigenous presenters and perspectives.
- Reasonable schedule consisting of sessions and breaks (3):
 - By this, the conference remained enjoyable.
 - Pre-organized times for all participants is an excellent idea.
 - I think there the 10-minute breaks between sessions/talks worked really well
 - Very well timers for sessions to keep everyone on target.
- Poster sessions (3):
 - The poster sessions were a nice informal way to learn and discuss ideas because they dealt with issues related to starting research and I could talk in depth with the presenters.
- Plenary talk (2)
 - because it was for a general audience; (2)
- Good hotel locations near beach and social activities.
- Transportation (2)
 - Convenient bus transportation.
 - Conference bus made coming and going easy.
- Facilities.
- wifi was excellent.
- Being in Hawaii is fantastic.
- Practically all of them.
- Everything was excellent!
- Overall, this was the best organized conference I've been to in several years. Well done!
- Really well organized;
- Warm welcoming environment, friendly atmosphere of sharing. excellent conference.

Were you able to attend all parts of the conference you wanted to?

Yes: 28

- A smart move to ensure presenters from the same countries did not clash(in?) timings.
- Several times a choice had to be made b/w a couple of interesting sessions, however.

No: 25

- Competing streams; concurrent, relevant talks .
- Too many parallel sessions.
- Timing is not transparent of workshops and colloquia.
- Perhaps the conference could have been three full days and had one fewer parallel session?
- I did NOT know workshops would fill up quickly. This should be clearly stated to all submitters early.
- Unable to attend Hilo session due to cost.
- Many timeslots had more than one paper which I would have liked to have attended so I'm grateful that papers will be available online.
- Knowing that recordings will be available makes it a lot better.

Mostly: 9

- Choices between papers is always difficult. looking forward to papers online.
- Except a couple of papers.
- I wish I could have stayed for the Hilo trip. Maybe next time.
- It was a little frustrating that, due to cancellations, some of the colloquia/consortium sessions were reorganized - this was not communicated well and so on a couple of occasions

I turned up to the colloquia/consortium and found that the speaker I wanted to see had already spoken.

Suggestions for future?

Theme & topics:

- A slightly stronger emphasis on Language policy and planning: this is a discipline into which some languages need to move.
- Revitalization efforts, partnership of academia and grassroots; some regions under represented (very Pacific based); language documentation in real life application.
- Maybe an overview of how far we have come in the past two decades in regards to language documentation and the scope of what still needs to be done (i.e. an update on the status of language endangerment and success projects.

Pre-conference workshops:

- Pre-conference workshops were great.
- Workshops to be announced with call for papers, to have a better opportunity to present in a workshop.
- More openings and availability to attend the pre-conf workshops
- Better workshops with more relevant hands on training
- More non-digital skills workshops, like the acquisition workshop
- I wish you would have a practical workshop on how lexicographers can prepare flora and fauna specimens for future scientific identification
- Maybe a pre-conference workshop on effective teaching strategies for different contexts - reclamation/revival -> language maintenance

Plenaries:

- No plenaries on Sunday.
- Keynotes moved to middle of the day.
- You might want to make the Saturday plenary in the morning - people were exhausted/overloaded by the afternoon.

Paper sessions:

- Would like more talks, even with the conflicts, seemed to give a richer mix of participants in 2009.
- 45-minute sessions, shorter days.
- Maybe fewer parallel sessions so I could get to more.
- Less parallel sessions, larger conference.
- Related talks not occurring in similar spot
- You might want to consider a closer thematic mapping of papers to sessions.
- It was hard to determine if the paper sessions had themes. If they did, it would have been to give them titles or print them in the program. If not it would be good to group them. I saw some common themes but some disparate papers as well.
- Many talks that were similar at the same time
- Most papers were extremely general and vague, lacking details on actual methodology and the data collected.
- The content of the talks (with a few exceptions) was disappointing. Most were not driven by research questions and did not really discuss methodology. Going forward, it might be better to

have some very specific questions or topics to get people to think at a higher level about the content of their presentations. I think the conference has been good for building community, but more talks have lacked intellectual content.

- Maybe more reflections of theory
- More issues in semantics in combination with computational linguistics and corpus linguistics; timetabled special interest meeting/discussion times.
- Sessions that deal with practices, procedures, and other broad documentation issues.

Colloquia:

- More transparent colloquia schedule like the rest, it was hard to know when to attend for a given talk.
- Please list presenter names and times under colloquia.
- It should not be necessary to apply the schedule straightjacket to the colloquia. For instance, a speaker might be allowed to occupy two schedule slots.
- A colloquium on language teaching.

Social events:

- [would like to] meet more Hawaiian culture
- Some Hawaiian vendors (4)
- Hawaiian dancers (more) for entertainment.
- tables to eat at for elders at supper.
- it was great the way it was done, however, it would of being great to sit at a table for one meal.
- (Better) sound system for reception entertainment.

Name tags:

- Name needs to be much larger font/more space to be read without peeing at someone's chest.
- Name tags too hard to read

Rooms:

- Signs for the entrance for Asia and Pacific room. so that many people wouldn't open the front door behind the presenter.
- Some of the more well-known or well-regarded speakers assigned to larger rooms.
- Bigger rooms for some of the paper presentations, there weren't enough chairs and were overcrowded at times.
- Some session rooms too small, had people sitting on floor and turned some away.

Accommodation & Transportation

- Just wish accommodation/transportation was easier.
- A few more shuttle buses from different locations and different times would have been helpful.

Other:

- Video record preparation and put them online.
- professionalism and organization of volunteers, especially, and also chairs- some sessions had no chairs.
- I would have liked a brief introduction by tribe so we could see who was Polynesian or Native American or any other indigenous tribal people.
- I would like to get information on future conferences. Probably all the participants of the conference could get on a mailing list.

Praise:

- Excellent job! Enjoy a good break knowing you've done well.
- Everything was great. Thank You!
- Overall, well done! This was a great conference and the organizers were all friendly and kind.
- Great conference, keep up the good work.
- This was a most enjoyable, well-run, and informative conference.
- Much praise for the friendly and most helpful volunteers. Congratulations to the organizers and sponsors. Also well done to the many presenters. Mahalo nui!
- Hard to say-it worked pretty well
- Do it every year?
- It was great!
- The conference was extremely well-organized.
- Excellent, I have no critiques.
- Just keep doing the same thing
- Thanks for a great conference.
- Jim Yoshioka [NFLRC] is terrific!