

2000 NFLRC SUMMER INSTITUTE:

Performance-based Chinese Language Instruction

July 10–21, 2000

EVALUATION

Shuhan C. Wang

Department of Education, State of Delaware

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	3
Background.....	4
Overview of the NFLRC and its Summer Institutes	4
Theoretical Framework and Methods of Evaluation.....	4
The Evaluator – Qualifications and Credibility.....	4
Evaluation: Theoretical Framework and Approach.....	5
Program Description	8
Workshop Goals as Stated on the Website:	8
Facilitators and Staff.....	9
Participants.....	10
Location and Time.....	11
Content and Format of the Workshop.....	11

What Did It Look Like?.....	13
Day One, July 10, 2000	13
Findings.....	18
The Contexts of the 2000 Chinese Summer Institute.....	18
The People and the Interactional Dynamics of the Workshop.....	20
Logistical/Physical Operation of the Workshop	25
The Content of the Workshop	27
Conclusion and Recommendations.....	33
References.....	37
Useful Resources.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Appendix A: Mid-way Evaluation Form	39
Appendix B: Summative Evaluation Form	40
Appendix C: Workshop Schedule.....	46

INTRODUCTION

This paper reports the evaluative results of the *Performance-based Chinese Language Instruction Workshop* held by the National Foreign Language Resource Center (NFLRC) at the University of Hawai'i (UH) from July 10 through July 21, 2000. As suggested by its title, the goals of the workshop were to introduce performance-based language instruction (PBLI) through discussions, teaching demonstrations, clinical practices, experiences as language learners in a mini language course, and conducting field work in Honolulu's Chinese community to develop authentic materials.

Fifteen participants, who teach Chinese as a foreign or second language at both secondary and post-secondary levels, were selected from a pool of applicants from China, Taiwan, and the United States. Together with the facilitators and the NFLRC staff, these participants had an intensive but productive two weeks working toward achieving these goals.

This report attempts to serve two purposes. The first is to describe the program and the second is to critically evaluate the workshop. Keeping these two purposes in mind, this report contains six parts. The first part is the Background, which includes an overview of the NFLRC and its summer institutes. The second part is the Theoretical Framework and Methods of Evaluation, which includes the qualifications and credibility of the evaluator, theoretical framework of and approach to evaluation, and data analysis and write-up of this evaluation report. The third part is the Program Description, which includes (1) the goals; (2) the participants, the facilitators, staff, and the laboratory class; (3) the location and time; and (4) the content and format of the workshop. The fourth part is "What Did It Look Like," i.e., the description of the first day of the workshop, which will provide the readers with a flavor for what the workshop was like. The fifth part is the Findings, which will be discussed in terms of (1) the contexts; (2) the people and the interactional dynamics; (3) logistical/physical operation; and (4) the content of the workshop. The sixth and final part is the Conclusion and Recommendations for future workshops of a similar kind.

The primary audience of the report includes the National Advisory Board, the Director, the Steering Committee, workshop facilitators and staff of the NFLRC; workshop participants; as well as the funding source of the workshop, i.e., the United States Department of Education. Members of the Chinese Language Teachers Association, Chinese Language Association of Secondary Schools-Elementary Schools, and other language teaching organizations, especially those of less commonly taught languages, will find this report useful for attending or providing professional development. The organizers of next year's UH NFLRC's workshop on Korean language pedagogy will also find this report helpful in designing their own workshop.

BACKGROUND

Overview of the NFLRC and its Summer Institutes

In 1989, under the Language Resource Centers Program funded by the US Department of Education, the University of Hawai'i (UH) established one of the first National Foreign Language Resource Centers (NFLRC) with the goal of providing services to improve and strengthen the nation's capacity for teaching and learning foreign languages. Although the number of such resource centers has grown from three to nine since 1989, the UH NFLRC has been able to draw on its strategic location as the intersection of the East and the West and has since exerted great impact nationally for the teaching and learning of a second language. In recent years, its major research and materials development projects have been focused on the less commonly taught languages, particularly those of Asia and the Pacific.

Since 1991, the Center has offered summer institutes to foreign language professionals nationwide. Not only have these summer institutes provided intensive training in effective foreign language pedagogy, but they have also encouraged and expected participants to share their experiences, skills and knowledge gained at the institute, both nationally and internationally.

The following institutes are examples of what have been offered during the previous three-year grant period (1996–99) and will be offered in the current grant period (1999–2002):

- 1997 Foreign Language Instruction via Distance Education
- 1998 Advancing Language Immersion Education
- 1999 Self-Directed Learning: Materials & Strategies
- 2000 Computer-Based Tests for Less Commonly Taught Languages
- 2000 Performance-based Chinese Language Instruction
- 2001 Distance Education
- 2001 Korean Language Instruction
- 2001 Pacific Island Languages

For more information about the UH NFLRC and its summer institutes, check their website at <http://www.LLL.hawaii.edu/nflrc>. It is important to note that I make no distinction between, and shall interchangeably use, the terms *institute* and *workshop* throughout this report.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND METHODS OF EVALUATION

The Evaluator – Qualifications and Credibility

I am a former teacher of Chinese, who has initiated, coordinated, and taught several Chinese language programs in middle schools, high schools, and at the university level. Having been a teacher, a principal, a board member and Vice President of the Association of Chinese Language



Schools, and an officer of the National Council of the Associations of Chinese Language Schools, I have also been actively involved in the heritage language sector.

Additionally, I am a materials developer and a researcher who has extensively studied the needs of the Chinese language-teaching field in the U.S. context. In 1997, I co-authored and published a textbook, *Chinese for Youth* (Wu & Wang, 1997), with the hope that the book would be used to meet the needs of high school students of Chinese. In 1996, I participated in the Leadership Seminar held by the Chinese Language Teachers' Association. One of my chosen topics was teacher training, on which I wrote and published an article (Wang, 1999). My effort to continue the training of Chinese teachers has resulted in a Chinese teachers' summer institute at the University of Pennsylvania. Over the past three summers, the institute's aims included assisting native speakers of Chinese to obtain teaching certification or licensure in their home states. The multiple roles that I have played in various dimensions of the Chinese language field have provided me with an *insider's* understanding of the field, which will be explained later in the macro and micro contexts of the workshop.

In recent years, as State Supervisor for World Languages at the Delaware Department of Education, I have further developed a broader perspective that allows me to see the Chinese field from the *outside in*. For example, because of my membership on the National Council of State Supervisors of Foreign Languages and my involvement in various national projects in second/foreign/heritage language education, I am familiar with the national trends in the field. My extensive work with standards-based educational reform, performance-based language instruction and assessment, teacher training, and professional development has helped me accumulate a wealth of knowledge in these areas. Being a Ph.D. candidate in Educational Linguistics at the University of Pennsylvania, my research interests in second/foreign language education, sociolinguistics and cross-cultural communication, language shift and maintenance, and language policy have also provided me with a theoretical framework for my role as evaluator of the workshop.

Evaluation: Theoretical Framework and Approach

As an evaluator, I went to Hawai'i with the following theoretical assumptions: (1) I am a strong believer in the socio-historical-cultural views on the relationship of language, culture, identity, and discourse; (2) as a teacher trainer, I emphasize the value of critical and participatory pedagogy (see Trueba & Zou, 1994; Goldstein, 1997) and am an advocate for action research (Grahams, 1993; Chamot, 1995); and (3) I have been working on a model of teacher education, which is constantly evolving and changing as I learn more about others, myself, contexts, and the dynamics of interactions when all of these factors come into play. In what follows, I shall explain each of these points briefly.



First, I subscribe to the sociolinguistic and sociocultural tradition of Gumperz (Gumperz & Hymes, 1964, 1972 [pp. 407–434]; Blom & Gumperz, 1972; Gumperz, 1982a, 1982b), Hymes (1974), and Erickson (Erickson & Shultz, 1982; Erickson, 1996). They insist that language must be studied in a larger socio-cultural-historical context, or what Gee calls Discourse with a capital D (1996). In this tradition, language is viewed as socially co-constructed by participants when they interact, who bring with them their identity, knowledge, experiences, ideas, and references acquired and shaped from their individual worlds.

Second, in a related vein, both my academic training and practical experiences of engaging in education and teachers' professional development have firmly shaped, and continue to shape, my views on the value of critical pedagogy, which McLaren describes in the following way:

A critical pedagogy situates itself in the intersection of language, culture, and history — the nexus in which the students' subjectivities are formed, contested, and played out. The struggle is one that involves their history, their language, and their culture and the pedagogical implications are such that students are given access to a critical discourse or are conditioned to accept the familiar as the inevitable. Worse still, they are denied a voice with which to be present in the world; they are made invisible to history and rendered powerless to shape it (McLaren, 1989: 233, cited in Trueba & Zou, 1994, pp. 203).

In this view, critical pedagogy calls for actions on the part of all constituents of an educational setting to pay attention to the social histories and processes, identify the power structures, both inside and outside the classrooms, and find solutions to challenge the imbalance of power to remove barriers and achieve true learning. One of the crucial elements of critical pedagogy is that teachers and students co-construct the classroom ecology (Erickson, 1996), thus creating a truly learner-centered environment.

Third, I adopted Walqui's (1997) teacher education framework and applied it from the professional development for teachers of English language learners to that of foreign language teachers. In this model, six dimensions of a foreign language teacher are identified: vision, understanding, practice, motivation, reflection, and context/community, each of which will be explained briefly because they are related to how I evaluated the workshop.

Vision refers to teachers' frames and belief system about themselves, their students, and learning and teaching. Understanding includes knowledge of the subject matter, approaches and methodologies, the use of technological tools, their students, and themselves.

Five sets of questions should be asked with regard to a teacher's own practices. First, about curriculum, what do they want to teach? Second, about skills, which skill(s) do they want students to develop at what point in time? Third, about teaching strategies, how do they teach? Fourth, about learning styles, how do students learn? And fifth, about opportunity, in what situations can students use the newly gained knowledge and skills?



Motivation refers to the reasons why, incentives, and emotions of teaching and learning. Reflections again include five aspects: (1) anticipatory — evaluating what works and what does not and figuring out why; (2) active/interactive planning — taking into account students' feedback and readjusting the content and method of teaching; (3) recollective — trying to remember what happened and why it happened while constantly searching for a different way of teaching; (4) being mindful — contemplating and thinking about what goes on in the classroom; and (5) participatory — involving students to become agents of learning and change while simultaneously learning from students.

Finally, a good foreign language teacher pays attention to the context and community in which he/she is a member. Viewing teaching and learning as an ecology system, an individual continues to engage in life-long learning while dedicating oneself to personal and social change at the individual, institutional, and wider community levels.

Based on my views on language, literacy, culture, identity, and discourse and my subscription to critical pedagogy and the teacher education model described above, I evaluated the workshop with the following questions:

1. What were the macro, institutional, and micro contexts of the workshop? Who were these people? Why did these individuals come together and how did they work with the constraints of, and draw resources from, these immediate and larger contexts?
2. What were the logistical and physical conditions prior to and during the workshop? Were they conducive to learning and meeting the personal and professional needs of participating teachers?
3. How were teaching and learning done at the workshop? In other words, how were the principles of Performance-based Language Instruction (PBLI) introduced and taught? How effective was each component of the workshop (whole group discussion, teaching demonstration, etc.) as it was supposed to contribute to the participants' acquisition of PBLI? And, how was learning constructed at this workshop?
4. According to the teacher education model described earlier, what kind of change in participating teachers was noticed, observed, documented, or reflected upon? What were participants' views of their own learning, of the workshop, and the attainment of their workshop goals?

In order to answer the first set of questions, I shall analyze the macro, institutional, and micro contexts of the workshop. I shall discuss who these participants, facilitators, and laboratory students were in terms of the contextual constraints and resources that they faced and possessed, and examine the interactional dynamics played out by these contextual factors and personalities.

To answer the second set of questions, I shall look into the preparatory work as well as the logistical and physical conditions of the workshop. The answers to the third set of questions will deal with the content of the workshop in terms of its format, process, and product. The answers to the last set of questions will come largely from participants' self-evaluation and reflections, coupled with classroom observation and interview data.

In view of the nature of these questions, and considering the fact that I have been trained as an ethnomethodologist (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974; Turner, 1974) and ethnographer



(Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995; Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995 [1983]), I conducted a qualitative study that was supplemented with quantitative data in my workshop evaluation. As such, I employed participant observation (see Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995 [1983]) as my major method of data collection while conducting on-going formal and informal interviews with facilitators, participating teachers, the lab class teacher, and lab students in the Chinese 102 class. I also collected and analyzed documents from teachers' applications, reflection journals, workshop handouts and writing samples, as well as mini-conference papers.

In addition to embedded assessments that were done on a daily basis, I conducted one formal mid-way evaluation at the end of the first week and a summative evaluation on the last day of the workshop. The mid-way evaluation form was the one used for in-service workshop evaluation at the Delaware Department of Education. It contains eight questions on the Lickert Scale from 1 to 5, with 5 being the most positive rating. It also asks one question that allows raters to elaborate upon their opinions or suggestions. Because it is simple and easy to answer, yet comprehensive to reveal the overall quality of the workshop, I decided to adopt it as the mid-term assessment instrument. The summative evaluation, on the other hand, is based on the evaluation form developed and used by the NFLRC for its past workshops. However, in order to elicit answers to the second, third, and fourth evaluative questions mentioned earlier and probe deeper into participants' feedback, I rewrote many questions that are tailored to this particular workshop. Both the mid-way and summative evaluation forms are listed in Appendix A and B.

The ratings and comments on all evaluation forms were calculated and compiled. These data, along with participants' applications and reflection journals, my daily observation field notes and interviews, were coded and categorized according to the themes that emerged from these triangulated sources. After the report was drafted, my colleagues, Lewis Huffman and Claudia Cola, both from the Delaware Department of Education, and Naomi Migliacci from the University of Pennsylvania, read the entire manuscript and provided valuable comments and suggestions to improve this report. I am indebted to their support and friendship.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Workshop Goals as Stated on the Website:

The following statements were taken directly from the website about the workshop

<http://nts.LLL.hawaii.edu/nflrc/chn2000/>.

The NFLRC Summer Institute in July, a workshop for Chinese language instructors, conducted in tandem with summer Chinese courses at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa,



will focus on strategies for instruction and testing to enhance learner performance on communicative tasks in the four skill areas.

This task-oriented workshop, designed for participants teaching pre-collegiate or collegiate levels, will cover the following topics:

- The role of the textbook in the performance-based classroom
- The role of grammar instruction in performance-based curricula
- Principles of instructional task design
- Performance-based testing

Participants will learn through:

- Demonstration
- Practice sessions
- Peer and instructor critique

Facilitators and Staff

In what follows, I shall introduce the facilitators and staff of this Chinese workshop. In order to bring these people closer to the readers, I decided to talk about them on a first-name basis.

David Hiple is the Summer Institute director as well as the associate director of the UH NFLRC. He is also an internationally renowned expert in the development and training of oral proficiency interview procedures. During the two weeks of the workshop, David came to sit in and observe the group on a daily basis. He gave two formal presentations, one on the first day to introduce the principles and contexts of PBLI, and the other about Oral Proficiency Interview procedures and the proficiency guidelines developed by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL).

Stephen Fleming was the leading facilitator of the workshop. He is the instructor in technology for foreign language education in the College of Languages, Linguistics & Literature at the University of Hawai'i. Currently he is working on a National Security Education Program grant that offers workshops nationwide in interactive television and Web-based foreign language instruction. During this Chinese workshop, Stephen also conducted Web-based material development sessions with each of the three small groups.

Generally, each day opened with Stephen leading the whole group in a discussion focusing on a central theme about PBLI. He was responsible for maintaining the pre-workshop online discussion forum and the online journaling during the workshop, as well as serving as a small group leader.

Cynthia (Cindy) Ning assisted Stephen in leading the daily discussions. She is the associate director of UH's Center for Chinese Studies and the author of the first-year text, *Communicating in Chinese* (1993). She has previously collaborated with Stephen, David, and Ted Yao (see below) many times in developing instructional materials and offering teacher-training institutes, a fact that created an unspoken understanding and harmony among the

facilitators. This turned out to be one of the key factors that affected the quality of the workshop, a point to be elaborated on in the Findings Section of this report.

In addition, Cyndy was the instructor of the Fuzhou lessons. When it was time for break out sessions, she would lead one small group to either prepare a teaching demonstration lesson, critique another group's teaching performance, or shoot videotapes for creating authentic materials.

Tao-Chung (Ted) Yao shared the responsibilities with Stephen and Cyndy as one of the facilitators of the workshop. Ted is a professor of Chinese at the University of Hawai'i and is one of the authors of *Integrated Chinese* (Yao & Liu, 1997), the textbook used by the CHN 102 lab class.

Ted led some of the whole group discussions and was a group leader of a small group to plan the teaching demonstration lesson, critique teaching performances, and shoot videotape footage. On the last few days of the workshop, all three facilitators shared the testing materials that they had developed with workshop participants, which turned out to be one of the highlights and a much needed component of the workshop.

Other key personnel included the following individuals:

Yan-Feng Li is a PhD candidate in Chinese Language and Literature at UH and the instructor of the Chinese 102 course that served as the clinical laboratory for this workshop.

Jim Yoshioka is the program coordinator who was in charge of all the essentials of life, ranging from travel, lodging, parking, vanpool, Saturday excursion, breakfasts, snacks, bentos (lunches), to the printing and copying of papers.

Heidi Agunias is a student assistant (office support). She was also the instructor of lei making.

Deborah Masterson is the publications specialist at the UH NFLRC.

Kin Chan and **Clayton Chee** provided much needed technical support in the use of computers and videotaping equipment.

Participants

There were fifteen participants selected nationally and internationally to attend the workshop. Among them, two were from Mainland China, three from Taiwan, and the remainder were from various U.S. institutions, ranging from K-12 schools to colleges and universities. Details about them will be discussed in the Findings. However, because the midway and summative evaluations were responded to anonymously, no participants' names will be revealed. Instead, alphabetical codes will be used.



Location and Time

This two-week workshop began on July 10 and lasted through July 21, 2000. Sessions were held in Moore Hall at UH, Mānoa Campus. The general sessions were held in Room 153 A, which is a PC Lab. Computers were available for participants to use from 8–8:30 in the morning and 5–7 in the evening. Room 155A was the classroom for the laboratory class. Room 259, on the second floor, and the room across from Room 155A were observation rooms. A Mac Lab, housed in Moore 155B, was used as a discussion and materials construction room (see map below).

Language Lab	Observation Room	PC Lab 153 A
hallway		
Mac Lab Moore 155B	Office	155A

Breakfasts, as well as morning and afternoon snacks, were served in the hallway by Moore 155, but participants were on their own for lunch and dinner. While participants had no problem finding good ethnic restaurants surrounding the UH campus or in Waikiki, lunch was usually consumed at the UH cafeteria. To add variety and taste to lunch, Jim offered Bento options on Tuesdays and Thursdays and personally transported the orders back to participants.

The daily schedule from Monday to Friday started at 8 AM with breakfast, followed by a whole group discussion that began at 8:30 AM. The day ended at 5 PM with small group discussions or activities. See Appendix C for Workshop Schedule.

Content and Format of the Workshop

Various components were built in as integral parts of the workshop for the purpose of helping participants learn about, discuss, and try new ideas and techniques for performance-based Chinese language instruction in the area of curriculum development, lesson planning, and instructional design and implementation. Again, for detail of the daily schedule and how these components were merged, see Appendix C. However, a detail of each component follows:

Preparatory Activities: Prior to the beginning of the workshop, and on some days during the workshop, participants were asked to read selections from Brown (1994) or other materials, search for materials on the Web, or complete worksheets or other assignments. There was a pre-workshop online discussion forum based on the readings, which was facilitated by Stephen.



Whole Group Discussions: At the beginning of each day, the whole group discussed a topic that Stephen highlighted on his Power Point presentation. For example, on Day Two, using Brown's model, group members were asked to identify their beliefs and teaching styles. On Day Three, the group was asked to focus on the meaning of "learner-centeredness;" and on Day Four, the teaching of vocabulary and the meaning of contextualization was highlighted. The topic usually was the question for reflection in the daily journal (see below for detail).

Online Journaling: Every day participants were asked to join an online discussion forum to share their reflections on the day's experience. A specific topic was given, although participants were encouraged to express their opinions, reflections, or concerns of any special topic that interested them.

Fuzhouhua Lessons: Under the tutelage of Cyndy, the whole group learned the Fuzhou dialect which has a distinctively different pronunciation system from Mandarin. After about thirty to forty minutes of learning Fuzhouhua, the group reflected and commented on their experiences of being students and/or Cyndy's teaching techniques.

Lesson Planning: The fifteen participants were divided into three smaller groups: Hibiscus, Ilima, and Plumeria, with five members each. Every afternoon during the breakout sessions, a specific small group would plan classroom activities for their hour-long teaching demonstration the following day.

Teaching Demonstration: The small group assigned to do a teaching demonstration for the day would join the CHN 102 class to carry out its lesson plan that had been developed the day before.

Critiquing: Members of the other two groups would observe the teaching demonstration from TV monitors in two observation rooms (the observation room next to Room 153A or Room 259) or in the classroom where the lesson was being taught (Room 155A). During the afternoon break-out sessions, all three small groups worked independently to critique the lesson they observed in the morning, but only one group was responsible to lead the whole group in reconstructing the lesson and making comments and suggestions.

Videotaping Assignments: During the two-week period of the workshop, each small group had the chance to visit various locations on the UH campus and in Honolulu. Based on the arrangements made with native speakers at local offices or shops, each group shot videotapes accordingly.

Mini-Conference Proposal and Presentation: The last day of the workshop was devoted to a mini-conference. During the second week, participants were asked to propose a topic for a presentation at the conference. The breakout sessions of the last two days prior to the Mini-Conference were devoted to the preparation of conference presentations.



WHAT DID IT LOOK LIKE?

In order to give the readers a flavor of the workshop, I am providing my field notes of the first day as seen through my eyes:

Day One, July 10, 2000

Breakfast was already there when I walked into the hallway of Moore Hall. I recognized some faces, although I did know all the facilitators, Ted, Cyndy, and Stephen. I chatted comfortably with a few people near me. Looking around, I could see that most people were also engaged in conversations.

Food was good and plentiful. There were bagels and cream cheese, coffee cake, bananas, apple and orange juices, hot tea, and coffee. I saw a man running around very much like a manager at a restaurant. I guessed he was Jim Yoshioka, so I introduced myself to him. Sure enough, it was Jim. In a crowd, I can always spot the person in charge.

At 8:35, the workshop began. David Hiple introduced himself and the Center. He talked about the purpose of the Center and the Institute. He was tall, tanned, and very fit. He was wearing a gray polo shirt and khaki pants.

There were twenty people present: David, three facilitators, fourteen participants, one extra participant who would just sit in for 2 days, and myself, the evaluator. We were told that the last participant would join us on Wednesday due to flight difficulties.

David emphasized that technology was not the focus of this workshop. Pedagogy would be the focus, but technology would be incorporated. There were two institutes this year, one was on testing and assessment and the other on Chinese pedagogy. He mentioned that the whole wing in this building would be at our disposal.

Then David introduced the leadership team. Jim, who seemed to be an energetic person willing to do anything for anyone, was the contact person for the Center. At this point, I noticed that Stephen Fleming was wearing a black and white print shirt with a dragon motif and stone khaki pants. Ted was wearing a patterned bluish gray shirt; and Cyndy was wearing a light colored shirt, long pants, and sandals. All of them seemed relaxed and had an unassuming manner making them very personable. By contrast, the participants were more formal in their attire and manners. I supposed this was normal on the first day of a workshop.

The participants then introduced themselves. We had a varied group with a vast array of interests, backgrounds, and experiences. There were five non-native speakers, whose Chinese sounded “standard” but they were very fluent. (In order to reduce repetition, I am skipping my descriptions of

the participants here. I shall elaborate more about their backgrounds and expectations in the section on the Findings).

The facilitators then talked about the format of the Institute, explaining that there would be field trips and videotaping activities to collect authentic materials.

From 8:45–9:30 was the Fuzhou lesson. Cyndy gave handouts with objectives of the whole Fuzhou lesson. She identified what participants would be able to do at the end of the five and half hours of instruction. She circulated among the participants greeting them and shaking hands. People greeted her with *Nyuhō*.

She proceeded with activities that introduced the singular pronouns, I, you, and he/she, and the plural pronouns, we, you, and they, and the last names of participants. Through interactions, she taught us how to say, “Whose last name is...” and “What is your last name?” She handed out a big name tag for participants to wear on their chests. Students went around introducing themselves in Fuzhouhua. Then she played a tape recording of her parents’ modeling of students’ names in Fuzhouhua. She asked the student to stand up if she/he heard her/his name.

She then asked students to write out the word in the romanization system based on our perception of the sound. Using an overhead, she wrote down the correct pronunciation, tone marks and hanzi for each word. We learned words like who, last name (vb), and what. She told us that tomorrow there would be a quiz on these words.

At 9:35 we had a break, but many participants lingered in the room to practice their Fuzhouhua. At 9:50, Stephen recapped the Fuzhou lesson. He gave the group a pink sheet of paper with three questions:

- How was the time spent?
- What were the three activities that were most appealing or effective and why? And,
- How to redesign the activities?

Each participant was given seven minutes to write the answers. He also asked three participants to write their answers on a transparency. The group then engaged in the discussion of these questions. I observed that Stephen was good in probing deeper, making participants think through their answers. For example, when talking about classroom activities, he asked participants to further define what constitutes an activity.

I reflected on this part of the activity wondering whether or not Stephen could have divided the group into three small groups and asked them to discuss these questions. Then each small group could share and have a whole group debriefing time. In this way, people could have gotten to know one another while sharing more ideas. This is the most important aspect of professional

development: interaction and exchange of ideas with colleagues. Individual work does not generate interaction or exchange. Additionally, I noticed that some participants finished early and were sitting idly.

Stephen asked the three students to share their transparency. The whole group then discussed if they agreed with what was written. One participant commented that the lesson was very interactive. She said that it was 30% teacher-centered and 70% student-centered. I wondered how she could determine that right away. Someone commented that this was a low risk activity, especially the part with the spelling of the pronunciation. Someone said that this was inductive, cognitive, and student-oriented. The big name tags also were very helpful. Participants agreed that the guessing game was fun when students had to identify whose last name was being called out.

The discussion then turned to task-based instruction by reconstructing Cyndy's Fuzhou lesson. One participant asked Stephen to define what a task was, to which Stephen replied that if nothing happened at the end, it was simply a practice. He emphasized that a task requires a learner to do something when they use or hear the language. He also asked the group to think about the sequence from input to skill-getting to skill-using for communicative purposes.

One other participant asked about the purpose of learning the Fuzhou romanization system. She wanted to know if it was meant for us to learn a new sound system or was it an activity that required us to use what we already knew by writing in our own way. Cyndy said that she wanted us to use what we knew. She then recapped the whole lesson: focus on meaning, motivating students, etc. Stephen reiterated that the forms, such as vocabulary and grammatical structures, which Cyndy introduced, were based on what we wanted. Interestingly, I wondered how we determined what our students wanted to learn in a classroom situation.

At 10:40 David discussed the principles of PBLI with the purpose of building a common understanding of what we wanted it to mean to us. He analyzed the topic from pedagogical, political, and policy perspectives. He then focused on the six essential components of PBLI:

- task-based
- focus on communication
- learner-centered
- contextualized
- authentic, and
- balance of skill-getting and skill-using

Being a student of language policy, I was deeply interested in his talk. While listening to him, I observed that the participants did not show much hedging or reaction. I began to wonder how much

they took in from his presentation. Later on, during lunch, I told David about my observation; he said that he was wondering about the same thing as well.

David also asked about the difference between proficiency and achievement, and why the term performance, rather than proficiency, was used here. According to him, proficiency became a brand name, rather than a generic term, which was associated with a few groups. The U.S. DOE wanted to stay neutral in its public stance. Although the U.S. DOE did not make overt language policies, it was aware of the implications of its language use on public policies. Therefore, the term performance was used in place of proficiency. However, I also wondered if the term had something to do with the standards-based educational reform (see ACTFL, 1996; National Standards in Foreign Language Educator Project, 1999) that also advocated the use of performance-based assessment in addition to standardized tests. I asked David about his thoughts on this matter. He replied that the standards movement was more or less a K–12 endeavor, not a focus of higher education. At this juncture, I wondered about the background of participants: how many were from K–12 and how many from the institutions of higher education? I needed to double check on this. I was also curious about the Institute’s stance on K–16 articulation.

It was now around 11:15. David asked the group to break into small groups to discuss what ‘tasks’ meant to them. I stayed with the Hibiscus group in which Stephen was the leader. The group focused on identifying the gap between institutional goals versus classroom teaching. Each participant talked about his/her own institutions. At 11:25, during the sharing session, two participants defined task in terms of socially constructed activities that involved informational transaction. David read Brown’s definition on p. 83. In fact, it was a quote from Michael Breen (1987, p. 23): “any structured language learning endeavor which has a particular objective, appropriate content, a specified working procedure, and a range of outcomes for those who undertake the task.” He explained again how this definition related to the six principles of PBLI on his handout (which was mentioned a little earlier).

The discussion turned to the teaching situation at each participant’s institution. David also asked the group to talk about what they hoped to bring home. Several participants talked about their expectations (which will be elaborated in the Findings). Stephen wrapped up at 12:05 and broke for lunch.

David, Cyndy, Stephen, Ted, and I had lunch together. Basically, I tried to understand the format of the workshop and what they hoped to achieve. Then I told them that, because I had been trained as an ethnographer, I would use participant observation as my main method of data collection. Of course, I would collect different documents in order to achieve triangulation. I asked them if they had any problem with my decision. They all said fine, and I jokingly said that I would be a

participant as well so that I could understand the participants' perspectives and what they were going through. One hour quickly evaporated along with the misty steam that is peculiarly Hawaiian.

All of us returned to the classroom. At one o'clock, the class resumed with Jim announcing some housekeeping business. At 1:04, we watched videotape clippings and discussed the following topics:

- Theoretical "whys" of using videotapes
- The role of an interviewer
- Language level in terms of language functions
- Proficiency level descriptors (Novice, Intermediate, Advanced, etc.)
- How much language students need to understand in order to use a videotape

The videotapes that we watched were shot in China and developed by the NFLRC. There were two segments. One was about a vendor who described how Chinese pancakes were made, and the other was an interview of a mother and her child.

At 1:40, Stephen and Cyndy explained the videotaping assignment that each group was about to undertake. They said the goal of the assignment was to flex the muscle of producing authentic materials. Cyndy emphasized that PBLI should not be textbook driven. Rather, teachers control the textbook. Furthermore, she jokingly said that the assignment was a way to get participants out on the streets, not just sitting in the classroom all day.

Each group was given the assignment to interview a native speaker of Chinese and ask the individual to give directions from where he/she was to the Student Center. I followed the Ilima Group and interviewed an associate at the Chinese Language Department, Mr. Tian. We taped the interview twice, one as a rehearsal and the other as the "real thing."

At three o'clock, all groups came back to Room 153A. We watched the tapes that each group produced. It was amazing to the participants that, although each group had identical assignments, the products were totally different. Each one had its own characteristics. The whole group was asked to identify the characteristics of each tape, the level of class to be used, and the authenticity of the conversation and the language used. Specifically participants were asked to relate the discussion to the six principles of PBLI. For example, for which stage did these tapes fit, skill-getting or skill-using? How could the tape be used for language input?

At 4 PM, facilitators led us to the Student Services Center. Dr. Roderick Jacobs, Dean of the College of Languages, Linguistics and Literatures, held a reception for us. To our surprise, Jim and Heidi were waiting for us. Each of us got a warm Hawaiian hug and kiss on the cheek, along with a fragrant purple and white orchid lei around our neck. There were mini sandwiches, tropical fruit, fried chicken wings, tortillas and salsa, and various kinds of fruit juices. Dean Jacobs greeted each of us



and made a few welcome remarks. The air was filled with excitement and anticipation for a productive two weeks of hard work and good company.

FINDINGS

The Contexts of the 2000 Chinese Summer Institute

The Macro Context: Since the 1980s, the national trend in foreign language education has been greatly influenced and shaped by the standards educational reform movement. As a result, using standards to determine both content and assessment with which students are being asked to demonstrate what they know and what they can do, foreign language instruction and assessment have increasingly become performance-based.

As far as the Chinese teaching field is concerned, the educational reform effort has been part of an on-going debate between the traditional and the progressive schools, which unfortunately, has dominated much of the professional discussion on Chinese pedagogy in the field. The paradox of the situation has grown even more evident with the fact that the general foreign language field has moved forward from one emphasis to another, e.g., from communication to proficiency to performance-based instruction, while the traditional school in the Chinese field remains constant with its emphasis on teaching the standard Beijing phonology and accuracy of language use. On the surface, it looks like the doctrine of the traditional school stands as the gospel for teaching the Chinese language. In fact, it has not done much service to the field to address the changing needs and goals of students, other than feeding the egos of some well established professors. As a result, many different voices in the field have been silenced by the hegemony of these professors who happen to control many career opportunities for new-comers.

On the other hand, being the center of East meets West, the UH NFLRC has enjoyed a reputation of the avant-garde of the Chinese language teaching field. Over the years, it has offered numerous workshops to explore and introduce new methods, approaches, and/or technological tools for the instruction and study of the Chinese language. It has thus developed a mentality of being the defender of a new trend or paradigm of teaching. This sense of mission turned out to be a crucial element in the design and operation of the workshop, a point that I will elaborate on in the section about the People and the Dynamics of the Workshop.

The Institutional Context: Because the number of National Foreign Language Resource Centers has dramatically increased in recent years, the budget of each NFLRC has become tighter. Therefore, the NFLRC workshop had to rely more heavily on the resources of the University of Hawai'i, which unfortunately, have also become tighter due to the socio-political situation in the State of Hawai'i.



While tapping into and sharing existing resources is desirable for any project, it also created many serious challenges to the organizers and facilitators of the workshop.

As a result, one of the major components of the Chinese workshop, the hands-on lesson planning/critiquing and the teaching demonstration, had to use a regular summer course offered at the UH instead of creating a laboratory class taught exclusively in PBLI. In fact, because this was the second session of the summer semester, students had already had one session of Chinese taught by a graduate student/lecturer who was not trained in PBLI. During the two-week period of the workshop, students were taught by a group of participants in PBLI for one hour, followed by another hour of instruction taught by the same lecturer in his own method, although all of them used the same syllabus faithfully. Therefore, this arrangement meant that not only much of the content and pace must be carefully coordinated, but also people's (including lab students, the lecturers, facilitators, and workshop participants) willingness to cooperate and their ability to adjust to different teaching and learning styles must be taken into consideration. The implications of such design will be discussed in the section about the Interactional Dynamics of the workshop.

The Micro Context: According to Cyndy and David, the decision to offer a Chinese pedagogy workshop was based on the recommendations from the First Chinese Language Summit held from February 27 through March 1, 1999, at the National Foreign Language Center (NFLC) in Washington, D.C. Representatives from the Chinese Language Association of Secondary and Elementary Schools (CLASS), Chinese Language Teachers Association (CLTA), and the NFLC worked toward identifying five common priority areas for the field. Teacher training was one of the priorities identified; thus, the workshop was proposed as a response to the Summit. For detail of the summit, see CLTA Newsletter (McGinnis, September 1999, p. 5).

Many participants of the UH NFLRC Chinese workshop echoed this need for teacher training in various dimensions of teaching. For example, even as early as the first day, several participants emphasized that their goal for attending this workshop, in addition to learning about PBLI, was to learn how to design a well-articulated Chinese language program either within their own institutions or with institutions of higher education. In other words, they were not just interested in improving their classroom teaching techniques or curriculum design, but they were also eager, even anxious, to learn about program design. This is true with the Chinese language field, or any of the other less commonly taught languages, that most of the instructors, with the exception of those who teach at a few elite or larger schools or universities, have to simultaneously play the multiple roles of a teacher, program designer, and coordinator single-handedly. Hence, the need for and the scope of teacher training must go beyond the classroom level.

Furthermore, due to differences in local conditions and personal backgrounds, the career path and professional training that each Chinese language teacher has had varies from one individual to another. To make the case even more complicated, native speakers and non-native speakers, K–12 teachers and tertiary level instructors/professors have different needs for teacher training (For detail of these issues, see Wang, 1999). Because Chinese language teachers are scattered around the country, it is essential and beneficial that a specific time and place be set aside for them to get together and learn from one another. This workshop provided an ideal forum for academic, professional, and social interactions that the field desperately needs.

The People and the Interactional Dynamics of the Workshop

The Participants: There were a total of fifteen participants, most practicing teachers. Among them, four were in K–12 schools, four were lecturers and three were assistant professors at colleges or universities. One was resident director for a study-abroad program in Beijing. There were three graduate students: two from Taiwan and one from an American university who was also a teaching assistant (TA) at her institution.

The last group represented novice teachers who had either never taught or had only TA experience for two years. Three of the participants had taught five to six years, but seven were veteran teachers who had taught eight to twelve years. On the average, there was 6.27 years of teaching experience, and the median of the group was six years. Because the language background of a teacher, i.e., native versus non-native speaker, was never an issue at this workshop, this report does not take this factor into account.

When asked if they had taken any courses or received any training that was similar to this type of workshop, two gave no answer. Four indicated no, and two had taken graduate courses in ESL, CFL, FL methods courses, or had a practicum in teaching Chinese. Seven had taken summer institutes of various kinds at many institutions of higher education.

As far as their expectations or goals of the workshop, the majority answered that they wanted to know about PBLI and how it could be implemented in the classroom. The following is a list of goals in the order of importance to them:

1. learn about PBLI and task-based instruction
2. meet other teachers and share ideas and teaching experiences
3. learn new methods and techniques
4. learn about curriculum/course design and implementation
5. receive teacher training
6. provide/receive teaching resources



7. learn about performance-based tests
8. learn to design materials
9. meet the authors of textbooks

The Facilitators: All facilitators were highly accomplished experts in the field of foreign/Chinese language education. According to one of the participants, “The facilitators were superb-I felt that they were very eager to lead us and yet open to learning along with us at the same time” (Summative Evaluation [SE], Part IV, #4, c). Other comments included: “The facilitators were extremely helpful” (SE, Part IV, #4, e); “I’m particularly impressed by all three facilitators’ teaching philosophies, experiences, and resourcefulness” (SE, Part IV, #4, f); “Accept everybody’s opinion” (SE, Part IV, #4, k); and, “Prepared thoroughly” (SE, Part IV, #4, m).

The fact that David, Cyndy, Stephen, and Ted all reside and work at the UH was instrumental in creating a great team of harmony and action. For example, they understood the macro and institutional contexts and knew the constraints or strengths of the institutions at different levels. They knew one another’s perspectives, philosophies, and idiosyncrasies to the extent that they could almost finish one another’s sentences. On the other hand, they each possessed different strengths and shared responsibilities accordingly. For instance, being the director of the NFLRC, David dealt with institutions; Stephen was in charge of facilitating the discussions and taking care of the daily preparation and adjustment of the workshop schedule; Cyndy was the transformer who brought PBLI from theory to life; and Ted was the glue that kept the balance of the workshop in place.

The Lab Class Instructor: Yan-Feng Li was the instructor of Chinese 102, who also taught the same group of students in the previous semester. He was friendly and laid back, which could be illustrated in one student’s Chinese sentence, “Li laoshi buxihuan chuan xiezi” (Teacher Li doesn’t like to wear shoes). Whether he liked it or not, a decision to use his class as the lab for PBLI teaching was made by the facilitators of the workshop, all of whom were his superiors as far as institutional hierarchy was concerned. He accepted it in good spirit and cooperated fully with the workshop facilitators and also with the participants when they student taught and critiqued the lessons. Not only did he allow participants to observe his teaching during the second hour of the class, but he also participated in the workshop discussions. He enriched the lessons of each small group by providing insights to students’ backgrounds and needs. His input helped create a coherent teaching plan for the class.

The Evaluator: In order to understand participants’ views and experiences at the workshop, I chose to be both a ‘participant’ and ‘observer.’ In other words, in addition to observing as an outsider, I actively participated in discussions and spent a lot of time socializing with participants, enjoying the good company, a variety of ethnic foods, and all the fun that Hawai’i has to offer. I developed friendships with all participants and stayed in daily contact with workshop facilitators and staff. I also



interviewed and chatted with Li Laoshi and the students in CHN 102 on a regular basis. In short, I developed a trusting and friendly relationship with all constituents of the workshop.

Because of my theoretical framework and beliefs about social interactions and critical pedagogy, I tried my best to maintain an open and honest relationship with all individuals there. Fortunately, everyone involved was open and responsive which allowed me to check the validity of my observations. As it turned out, formative assessment was possible and accepted, and many changes were made as a result of this on-going evaluation and feedback. In retrospect, this willingness to listen and act was central to the success of this workshop.

Lab Students: There were fifteen students enrolled in CHN 102, a second semester course of first year Chinese. The textbook used was one of Yao's books, *Integrative Chinese* (Yao & Liu, 1997). The majority of the students cooperated with the class and the workshop, the combination of which indeed demanded a great deal of the students adjusting constantly to different personalities, different teaching styles, methods, activities, and even different accents.

However, it became obvious, even during the first teaching demonstration (7/11, Day 2, field notes) that one female student was unhappy and uncooperative. Later this female student approached David and other facilitators to express her displeasure at being in a laboratory setting, which she perceived as slowing down her progress. Although she admitted having been notified at the beginning of the semester that such an arrangement would be made for the purpose of teacher training, she felt the laboratory component added confusion for the students. Additionally, the lack of writing desks in the TV room was not conducive for learning. Because of the financial constraints of the UH and NFLRC, there was no other class or section of Chinese that could be offered, and it was not possible for a real lab class to assemble for the workshop.

Similarly, several other students were identified as having strong negative feelings toward such teaching demonstration arrangements. In fact, one commented during one teaching demonstration that he felt like 'a laboratory rat' (7/13, Day 4, field notes). It was clear by the middle of the first week to all who were involved in the workshop that this unexpected sentiment among lab students must be addressed immediately. How this issue was resolved will be discussed in the next section.

Webs of Relationships: As alluded to in the sections about the contexts and the lab students, two complicated webs of relationships emerged by the middle of the first week. One web obviously was the lab students' rebellious attitude, which presented a potential danger that might spoil the mood of the workshop in general. The other web of tension appeared between the workshop facilitators and participants on certain workshop goals and pedagogical issues.

The tension between the facilitators and the participants came from different experiences drawn from the macro and micro contexts explained above. As discussed in the micro context of the



workshop, with the exception of those three graduate students/TAs, almost all participants were responsible for the entire Chinese program at their institutions, in addition to their teaching duties. To them, program design was as important as curriculum design. However, as indicated by Stephen to the whole group at the beginning session, the workshop was aimed at introducing participants to the teaching approaches and techniques of PBLI at the classroom level (Day 2 notes). Clearly, there was a disconnection between the facilitators' and participants' goals.

In addition, the on-going debate between the traditional and progressive camps in the Chinese field and the mentality of the UH NFLRC as an avant-garde bastion of pedagogy training played a role in the workshop at its earliest stage. As analyzed in the section about participants, several of them had not received much training in teaching methodology. However, to teach using PBLI required a new mindset about teaching, in addition to learning a set of techniques and methods that came along with it. Consequently the six principles of PBLI were elusive and quite difficult for participants to grasp when the workshop began.

These participants' questions and concerns, however, were misconstrued by workshop facilitators at first as challenges and resistance from the traditional camp. Several participants made comments to this effect in their mid-way and summative evaluations:

- *Probably do a survey on particular issues participants have and arrange some small group discussions (Midway evaluation, 7/14/00).*
- *I have been enjoying the workshop very much. I have learned a lot from the facilitators and also from my colleagues. However, I think sometimes the facilitators tend to be very 'protective'. I guess that is maybe because we are still under 'modeling' period (Midway evaluation, 7/14/00).*
- *Sometimes, however, the 'agenda' pre-supposed troglodyte attitudes of participants. Many of us actually came to the institute already believing in PBLI (SE, Part III, #4, m).*
- *More earnestly solicited and responded to feedback (SE, Part IV, #3, m).*
- *Personally I am a believer of Performance-based language instruction. But I knew that some of the participants did not believe it as firmly as I do. I wish to hear many different voices so that the truth can be revealed through discussions and debates (SE, Part III, #5, e).*

It was then pointed out to workshop facilitators (July 12 and 13 fieldnotes) that participants needed a bridge in order to cross from the traditional way of teaching to that of PBLI. In fact, they needed space and time, in addition to guidance, in clarifying the principles of PBLI and incorporating the newly gained knowledge and skills into their existing systems, if they so desired.

The facilitators deserve a lot of credit in accepting and listening to these dissenting voices and in their ability to modify their communication styles and to expand the scope of the workshop goals during the remaining portion of the workshop. The weekend excursion on July 15 provided just such



an opportunity to interact. By spending the whole day together socially, open communication on a personal level became a reality. As a result, facilitators became more empathetic and relaxed in their attitude, while participants were more willing to ask more questions.

Meanwhile, the web woven by lab students became tighter and tighter as time went on. By the end of the first week, it reached the level that “something must be done.” By then, not only had the students manifested their displeasure by being passive and non-responsive during classes, they had also approached Li Laoshi and David. I also talked to them, trying to ascertain what bothered them and solicited their suggestions on how to improve the situation. The following mid-way evaluative comment from one participant described the situation vividly:

I have really enjoyed many parts of this institute. I am really concerned though the relationship between the institute participants and the Chinese 102 students has been compromised by the failure to warn them in advance. Problems from this include both their experiences (choppy, experimental, etc.) and ours (resistant students, etc.). Also, it is unclear to me whether their experiences have been consistently PBLI or a mixture of more traditional methods with PBLI (also, I wonder why they are using a traditional style textbook when there is a PBLI text available). Clearly there are a range of ideologies within the department and perhaps also within the facilitators? I think that is O.K., but should be out in the open (Midway evaluation, 7/14/00).

One interesting thing about this workshop at this point was the paradox of what it tried to teach versus what it was facing. In other words, was the workshop to be conducted in the traditional way of transmitting the knowledge to participants in a top-down fashion or to practice the principles of PBLI by treating contexts and student-centeredness as priorities?

After much discussion, a decision was reached. On Tuesday of the second week, the first opportunity that a luncheon could be arranged, a pizza party for all constituents was held. Apparently, the lunch achieved its goal of allowing people to interact on a human level, not just in a laboratory situation. Students were happy to see that their feelings and feedback were taken seriously and were thus willing to help the participants receive the training they needed.

From this point on, the workshop was co-constructed on every level. Concerns about the CHN 102 students or other pedagogical issues were openly discussed, and participants expressed their desire of wanting to know more about advanced level teaching in PBLI and about testing. They also voiced their preference about the topics, formats, and content of the mini-conference (see discussion of mini-conference), to which the facilitators agreed. This summative comment, “*You really had your act together. I particularly like the fact that you treat students like human beings, not as products*” (SE, Part IV, #4, m) captured the effort and spirit of the workshop. It is interesting to note that the author of this comment was participant *m* who had been most conscious of the uneven power relationships of the workshop (see comments listed in the fourth paragraph of this section). In this regard, the workshop became a good example of critical pedagogy in practice.



Logistical/Physical Operation of the Workshop

So far, I have discussed the findings in terms of the social interactions impacted by the wider and the immediate contexts of the workshop. The rest of the report will be organized differently because the focus of my evaluation will shift from the more abstract to the more tangible aspects of the workshop, such as the logistical/physical operation, the facilitation and learning of the content, and the future plan of disseminating the information. In addition to listing the question and participants' rating, I shall draw on the rich data collected throughout the workshop and make evaluative comments in order to help the readers make meaning out of the rating. The following section came from Part II of the summative evaluation (SE) form, which asked participants to "tell us how you feel about the logistical/physical operation of the workshop" (See Appendix B).

"How did you find out about the 2000 NFLRC Summer Institute?": More than half (8/15) of the participants found the information about the workshop via the Internet/Web. Three found it through a conference, two from a colleague and journal/newsletter, respectively, and one from a flyer. One participant reported multiple means of learning about the workshop. It seemed that multiple channels are still desirable in order to reach out.

"The information I received about the Workshop/Summer Institute prior to coming was adequate for my needs": All participants agreed that the information they received prior to the workshop was adequate (7 strongly agreed and 8 agreed).

"The Workshop was well organized and well run": Eleven participants strongly agreed, and three agreed that the workshop was well run, but one participant was neutral. As one of them commented, there were *few glitches but all seemed to be able to get worked out without effort* (SE, Part II, #3, g). Another participant enthusiastically stated: *"The theme of discussion was clear, the content rich, and the daily activities and time were well arranged."* (SE, Part II, #3, b).

"The staff was helpful": No participant questioned the helpfulness of the staff (14/15 strongly agreed, 1/15 agreed). Here are some examples of their comments:

- *Very resourceful, well informed, know the subject well and extremely generous in sharing resources and ideas. A big thank-you* (SE, Part II, #4, g).
- *I appreciate so much the hard work of the staff. They were nice and helpful in every way* (SE, Part II, #4, h).
- *Jim has been extremely helpful before and throughout the workshop* (SE, Part II, #4, i).
- *Everyone was very giving of their time and energy. I didn't expect that they would be willing to spend so much extra time working and socializing with us* (SE, Part II, #4, j).
- *Yes! The entire staff was helpful, supportive, and very generous with their time. The facilitators knew their stuff and worked well together, which made the Institute pleasant for all of us. Jim*



Yoshioka was indefatigable — always running here and there to meet our every need. Thank you to all! (I also appreciated having the input of Zhou Shuhan at Institute). The binders we received were terrific — with all their important info (SE, Part II, #4, l).

- *The staff was not just helpful, but also considerate. I especially appreciate their willingness to share (SE, Part II, #4, o).*

“The Workshop facilities and technical support were adequate”: Again, all participants found no fault in this aspect of the workshop (11/15 strongly agreed, 4/15 agreed). However, the infamous air-conditioning in the lab, which had been repeatedly mentioned in the evaluative reports of previous years, continued to haunt the participants throughout this workshop. There were also suggestions made to future workshops:

- *The air-conditioning was quite strong (SE, Part II, #5, c).*
- *Too cold in the classroom with ELMO/TV. Copy machine can be better. Tech support people are great (SE, Part II, #5, g).*
- *Need: a comfortable place to meet, a comfortable place to work/write, a place to sit down and relax/eat during breaks (SE, Part II, #5, i).*
- *The air-conditioning was a little overboard, but yes, the facilities were good and Clayton, Kin (the afternoon student monitor), and Dan Tom were all very helpful (SE, Part II, #5, m).*

“The length of the Workshop (two weeks) was appropriate”: Fourteen of the participants agreed that two weeks was just right, while one participant remained neutral. However, there were a couple of suggestions:

- *It would have been better if we had had more time for sightseeing (SE, Part II, #6, c).*
- *Two weeks was appropriate except for that the last one or two days we all felt somewhat exhausted. Maybe including the facilitators. Maybe something completely different should be scheduled for the last three days (SE, Part II, #6, j).*
- *Extend lab hours on some days (SE, Part IV, #3, d).*
- *Since Hawai‘i is such a fun place, I think in the future instead of a one-day excursion over the weekend, the workshop can organize a two-day trip to one of the neighboring islands. (It can be an option for the workshop.) (SE, Part IV, #3, e).*

Considering the fact that almost all participants had to spend a handsome sum of money on the airfare to get to Hawai‘i, and considering the fact that Hawai‘i has so much to offer, the daily schedule of the workshop seemed to be unreasonably long and inflexible, from 8 am till 5 pm daily. In the future, the workshop organizers might consider planning a few free afternoons and resume the small group discussion or lesson development/critique during the evening hours. This would be possible because almost all participants stayed at the UH dormitories. Furthermore, because a product (e.g., a paper for the mini-conference) was required, facilitators and organizers did not need



to police the attendance of these professionals at all times. In this way, those who would like to do some sightseeing would be able to do it during the afternoons, when most activities and landmarks are available and open. The computer laboratory could be available to participants during those free afternoons, thus providing more time for them to engage in extra reading or reflective journaling.

“I was satisfied with the logistical and social aspects of the Workshop (housing arrangement, breakfast, afternoon snacks, excursions, bento option, lei making, Dean’s reception, pizza luncheon, etc.)”: Fourteen participants agreed (with ten strongly agreeing), and one was neutral. Many expressed appreciation to the facilitators and staff for spending so much time with them. Although in my questions I neglected to mention the handbook that we received upon arrival, which contained all the essential information about restaurants, transportation, shopping, and temporary e-mail accounts, several participants made a point to thank the NFLRC staff for it.

Furthermore, the dream-like dinner at Axiong and Heidi Wong’s home on Saturday will definitely be the legend of this workshop: The house existed as in a Chinese landscape painting; dishes served as only one would find at a five-star restaurant; and the emerald ocean, the misty mountains, and the sound of laughter and music.

The Content of the Workshop

In this section, the focus is on various aspects of the content delivery and learning.

“I liked the pre-Institute introduction and discussion forum on the web”: Stephen facilitated a pre-workshop online introduction of facilitators and participants and a discussion forum. The introduction was quite successful because most participants sent a short bio containing both professional and personal information such as educational background and hobbies. However, the participation in the discussion forum was not as high as expected. As a result, only three participants strongly agreed, while nine agreed with this statement. Two participants felt neutral and one did not answer this question.

In retrospect, this did not come as a surprise. First, it was during the months of May and June, a time when most teachers/instructors were busy finishing up the year’s or semester’s work. Second, many of them had not read the assigned book and found it difficult to participate since the forum was supposed to be based on the readings. Third, the psychological price was high for people to expose their thoughts and ideas to a group of strangers. In the future, it might be better if the reading is announced early, soon after the participants are notified (SE, Part III, #1, n). The questions posed could also be more open-ended, as suggested by one participant (SE, Part III, #1, m).

“I found the assigned reading (Brown’s book) relevant and helpful for my participation in the Institute”: Everyone agreed that Brown’s book was relevant and useful. Among them, seven



participants strongly agreed, and eight agreed to this statement. However, lacking the time to read the book prior to arriving at the workshop was a concern (SE, Part III, #2, o). Again, earlier announcement of the reading will improve the situation.

“I felt comfortable expressing my opinions, ideas, or feelings during the Institute”: Almost all participants either strongly agreed or agreed that they had no problem expressing their opinions or thoughts. One participant wished that her English was better. One interesting comment came from one participant who felt that the opposite, to listen, was also beneficial because “*most people had a lot of experience teaching Chinese.*” (SE, Part III, #3, f).

“I felt that my voice was heard and valued at the Institute”: Six participants felt strongly that their voice was heard and valued; eight agreed, and one was neutral about this statement. (See Webs of Relationship above for detail.)

“I found the variety of perspectives represented by workshop facilitators and participants valuable”: Ten participants strongly agreed, four agreed, and one was neutral. As discussed in Webs of Relationships, some participants felt that “*it was not originally presented as a range of ideas (from facilitators) — but they did give us a range*” (SE, Part III, #5, m). Generally, this comment summed it up: “*Most definitely. I really welcomed all the different perspectives and hearing about others’ experiences in teaching*” (SE, Part III, #5, l).

“The discussions of Performance-based language instruction was applicable/relevant to my professional goals and needs”: Eleven participants strongly agreed and four agreed that the discussions of PBLI were applicable/relevant to their professional goals and needs. This comment said it all:

I am very happy to have this opportunity to discuss and design class activities with so many great teachers before I begin my actual teaching. So many good ideas, so many that I can’t digest them all! (SE, Part III, #6, b).

“I can explain the six principles of performance-based language instruction clearly to a colleague who is not familiar with this paradigm of teaching”: Most (13/15) people agreed, but only three of them were confident enough to strongly agree with this statement. The remaining two participants were neutral. Considering that PBLI was new to many of them, for instance, one participant even thought performance-based was related to teaching through drama (application data), this result showed that the workshop did a good job explaining and demonstrating PBLI. The fact that the majority of them only checked ‘agree’ might come from the fact that there was no wrap-up session prior to closing to revisit the principles of PBLI (SE, Part IV, #3,a). Furthermore, it might be an indicator of participants’ efforts in trying to incorporate these principles into their existing systems. This comment from one participant explained it well: “I felt that I only touched the surface” (SE, Part III, #7, b).



In response to the statement, ***“I found the following components of the Institute facilitated my hands-on experience of learning about, developing, and discussing performance-based language teaching,”*** the components included:

“Fuzhou Lessons and Critique/Reflection”: Almost everyone, eight participants strongly and six agreed, that these components were useful, with one participant neutral. They were impressed with Cyndy’s ability to motivate and lead students from one activity to another, and from one task to another. This comment sharply pointed out the function and the success of the Fuzhou lessons and the reflections upon them:

Most helpful. Fuzhou lesson idea is most brilliant — It not only gave us models of how PBLI in action is, should be, also gave us a student/learner perspective experience. Reflection sessions were extremely valuable — Well done! (Part IV, #8, f).

On the other hand, because participants were new to this dialect, Fuzhou lessons must start at the beginning level. Consequently, some participants viewed the techniques used as suitable only for beginners. Furthermore, because this was the first time many participants had any contact with the concept of PBLI, it was difficult for them to see beyond the technique level and see the rationale and approach behind it. Thus, this comment came as no surprise:

I often felt that we were only learning phonology during Fuzhou lessons. But Prof. Ning’s teaching methods were very useful and inspiring (SE, Part III, #8a, e).

Although Cyndy tried to address this issue by teaching “ba” sentences, which was presumably a sentence structure for a more advanced level of Chinese language learning, her effort did not satisfy participants’ appetite for PBLI in more advanced levels. The gap came from the fact that, though Fuzhouhua and Mandarin differ greatly in phonology, they share similar syntactical structures. For students who are native Chinese speakers, the challenge did not lie in learning “ba” sentences. Rather, it lay in their desire to map the sound system from the known (Mandarin) to the unknown (Fuzhouhua). In this sense, Fuzhou lessons probably were not a good medium for the demonstration of higher level instruction in the PBLI framework to these fluent speakers of Mandarin.

“Small-Group Teaching Demonstrations and Critique/Reflection”: Overwhelmingly, twelve participants strongly agreed and two agreed that they were useful, while one was neutral. In the summative evaluation, many participants mentioned that the most valuable learning experiences at the workshop were preparing lessons, doing teaching demonstrations, and discussing and reflecting on the demonstrations with colleagues (SE, Part III, #1). As one participant put it, *“This was one of the most valuable aspects of the Institute for me. To put PBLI into practice was hard but rewarding. Again, the critiques were valuable”* (SE, Part III, #8b, l).

However, one participant strongly objected to the idea of teaching the class without knowing the students. This comment was thus made, *“The lesson preparation was extremely valuable. The teaching*



was a waste of time” (SE, Part IV, #8b, m). In fact, a lunch pizza party on the first day of the workshop would solve this problem. Not only would it provide an opportunity for everyone to meet and get acquainted, it would also reduce the resistance from the students in the CHN 102 class mentioned in the Webs of Relationships section.

Other suggestions for future workshop design include the following points: First, it would be nice for the group that was going to teach the next day to stay and observe Li Laoshi’s lesson on the second hour of the CHN 102 class. In this way, lesson coherence and continuity would be established. Otherwise, “*it was extremely difficult to plan using someone else’s outline with five people in such a short period of time*” (Part III, 8b, n). This comment pointed to the inauthenticity of the experience. Second, only the group that needed to teach should do the lesson planning. Other groups could work on critiquing the previous lesson or developing a lesson/task based on the videotapes that workshop participants had developed. It was not the best way to use the precious group time on the same lesson planning or critiquing which would not be used or shared later on.

“Videotape Field Assignments”: This question stirred different feelings among the participants. Some strongly agreed that they were useful (5/15), some (6/15) agreed, a few (3/15) were neutral, but one (1/15) did not answer. Several participants gave very positive comments: “*That was one of the best parts during the Institute*” (Part III, 8c, f) and “*These assignments have inspired me to develop authentic teaching materials myself*” (Part III, 8c, n). In general, however, this component was viewed as a missed opportunity.

First, it was felt that more planning prior to field work must be done. Second, as discussed in the previous section about teaching demonstrations and critiques, some of the time allotted for group critique or lesson planning could be used in developing tasks or lessons of instruction based on these videotapes. Although each participant received a copy of the videotape prior to leaving the workshop, the golden opportunity of working together to generate more ideas was lost. This comment should serve as a good suggestion for future workshops:

I suppose perhaps we didn’t need to shoot the videotapes three times. Twice may have been enough. The first time was for practice. For the second time, it would have been better to have designed instructional activities before we went out to shoot the footage. After we had taped it, we could use two hours to design related activities (SE, Part III, 8c, h).

“Whole Group Discussions”: Six participants strongly agreed and eight agreed to this statement, but one did not give any rating on this statement. Generally speaking, the whole group discussion was very lively, focused, and productive. The majority of participants felt that ‘*it was most useful to hear ideas from the group on a variety of topics*’ (SE, Part III, 8d, l).

“Reflection Journals”: Only two participants strongly agreed, but most (12/15) agreed, that they were useful while only one felt neutral. There were several factors that could account for such results.



The first one, of course, was the lack of time to reflect, to synthesize, and to write. The limited hours for the computer lab further required participants to become more creative in stealing time. Second, the nature of exposing one's thoughts to the whole group was rather intimidating and inauthentic in traditional Chinese cultural practices. The two graduate students who came directly from Taiwan (see Participants in the Section of The People and the Interactional Dynamics of the Workshop) found it especially difficult to write in English. In fact, to engage in reflective journaling would require a lot more practice.

A more serious flaw, however, was that most questions were about participants' opinions/perceptions on what happened. While making observational comments was useful, this kind of question did not force participants to examine their own beliefs and practices. Questions such as "I wonder if..." "what would you have changed?," "what could have been done differently?;" and "how and why/why not?" would be helpful to enable participants to link what they experienced at the workshop to what they do in the classrooms, i.e., to connect the new to the existing experiences/knowledge while pushing one step further. (For more detail, see my discussion in the section Evaluation: Theoretical Framework and Approach, pp. 4-6.)

"Mini-conference": Almost everyone liked this component, with half and half strongly agreed and agreed (7/15 respectively), while one gave no rating. Interestingly, the format and content of the mini-conference were another example of co-construction between participants and facilitators. Originally, the topic and format of the mini-conference were intended to follow those of a professional conference, i.e., individual papers on theoretical considerations of PBLI pedagogy. It was expressed to facilitators during private conversations and whole group discussions (7/17, 18, 19, 20, field notes) that participants would like to continue what they had already been doing throughout the workshop, i.e., to develop lessons of their choice in order to apply what they had learned to their institutional situations. The facilitators agreed with this suggestion and allowed the participants to form their own groups and topics. Six groups were formed: four worked on developing lessons based on their selected textbooks, one developed a lesson based on the videotape filmed, and another focused on the theoretical definitions and implementations of the notion of "contextualization," one of the six principles of PBLI.

The last day of the workshop, July 22, was the mini-conference. Each group had fifty minutes to make their presentation and hold a question-answer session. As expected, not only had each group devoted considerable time to develop its topic, but the product had also shown a lot of thought, reflection, and creativity. One participant commented that the workshop had provided her with the theory of knowing why she was doing certain things in certain ways, instead of relying on instincts and common sense. The strongest statement came from another participant who talked about her

realization that she had been very textbook driven before she came to the workshop. “Now I am worry-free and have become daring. I know what to add and what to chop!” (Day 10, 7/22 field notes).

“I was satisfied with the facilitation of the Workshop”: Eleven participants strongly agreed and three agreed that the facilitation of the workshop was excellent, while one was neutral. (See Webs of Relationships for detail.)

“My participation in the Institute has influenced my view on teaching and learning”: Ten participants strongly agreed and four agreed, while one was neutral that the workshop had influenced their views. The majority liked what they learned at the workshop (SE, Part III, #10, a-o), which could be summed up by this comment:

Basically, I had envisioned FL teaching is ideally done in PBLI principles. But I did not have enough exposure nor do I have support network to brainstorm and learn from. I am very happy and pleased with being here to learn from the team of facilitators who are very clear on the concept and who have a large pool of ideas and activities to deliver teaching and enhance learning to show me, to give me a chance to try out and have colleague to brain storm with. Also was exposed to new issues and approaches to think about (SE, Part III, 10, g).

Several participants also showed that they would continue to think about the principles and implementation of PBLI after the workshop. For example:

Yes. My thoughts on teaching have changed. I realize my classroom is not as learner-centered, nor my classroom material as contextualized as I would like it to be. I would really like to try to employ the techniques Cyndy used in the Fuzhou lessons. However, I am not so sure how/if/should change the way I do grammar presentation or handle pronunciation correction (SE, Part III, #10, l).

I plan to at least partially adapt the principles and techniques in curriculum design and course planning (Part III, #10, a).

I’m mostly impressed by the testing methods introduced during the workshop. I valued authentic, communicative and learner-centered class activities before I attended the workshop, but it never occurred to me that tests could be conducted in the same manner. This makes me realized that PBLI is supposed to be a systematic method but not just some approaches (Part III, #10, i).

“I felt that the Institute has achieved its stated goals”: Nine participants strongly and five agreed that the workshop had successfully achieved its stated goals, while the remaining one was neutral. Based on my discussions above and the evaluation of participants, I would say that this assessment reflects the success of the workshop.

“What issues would you like to continue to discuss through the web-based discussion forum”:

Participants gave the following list of suggested topics:

- PBLI in testing and assessment, especially in reading and writing
- Methods of teaching grammar
- PBLI of advanced levels of Chinese language learning
- Application and discussion of PBLI in real-world teaching: problems, ideas, experiences, materials, and lesson plans



- Encouragement and advocacy

Although the online forum was discontinued after July 31, the electronic mail exchanges among participants and facilitators have remained active. There was also talk about getting together at the upcoming annual ACTFL/CLTA conference in November. Hopefully, this kind of post-workshop dialogue will continue to offer support, ideas, and advice to all who were involved.

“Overall, my expectations of the Workshop were met”: The majority of participants strongly agreed that their expectations of the workshop were met (11/15), three agreed, and one was neutral. The only regret was from one participant who wished that Cyndy and Ted had spoken more at the workshop, especially Ted (SE, Part III, #13, n). Other than that, this comment represents the essence of their responses:

Yes — it was well worth the time and effort — I made new friends/colleagues and got to observe new techniques — plus I had many of my assumptions challenged which was a good experience (SE, Part III, #13, l).

I shall further discuss this point in the conclusion part of this report.

“How do you plan to share/disseminate what you have learned with colleagues at your home institution?”: This question belonged to Part IV of the summative evaluation form. The rest of Part IV will be incorporated into the section, Conclusion and Recommendations.

All participants answered this question. They said that they will share with their colleagues and supervisors at their own institutions. Additionally, some of them plan to offer a workshop or do a teaching demonstration of a lesson in PBLI. Others will consider presenting a paper at a conference or a written report.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

So far, I have described the program, introduced the people, and discussed the findings of the UH NFLRC 2000 Chinese Workshop. Now I would like to conclude this evaluative report by revisiting the four research questions asked in the section on Theoretical Framework and Methods of Evaluation.

The first question asked what the macro, institutional, and micro contexts of the workshop were; who these people were; why these individuals came together and how they worked with the constraints of, and drew resources from, these immediate and larger contexts.

This Chinese workshop, as a response to the needs of the Chinese teaching field, was successful in introducing PBLI to participants. The fact that most conversations related to pedagogical issues were conducted in a reflective “what was possible” rather than the competing “what was better” mode was



a great leap for the field. As discussed throughout the report, this workshop was not free from many contextual constraints. However, it was able to draw resources such as the expertise, time, and willingness to share and cooperate from all constituents and hence removed many barriers of learning for the laboratory students and participants alike (SE, Part IV, #4, c, d, e, f, g, h, k, m, o).

The second question asked what the logistical and physical conditions prior to and during the workshop were and whether or not they were conducive for learning and meeting the personal and professional needs of participating teachers.

Much credit should go to the organizers, facilitators, and staff of the UH NFLRC in providing the participants with an amiable and comfortable setting for the workshop. Again, although the workshop and computer laboratory schedules and other facilities (such as the copy machine and the air-conditioning) could be improved, the sincerity and hard work of the staff compensated for many minor inconveniences and were much appreciated by the participants and the evaluator (SE, Part IV, #3, d, e, g).

The third question asked how teaching and learning were done at the workshop. In other words, it looked at how the principles of Performance-based Language Instruction (PBLI) were introduced and taught; and how effectively each component of the workshop (whole group discussion, teaching demonstration, etc.) contributed to the participants' acquisition of PBLI; and how learning was constructed at this workshop.

One answer to this set of questions lies in the design of the workshop. By building several innovative components into the workshop, the principles of PBLI were introduced in creative and hands-on ways. More importantly, these components encompassed the content, process, and product aspects of learning and teaching. For example, the preparatory activities, readings, and whole group discussions introduced the content, or the "input" component of PBLI. The journaling; Fuzhouhua lessons and critiquing, teaching demonstration and critiquing, and videotape assignments were the process component, or the "skill-getting" part of PBLI. The mini-conference presentations and papers were the products, or the "skill-using" component of PBLI.

As a matter of fact, participants cited several of these components as the most valuable learning experiences of the workshop for them. For example, they liked:

- Whole group discussions
- Fuzhouhua lessons and critiques
- Group lesson planning
- Teaching demonstration, observation, and critique
- Videotaping assignments

Additionally, they mentioned other intangible aspects of the workshop such as the combination of theory and practice; conversation with other participants and facilitators; and friendship and outings (SE, Part IV, #1, all comments).

The greatest accomplishment of the workshop, however, must be attributed to the willingness and abilities of everyone involved in co-constructing meaning and learning in a critical and democratic fashion. This workshop showed clearly, by example, that when we put students at the center, pay attention to contexts and communication, authentic learning and teaching experiences will emerge.

Finally, the last question asked, based on the teacher education model described in the theoretical framework, what kind of change in participating teachers was noticed, observed, documented, or reflected upon; and, how did they view their own learning and the attainment of their workshop goals.

The most obvious evidence to this set of questions was the papers and presentations at the mini-conference. They showed how these participants have learned and incorporated the principles of PBLI into their own systems. Not only did they demonstrate their skills in developing lessons and adapting textbooks, but they also discussed their thinking and reflections of the learning process and content. Furthermore, participants' evaluative comments that were cited throughout this report reflected participants' change or affirmation in thinking, ideas, attitudes, and/or methods/techniques about teaching Chinese in their specific institutional contexts.

With regard to the attainment of workshop and individual goals listed on pages 8–9 and 24, respectively, the answer is not as straight forward. That is, according to the self-evaluation of participants (SE, Part III, #13 and SE, Part IV, #4), individual goals were achieved. Many participants expressed satisfaction that many of their questions about PBLI and teaching the Chinese language in general were answered, or at least they would continue to ponder the issue of improvement. However, a close examination of workshop goals shows that not all goals were achieved equally.

For instance, participants indeed learned through demonstration, practice sessions, and peer and instructor critiques. They also talked about the role of the textbook in PBLI; the role of grammar instruction in PBLI; principles of instructional task design; and performance-based testing. The discussions, though, could have probed the issues deeper than they actually were. As pointed out by one participant, *"I think some crucial terms like 'task', 'contextualization,' 'authenticity,' were used too loosely. Their definitions were not followed carefully and were used differently from time to time"* (SE, Part III, #10, n). There needed to be more in-depth discussions and examples to define many concepts in PBLI. Moreover, many participants repeatedly expressed the desire to discuss the issues of applying PBLI in advanced levels of Chinese teaching. Although the facilitators tried to address these issues,

they were not fully explored. Finally, a wrap-up session revisiting the six principles of PBLI at the end of the workshop would have been beneficial (SE, Part IV, #4, a). During such a concluding session, many issues could be clarified and reinforced.

In my opinion, these problems stemmed from the somewhat over ambitious scope of the workshop goals. It was understandable that a workshop on PBLI must include both the elements of instruction and testing. On the other hand, testing and assessment, especially alternative and performance-based assessment, could easily be the topic of an independent workshop, which actually could be a follow up to this one. It was the same for creating authentic materials and tasks through videotape and other media. It was thus understandable that these topics could only be dealt with in a rather superficial way. The issue of achieving a balance between scope and depth must then be incorporated in the design of future workshops of a similar kind.

One easy solution to this dilemma may be reached by making a minor change to the task requirements of the workshop. For example, the number of hours for critiquing or developing lessons could be reduced. Instead of having all three small groups work on the same tasks, while the product of only one group would be used and shared, independent assignments on developing tasks from the videotapes or for advanced levels would free up much of the time of the other two small groups, and their products could in turn be shared and critiqued by the whole group.

In short, my recommendations for the future workshops include: (1) fully capitalize on each component of the workshop; (2) use time more creatively in scheduling; and (3) sharpen the goals and objectives of the workshop to keep a clear focus.

Last, but not least, the workshop suggested a gold mine for research. For example, what kind of performance do students of PBLI demonstrate? To what extent can empirical data support the six principles of task-based; focus on communication; learner-centered; contextualized, authentic, and balance of skill-getting and skill-using? Are there other theoretical considerations to be included in PBLI? What effect does team-teaching have on students' learning? What are students' skill attainment in the interpersonal (oral, aural, and writing), interpretive (listening and reading), and presentational (speaking and writing) modes in the PBLI paradigm?

Based on my informal interview data with students of CHN 102, students felt that they were confused by multiple personalities in the classroom when teaching demonstrations were done. However, their curiosity was aroused because they wanted to know what kind of "tricks" or activities these teachers had designed for them. They also liked the fact that there were a range of accents and speech styles presented. In comparing PBLI to the traditional way of teaching, they felt that PBLI generated more interactions and opportunities to practice and use the language, in addition to the fact that they felt more at ease because the atmosphere was friendly and low risk. Hence, they were

more willing to try new things in front of the class. However, they felt that more individual work outside the classroom would help them tackle the task of memorizing Chinese characters, or *hanzi*. They suggested that the teacher give them daily *hanzi* quizzes in order to help them retain what they learned and balance their skill development in different areas.

These students' feedback invites researchers and teachers of the Chinese language to conduct studies and to reflect upon their practices in order to advance the field pedagogically. This Chinese workshop was an important step toward that goal, and a long stride indeed!

REFERENCES

- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (1996). *Standards for foreign language learning: Preparing for the 21st century*. Lawrence, KS: Allen Press, Inc.
- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (1998). *ACTFL performance guidelines for K-12 learners*.
- Blom, J., & Gumperz, J. J. (1972). Social meaning in linguistic structure: Code switching in Norway. In J. J. Gumperz & D. H. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics*. 407-434. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Breen, M. (1987). Learner contributions to task design. In C. Candlin, & D. Murphy, (Eds.), *Language learning tasks*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Brown, H. D. (1994). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Chamot, A. U. (1995). The teacher's voice: Action research in your classroom. *ERIC/CLL News Bulletin*, 18(2).
- Crookes, G. (1993). Action research for second language teachers: Going beyond teacher research. *Applied Linguistics*, 14(2), 130-144.
- Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. (1995). *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes*. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Erickson, F., & Shultz, J. (1982). *The counselor as gatekeeper: Social interaction in interviews*. New York, NY: Academic Press, Inc.
- Erickson, F., & Shultz, J. (1996). Ethnographic microanalysis. In S. L. McKay, & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 283-306). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Gee, J. P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses*. Bristol, PA: Taylor & Francis Ltd.
- Goldstein, Tara (1997). Language research methods and critical pedagogy. In N. H. Hornberger & D. Corson (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education, Volume 8: Research methods in language and education* (pp. 67-77). Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Gumperz, J., & Hymes, D. H. (1964). *The ethnography of communication*. *American Anthropologist*, 66(2).
- Gumperz, J., & Hymes, D. H. (Eds.) (1972). *Directions in sociolinguistics*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Gumperz, J., & Hymes, D. H. (1982a). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.



- Gumperz, J., & Hymes, D. H. (1982b). *Language and social identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (1995 [1983]). *Ethnography: Principles in practice* (2nd ed.). London & New York: Routledge.
- Hymes, D. H. (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- McGinnis, S. (1999). *Chinese Language Teachers Association Newsletter*. September. Kalamazoo, MI.
- McLaren, P. (1989). *Life in schools*. New York, NY: Longman.
- National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project. (1999). *Standards for foreign language learning in the 21st century*. Lawrence, KS: Allen Press, Inc. .
- Ning, C. (1993). *Communicating in Chinese*. Far Eastern Publications.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simple systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation. *Languages*, 50, 696–735.
- Trueba, H. T., & Y. Zou. (1994). *Power in education: The case of Miao university students and its significance for American culture*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Turner, R. (1974). *Ethnomethodology*. Middlesex, England: Penguin Education.
- Walqui, A. (1997). Professional development for teachers of English language learners. Paper presented at the Conference of Improving the Education of English Language Learners: Best Practices. Co-sponsored by The National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board, The Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs, The Office of Educational Research and Improvement. July 15–16, 1999. Washington, D. C.
- Wang, S. C. (1999). Teacher training—Meeting the needs of the field. In M. Chu (Ed.), *Mapping the course of the Chinese language field*, Chinese Language Teachers Association Monograph Series, Vol. III. (pp. 25–36). Kalamazoo, MI: Kalamazoo College Press.
- Wu, W., & Wang, S. C. (1997). *Chinese for youth*. Taipei, Taiwan: The Far East Book Co. Ltd.
- Yao, T., & Liu, Y. (1997). *Integrated Chinese* (Traditional Edition). Cheng & Tsui Company.

APPENDIX A: MID-WAY EVALUATION FORM

COURSE TITLE: _____ COURSE NUMBER _____

INSTRUCTOR: _____ DATE(S) GIVEN: _____

LOCATION: _____

Please circle one number from 1–5:

COURSE

- | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|---|---|---|-----------------|---|
| 1. The OBJECTIVES of the course were: | Clearly Evident | | | | | |
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | Vague | 1 |
| 2. The OBJECTIVES of the course were: | Met | | | | Not Met | |
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| 3. The course CONTENT was: | Very Thorough | | | | Limited | |
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| 4. The PRODUCT'S RELEVANCE to the course was: | Highly Appropriate | | | | Not Appropriate | |
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |

INSTRUCTOR

- | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------------|---|---|---|--------------|--|
| 5. The course ORGANIZATION was: | Well Planned | | | | Confusing | |
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| 6. The DELIVERY/PRESENTATION was: | Excellent | | | | Poor | |
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| 7. The IDEAS AND ACTIVITIES presented were: | Relevant to the Course | | | | Not Relevant | |
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |

OVERALL :

- | | | | | | | |
|--|------------|---|---|---|----------------|--|
| 8. My attendance at the workshop should prove to be: | Beneficial | | | | Not Beneficial | |
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| 9. Please use the other side for comments and suggestions. | | | | | | |



APPENDIX B: SUMMATIVE EVALUATION FORM

2000 NFLRC SUMMER INSTITUTE

NATIONAL FOREIGN LANGUAGE RESOURCE CENTER
University of Hawai'i



Workshop
July 10–21, 2000

Evaluation

Your assistance with this questionnaire is greatly appreciated. Please take a few minutes to assess the effectiveness of the Workshop. Completing it carefully will aid those who participate in future Summer Institutes. Thank you very much!

PART I: TELL US ABOUT YOURSELF

1. Which best describes your institutional affiliation?

- Elementary Intermediate High School
 Community College College/University Other _____

2. What is your position title? _____

3. How many years have you been teaching Chinese as a S/FL? _____

4. Have you taken any courses or received any training that is similar to this type of Institute?

If so, please give a few examples _____

5. Briefly describe your expectations of the Institute _____

PART II: TELL US HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT THE LOGISTICS/PHYSICAL OPERATION OF THE INSTITUTE

Please check the phrase or statement that best applies to your experience. Feel free to add any comments to clarify or enhance your response.

1. How did you find out about the 2000 NFLRC Summer Institute?

- Journal/Newsletter Flyer Email/WWW
 Conference Colleague



Other? Comment _____

2. The information I received about the Workshop/Summer Institute prior to coming was adequate for my needs.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

Comment _____

3. The Workshop was well organized and well run.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

Comment _____

4. The staff was helpful.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

Comment _____

5. The Workshop facilities and technical support were adequate.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

Comment _____

6. The length of the Workshop (two weeks) was appropriate.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

Comment _____

7. I was satisfied with the logistical and social aspects of the Workshop (housing arrangement, breakfast, afternoon snacks, excursions, bento option, lei making, Dean's reception, pizza luncheon, etc.).

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

Comment _____



PART III: TELL US HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT THE CONTENT OF THE INSTITUTE

1. I liked the pre-Institute introduction and discussion forum on the web.
 Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
Comment _____

2. I found the assigned reading (Brown’s book) relevant and helpful for my participation in the Institute.
 Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
Comment _____

3. I felt comfortable expressing my opinions, ideas, or feelings during the Institute.
 Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
Comment _____

4. I felt that my voice was heard and valued at the Institute.
 Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
Comment _____

5. I found the variety of perspectives represented by Workshop facilitators and participants valuable.
 Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
Comment _____

6. The discussions of performance-based language instruction were applicable/relevant to my professional goals and needs:
 Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
Comment _____



7. I can explain the six principles of performance-based language instruction clearly to a colleague who is not familiar with this paradigm of teaching:

- Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

Comment _____

8. I found that the following components of the Institute facilitated my hands-on experience of learning about, developing, and discussing performance-based language teaching:

a. Fuzhou Lessons and Critique/Reflection

- Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

Comment _____

b. Small-Group Teaching Demonstrations and Critique/Reflection

- Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

Comment _____

c. Videotape Field Assignments

- Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

Comment _____

d. Whole Group Discussions

- Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

Comment _____

e. Reflection Journals

- Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

Comment _____

f. Mini-conference

- Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree



Comment _____

9. I was satisfied with the facilitation of the Workshop.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

Comment _____

10. My participation in this Institute has influenced my views on teaching and learning.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

If you agree, what has changed? If not, what are your concerns?

11. I felt that the Institute has achieved its stated goals (See Appendix of NFLRC's Workshop Description on the Web).

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

Comment _____

12. What issues would you like to continue to discuss through the web-based discussion forum?

13. Overall, my expectations of the Workshop were met.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

Comment _____

PART IV: TELL US WHAT YOU PLAN TO DO WITH WHAT YOU HAVE LEARNED AT THE WORKSHOP

Please respond to the following questions. Your comments will assist in the preparation of similar future institutes.



1. Please sum up your most valuable learning experience(s) at the Workshop (e.g., specific session, conversation with a Workshop facilitator/another participant, etc.).

2. How do you plan to share/disseminate what you have learned with colleagues at your home institution? _____

3. Finally, what could we have done better at the Workshop? _____

4. What did we do particularly well? _____

MAHALO FOR YOUR TIME.

IT'S BEEN A PLEASURE GETTING TO KNOW YOU AND WORKING WITH YOU!



APPENDIX C: WORKSHOP SCHEDULE

MONDAY, JULY 10	8:00–8:30	Morning refreshments (coffee, tea, juice, bagels, & pastries) Open computer lab
	8:30–8:45	Welcome to the institute!
	8:45–9:30	"Let's learn Fuzhou!" – A language lesson
	9:30–9:45	Break
	9:45–10:15	Critique of Fuzhou lesson
	10:15–10:30	Break
	10:30–12:00	"Principles of Performance-based Language Instruction (PBLI)"
	12:00–1:00	Lunch
	1:00–2:00	Video training session
	2:00–3:00	Working groups: Hibiscus (H), Ilima (I), & Pikake (P) Video assignments
	3:00–4:00	Feedback on video assignments
	4:30–6:30	Dean's reception (Student Services Center, Room 412)
TUESDAY, JULY 11	8:00–8:30	Morning refreshments (coffee, tea, juice, bagels, & pastries) Open computer lab
	8:30–10:15	"Principles of PBLI"
	10:15–10:30	Break
	10:30–11:30	Workshop Facilitator Demonstration Session [IC 14]
	11:30–1:00	Lunch (bento option available)
	1:00–1:45	Critique of morning demonstration
	1:45–2:30	Fuzhou lesson
	2:30–2:45	Break
	2:45–3:45	"Principles of Lesson Planning"
	3:45–4:00	Break
	4:00–5:00	HIP lesson planning
	5:00–7:00	Open computer lab
WEDNESDAY, JULY 12	8:00–8:30	Morning refreshments (coffee, tea, juice, bagels, & pastries) Open computer lab (Moore 153A)
	8:30–9:30	"Principles of PBLI"
	9:30–10:15	Lesson sharing [all groups]
	10:15–10:30	Break
	10:30–11:30	Group H Demonstration Session, with Workshop Facilitator [IC 14]
	11:30–1:00	Lunch
	1:00–2:15	Fuzhou lesson
	2:15–2:30	Break
	2:30–3:15	HIP: Group I prepares for its participant demonstration. Group P works on critiquing the demo session. Group H attends a workshop
	3:15–3:30	Break
	3:30–4:15	Critique of the demonstration session [Group P]
	4:15–5:00	HIP lesson planning
5:00–7:00	Open computer lab	



THURSDAY, JULY 13	8:00–8:30	Morning refreshments (coffee, tea, juice, bagels, & pastries) Open computer lab
	8:30–9:30	"Principles of PBLI"
	9:30–10:15	Lesson sharing [all groups]
	10:15–10:30	Break
	10:30–11:30	Group I Demonstration Session, with Workshop Facilitator [IC 15]
	11:30–1:00	Lunch (bento option available)
	1:00–1:45	HIP: Group P prepares for its participant demonstration. Group H works on critiquing the demo session. Group I attends a workshop
	1:45–2:15	Critique of the demonstration session [Group H]
	2:15–2:30	Break
	2:30–4:15	Groups H (restaurant) & I (travel agency) go on Excursion 1; Group P continues lesson planning
4:15–5:00	HIP lesson planning	
5:00–7:00	Open computer lab	
FRIDAY, JULY 14	8:00–8:30	Morning refreshments (coffee, tea, juice, bagels, & pastries) Open computer lab
	8:30–9:30	"Principles of PBLI"
	9:30–10:15	Lesson sharing [all groups]
	10:15–10:30	Break
	10:30–11:30	Group P Demonstration Session, with Workshop Facilitator [IC 15]
	11:30–1:00	Lunch
	1:00–1:45	HIP: Group H prepares for its participant demonstration. Group I works on critiquing the demo session. Group P attends a workshop.
	1:45–2:15	Critique of the demonstration session [Group I]
	2:15–2:30	Break
	2:30–4:15	Group P (TV station) goes on Excursion 1; Group I (Chinatown) goes on Excursion 2; Group H continues lesson planning
4:15–5:00	HIP lesson planning	
5:00–6:00	Lesson in Lei making [optional]	
5:00–7:00	Open computer lab	
SATURDAY, JULY 15 (OPTIONAL ISLAND EXCURSION)	8:45	Departure from Lincoln Hall (UH campus) by van
	9:00–12:30	Prince Lot Hula Festival (Moanalua Gardens)
	12:30–2:00	Lunch in Kaneohe
	2:00–5:30	Afternoon options: Hau'ula Loop Trail/Waipilopilo Gulch Kualoa Beach Park (5:00 pick-up) Quality relaxation time at the Wong residence
	5:30–8:00	Dinner at the Wong's; Chinese/island cuisine
SUNDAY, JULY 16	8:00	Departure for UH campus
	FREE TIME!	FREE TIME!



MONDAY, JULY 17	8:00–8:30	Morning refreshments (coffee, tea, juice, bagels, & pastries) Open computer lab
	8:30–9:30	"Principles of PBLI"
	9:30–10:15	Lesson sharing [all groups]
	10:15–10:30	Break
	10:30–11:30	Group H Demonstration Session [IC 15/16]
	11:30–1:00	Lunch
	1:00–1:45	HIP: Group I prepares for its participant demonstration. Group P works on critiquing the demo session. Group H attends a workshop.
	1:45–2:15	Critique of the demonstration session [Group P]
	2:15–2:30	Break
	2:30–4:15	Groups H & P (supermarket) go on Excursion 2; Group I continues lesson planning
4:15–5:00	HIP lesson planning	
5:00–7:00	Open computer lab	
TUESDAY, JULY 18	8:00–8:30	Morning refreshments (coffee, tea, juice, bagels, & pastries) Open computer lab
	8:30–9:30	"Principles of PBLI"
	9:30–10:15	Lesson sharing [all groups]
	10:15–10:30	Break
	10:30–11:30	Group I Demonstration Session [IC 16]
	11:30–1:00	Lunch (bento option available)
	1:00–2:00	Fuzhou lesson
	2:00–2:15	Break
	2:15–3:15	HIP: Group P prepares for Thursday's demonstration. Group H works on critiquing the demo session. Group I attends a workshop.
	3:15–3:30	Break
3:30–4:15	Critique of demonstration session [Group H]	
4:15–5:00	Proposal writing; proposals from individuals and groups accepted. [Proposals due by 6:00]	
5:00–7:00	Open computer lab	
WEDNESDAY, JULY 19	8:00–8:30	Morning refreshments (coffee, tea, juice, bagels, & pastries) Open computer lab
	8:30–9:30	"Principles of PBLI"
	9:30–10:15	Proposals returned and feedback given. Discussion about the upcoming mini-conference
	10:15–10:30	Break
	10:30–11:30	Demonstration Session by Workshop Facilitator [IC 16]
	11:30–1:00	Lunch
	1:00–2:00	Fuzhou lesson
	2:00–2:15	Break
	2:15–3:15	HIP: Group H has a surprise session. Group I works on critiquing the demo session. Group P attends a workshop
	3:15–3:30	Break
3:30–4:15	Critique of demonstration session [Group I]	
4:15–5:00	Group H shares their surprise	
5:00–7:00	Open computer lab	



THURSDAY, JULY 20	8:00–8:30	Morning refreshments (coffee, tea, juice, bagels, & pastries) Open computer lab
	8:30–9:30	"Principles of PBLI"
	9:30–9:45	Lesson sharing [Group P]
	9:45–10:15	Mini-conference preparation
	10:15–10:30	Break
	10:30–11:30	Group P Demonstration Session [IC 17]
	11:30–1:00	Lunch (bento option available)
	1:00–2:00	Fuzhou summation
	2:00–2:15	Break
	2:15–3:00	Critique [all groups]
	3:00–3:15	Break
3:15–5:00	Mini-conference preparation	
5:00–7:00	Open computer lab	
FRIDAY, JULY 21	8:00–8:30	Morning refreshments (coffee, tea, juice, bagels, & pastries) Open computer lab
	8:30–10:00	Mini-conference, part I
	10:00–10:30	Break
	10:30–11:30	Mini-conference, part II
	11:30–12:00	Summer Institute workshop evaluation
	12:00–1:30	Lunch
	1:30–3:00	Mini-conference, part III
	3:00–3:30	Break
	3:30–4:30	Wrap-up
	6:30–9:00	Closing banquet

