

AAUSC Issues in Language Program Direction 2011

Educating the Future Foreign Language Professoriate for the 21st Century

Heather Willis Allen
Hiram H. Maxim
Editors



Australia • Brazil • Japan • Korea • Mexico • Singapore • Spain • United Kingdom • United States



**AAUSC Issues in Language
Program Direction 2011:
Educating the Future Foreign
Language Professoriate for
the 21st Century**
Heather Willis Allen,
Hiram H. Maxim
Editors

Publisher: Beth Kramer

Editorial Assistant: Laura
Kramer

Media Editor: Morgen Murphy

Marketing Program Manager:
Caitlin Green

Manufacturing Planner: Betsy
Donaghey

Rights Acquisition Specialist:
Mandy Groszko

Design and Production Services:
PreMediaGlobal

© 2013 Heinle, Cengage Learning

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. No part of this work covered by the copyright herein may be reproduced, transmitted, stored, or used in any form or by any means graphic, electronic, or mechanical, including but not limited to photocopying, recording, scanning, digitizing, taping, Web distribution, information networks, or information storage and retrieval systems, except as permitted under Section 107 or 108 of the 1976 United States Copyright Act, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

For product information and
technology assistance, contact us at **Cengage Learning
Customer & Sales Support, 1-800-354-9706**

For permission to use material from this text or product,
submit all requests online at **www.cengage.com/permissions**.

Further permissions questions can be emailed to
permissionrequest@cengage.com.

Library of Congress Control Number: 2011938980

ISBN-13: 978-1-133-31278-9

ISBN-10: 1-133-31278-0

Heinle

20 Channel Center Street
Boston, MA 02210
USA

Cengage Learning is a leading provider of customized learning solutions with office locations around the globe, including Singapore, the United Kingdom, Australia, Mexico, Brazil and Japan. Locate your local office at **international.cengage.com/region**

Cengage Learning products are represented in Canada by
Nelson Education, Ltd.

For your course and learning solutions, visit
www.cengage.com.

Purchase any of our products at your local college store or at our
preferred online store **www.cengagebrain.com**.

Printed in the United States of America

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 15 14 13 12 11

Chapter 1

Teaching Language and Culture in a Global Age: New Goals for Teacher Education

Richard Kern, University of California at Berkeley

Introduction

Recently, following on the heels of the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning* (ACTFL, 1996), a number of new and challenging goals have been put forth for the teaching of foreign languages and cultures. These include literacy-oriented approaches, the MLA's espousal of *translingual and transcultural competence*, an accelerating European movement toward a pedagogy of *plurilingualism and pluriculturalism*, and a call to move beyond communicative competence to what Kramsch (2006, 2009) describes as *symbolic competence*. These proposals all entail principles that are not part of the canonical communicative language teaching framework that serves as the foundation for language teaching methods courses in many American universities. This chapter will briefly review these new proposed goals for language education, will identify implications for the preparation of graduate student instructors, and will offer a few practical examples of how some of the identified areas are being addressed at the University of California at Berkeley.

The goals embodied in the *Standards* (ACTFL, 1996) moved us beyond traditional approaches that teach *about* languages/cultures to approaches that develop learners' *awareness* of how language and culture interact in communities, that engage learners in making *comparisons*, and that help them make *connections* to other disciplines. The emphasis in the *Standards* is on communication not only in an interpersonal sense, but also communication in *acts of interpretation*, and in monologic *presentational* modes. The *Standards* enlarged the traditional goals of teaching grammar and vocabulary to include sociolinguistic and cultural dimensions of language use. According to the *Standards*, communication is all about "knowing how, when, and why, to say what to whom" (ACTFL, 1996, p. 11).

All four of the conceptual approaches discussed below put into question the idea that we can ever establish a "how, when, and why to say what to whom" in any absolute or *a priori* sense. In today's globalized society, with its dynamic flows of people, capital, media, and cultural influence, the stability of norms can no longer be taken for granted. But most importantly, the complex social, cultural, and material contexts in which our learners will use language have become impossible to fully anticipate in all their variety.

Literacy-Based Language Teaching

Building on work in social semiotics, sociolinguistics, and discourse analysis over the past 30 years, the New London Group (1996) proposed a vision of “multiliteracies” education whose goal was to prepare learners to custom tailor their interpretations, expressions, and negotiations of meaning to various contexts. A key concept in the New London Group’s manifesto is *design of meaning*, which is about the use of existing resources together with creative monitoring of activity that allows people to redesign their activities in the very act of performing them—all within “complex systems of people, environments, technology, beliefs, and texts” (p. 73).

In the context of foreign language education, the concept of multiliteracies has been adapted by Byrnes (2005; Byrnes & Kord, 2002; Byrnes, Maxim, & Norris, 2010; Byrnes & Sprang, 2004), Kern (2000, 2004; Kern & Schultz, 2005), and Swaffar and Arens (2005), among others. A general goal of literacy-based language teaching is to reconcile communicative language teaching, with its emphasis on face-to-face verbal interaction, with the development of learners’ ability to read, discuss, think, and write critically about texts. Accordingly, literacy-based teaching focuses on language use in social contexts, but integrates critical reflection about how discourse is constructed, how it is used toward various social ends, and how it relates to the culture(s) that gave rise to it.

Literacy is of course always linked to technologies of text, and with the advent of consumer multimedia tools, texts now increasingly involve images, color, animation, and sound, presenting diverse combinatory ways of making meaning. Literacy in electronic environments introduces the need for new kinds of critical thinking, focused, for example, on the biases inherent in the structural characteristics of a given medium (e.g., Web pages, PowerPoint). Literacy-based language teaching thus has a rhetorical aim to sensitize students to the various logics at play in texts and to help them see how these logics affect meaning (Kress, 2003).

The New London Group (1996) proposed four curricular components to guide the development of teaching activities, which were subsequently adapted for foreign language teaching (Kern, 2000): *situated practice*, *overt instruction*, *critical framing*, and *transformed practice*.¹

- *Situated practice* is immersion in language use, with a focus on communicating in the “here and now” about students’ own lives and experiences.
- *Overt instruction* involves developing concepts and a metalanguage to allow the various elements that contribute to the meaning of a text to be identified, talked about, and learned explicitly.
- *Critical framing* has to do with the analytical dimension of literacy. Whereas situated practice focuses on the immediate “here and now,” critical framing involves stepping back and looking at the “then and there” of communication. It draws on the metalanguage developed through overt instruction to direct learners’ conscious attention to relationships among elements within the linguistic system as well as relationships between language use and social contexts and larger institutional and societal contexts.

- *Transformed practice* involves what Kress (2003) calls transformation and transduction. In Kress's terms, *transformation* involves reshaping the forms and structures within a single mode (e.g., speech, writing, video) whereas *transduction* involves changing the form of representation across modes. In concrete terms, this means creating new texts on the basis of existing ones, with an explicit awareness of the immediate communicative context as well as the larger sociocultural and political contexts (developed through critical framing).

The idea of a literacy-based curriculum is not to focus just on situated practice in introductory courses and transformed practice in advanced courses, but to provide a balance of all four components throughout *all* levels of the language curriculum.

Translingual/Transcultural Competence

The 2007 MLA Report “Foreign Languages and Higher Education: New Structures for a Changed World” eschews a goal of trying to replicate the competence of monolingual educated native speakers and instead articulates the goal of *translingual and transcultural competence* for university foreign language programs. Translingual and transcultural competence has to do with learners' ability to operate *between* languages, to “reflect on the world and themselves through the lens of another language and culture” (MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages, 2007, p. 4). As in the *Standards*, a key feature of translingual/transcultural competence is the “ability to comprehend and analyze the cultural narratives that appear in every kind of expressive form—from essays, fiction, poetry, drama, journalism, humor, advertising, political rhetoric, and legal documents to performance, visual forms, and music” (p. 4). What is clearly distinct from the *Standards*, however, is the “trans” in translingual and transcultural, which, rather than seeking emulation of native speaker norms of performance, stresses the cultivation of a critical disposition to reflect on differences in meanings, mentalities, and worldviews between the two cultures. While communicating with the Other remains an essential goal, it is integrated with the further wide-ranging goals of “critical language awareness, interpretation and translation, historical and political consciousness, social sensibility, and aesthetic perception” (p. 4). These broad goals require a curriculum that includes elements of history, anthropology, and geography in addition to language and literature. Accordingly, the MLA Report contains a set of recommendations for structural reforms in departments of language and literature, which have sparked considerable debate in the profession (e.g., the *Perspectives* section of the Summer 2008 issue of the *Modern Language Journal*).

Plurilingualism/Pluriculturalism

Another framework that also highlights the need for learners to work between languages and between cultures comes from the plurilingualism/pluriculturalism movement in Europe, crystallized in the 2008 *Précis du plurilinguisme et du pluriculturalisme*, edited by Zarate, Kramersch, and Lévy.² This book brings together the thinking of some 80 language educators from around the world and argues

that language learning and teaching needs to position itself in relation to an *internationalized, globalized* context in which young people are increasingly mobile, growing up with affiliations to a variety of national, supranational, and ethnic cultures. The project developed out of the context of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages project (Council of Europe, 2001).³ The CEFR, developed to provide a common metric for the assessment of language ability for an increasingly mobile European population, adopted an “action-oriented” approach, viewing language learners “primarily as ‘social agents’, i.e., members of society who have tasks (not exclusively language related) to accomplish in a given set of circumstances, in a specific environment and within a particular field of action” (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 9). While this approach is laudable in theory, the practical result of emphasizing communication has been to enshrine the communicative approach, critiqued by some as a return to a retrograde pedagogy that was developed in the societal context of the 1970s and that does not adequately address the complexities of today’s globalized society (Zarate, 2008).

The plurilingualism/pluriculturalism debate validates the CEFR notion of language learners as social actors but it goes much farther in its recognition of a new generation of learners who are routinely exposed to multiple languages, and have varying degrees of *use* of those languages. In this context, languages are seen less as “foreign” and more as “appropriable.” That is, they are viewed as available resources for social engagement, social action, and power that add to one’s social repertoire, and therefore enhance one’s social mobility. A key point is that plurality here does not mean just the parallel *coexistence* of multiple languages, but the *interplay* of complex networks of social activity that result from the interpenetration of values across borders, the dynamic negotiation of cultural identities, and the hidden twists and gaps in meanings “often masked by the shared illusion of successful communication” (Zarate, Lévy, & Kramersch, 2008, p. 15).

A plurilingual/pluricultural pedagogy, like that espoused by the 2007 MLA Report, is highly multidisciplinary, extending beyond psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics to sociological and political issues such as language rights, discrimination, mobility, and cultural diversity. It also explores subjective dimensions of language and discourse, which is at the core of the final theoretical thread we will consider: symbolic competence.

Symbolic Competence

Given Claire Kramersch’s important contributions to both the 2007 MLA Report and the plurilingualism/pluriculturalism project, it is no surprise that her notion of symbolic competence (Kramersch, 2006, 2009; Kramersch & Whiteside, 2007) shares similar social and cultural underpinnings. However, symbolic competence grows most directly out of her work on multilingual subjectivity (2009) and goes much farther in highlighting the significance of the idiosyncratic and psychological inner worlds of individual language learners. She characterizes symbolic competence as not just the ability to understand the value of symbolic forms but also “an ability to draw on the semiotic diversity afforded by multiple languages to reframe ways of seeing familiar events, create alternative realities, and find an appropriate

subject position ‘between languages’” (2009, p. 201). For Kramersch, symbolically competent learners “capitalize on the aesthetic, that is, the formal aspects of language as symbolic system combined with the subjective resonances of these forms in the emotions, memories, and fantasies of their users” (2009, p. 197).

Not surprisingly, literature plays a key role in the teaching of symbolic competence, for it is there that the complexities of communication are often made most plain—when, for example, “characters in novels get trapped by language into situations that offer neither good nor bad solutions, just tragic dilemmas” (2006, p. 251). Kramersch’s point is that by grappling with the symbolic use of language in a foreign literature—seeing how other people and societies represent and construct social identities, social relations, social realities through language—learners can entertain alternative ways of being, belonging, and acting in their own world. In other words, language learning is not just about communicating with other people in day-to-day contexts, but also about experiencing alternative models of knowing, thinking, and valuing that come from an engagement with symbolic (i.e., aesthetic, mythical, historical, political) dimensions of language use. Kramersch (2006) outlines three components of symbolic competence-oriented teaching:

- *Complexifying, not simplifying.* This involves helping students to deal with more than single strands of meaning, leading them to see the interplay of multiple semiotic layers in almost all forms of communication, but perhaps most readily seen in literary texts.
- *Developing tolerance of ambiguity.* The idea here is to explore contradictions, paradoxes, incompatibilities between words and actions, between myths and realities—not in an effort to resolve the gaps but to understand how language affords sufficient slippage to accommodate them, and how this slippage relates to social power.
- *Form as meaning.* If communicative competence emphasizes negotiating linguistic meanings, symbolic competence broadens the scope to look at form/meaning relationships across a wide range of domains (e.g., linguistic, textual, visual, spatial, gestural, auditory, poetic). So it’s not just the “words” but also the emotional resonances of the sounds, shapes, rhythms, and layouts of the foreign language that counts.

Like translingual/transcultural competence, symbolic competence prioritizes alternative ways of seeing, feeling, and understanding things. As Kramersch (2009) points out, it is difficult to directly *teach* this kind of competence as some kind of content; instead it must be *modeled* and then reflected on critically. And there must be acknowledgement of learners’ need to *transgress* the bounds of whatever systematic knowledge is explicitly taught.

Such a stance is not unique to foreign language teaching, but is part of a larger epistemological debate engaging educators in a broad range of fields. Kress, reflecting on current educational trends, summarizes our present transition as follows:

At the moment, our theories come from the era dominated by notions of conventions and competence, whereas we need theories

apt for an era of radical instability. Instead of competence in relation to stable social frames and stable resources for representation, we need the notion of design, which says: In this social and cultural environment, with these demands for communication of these materials, for that audience, with these resources, and given these interests of mine, what is the design that best meets these requirements? Design focuses forward; it assumes that resources are never entirely apt but will need to be transformed in relation to all the contingencies of this environment now and the demands made. (Kress, 2005, p. 20)

This shift in emphasis from *acquisition* to *transformation*, Kress points out, highlights learners' agency in the appropriation, reshaping, and repurposing of social and cultural resources, which would of course include language.

Foreign language departments have been slow to adjust to these new challenges, and given normal institutional inertia combined with the current distraction of severe budget crises, broad departmental change is not likely to come fast. But because we, as language program coordinators and supervisors, are charged with preparing future generations of language teachers, it is incumbent on us to acknowledge these new directions in our teacher education programs without delay.

Implications

Drawing from all of the globalization-inflected goals that have been discussed, below are three objectives that language departments might start with in their efforts to upgrade their teacher education programs. I say language departments, not language program coordinators, because as Byrnes (2001) points out, it takes a department to effect the kinds of changes called for, which amount to a change in ethos.

1. *Broaden young teachers' understanding of what language teaching is all about.* Many graduate students start out with a notion that language teaching is a matter of presenting structures, vocabulary, and cultural information, and then getting students to use all this information in interaction with one another. But their role is much more significant than that. As language teachers, our graduate students are modeling new ways of *thinking and seeing*—new ways of *being and acting* in the world. By engaging their students in new ways of making meaning, they are investing them with the power that goes with mastery of multiple symbolic systems. Correspondingly, graduate student instructors need to view their students not just as learners of grammar and vocabulary and culture, but also as *social actors*, who co-construct their identities, their cultural practices, and their social networks through interaction with other people, including those who speak the language they are studying. In our language programs, we need to shift our orientation from one of treating language as an autonomous system of fixed norms to treating language as a dynamic semiotic resource that people use creatively in combination with other semiotic resources to act and interact in social and imaginative worlds.

2. *Take a less hermetically “monolingual” approach to foreign languages.* Here the goal is thinking in terms of *multicompetence* (Cook, 1996) that is *more* than the sum of individual competences in two or more languages. For teachers in training, this means thinking about the ways that mother tongue, second, third, and additional languages interact with one another in linguistic, cognitive, social, and aesthetic ways. It is also a matter of considering various ways that connections can be made between L1 and L2 pedagogies, and thinking about the positive role that attention to the students’ native language might play in the teaching of the foreign language, including the use of translation and the sociopragmatic and cultural issues it brings to light.

3. *Devote attention to the development of language awareness.* This is partly the traditional matter of getting graduate student instructors to think about how explicit knowledge about language relates to language learning and teaching, and how teachers can approach fostering such knowledge. But it also involves thinking more broadly about relations between language and thought, language and culture, language and identity, language and emotion, language and power. It includes thinking about ways to sensitize students to aesthetic and literary uses of the language, to manipulative uses of the language, and to beliefs and attitudes about the language. With regard to communication, it involves thinking of ways of preparing learners (and our graduate students) to deal with more than the sanitized communication scenarios presented in their textbooks and ways of encouraging their tolerance for real-world cross-cultural conflict, contradictions, and paradoxes. With regard to culture, it is a question of thinking about how to get students to understand the foreign culture not as a reliable set of fixed norms and practices but as a dynamic and contingent set of relationships that gets refracted in new ways with each new contextual frame that one holds up to it.

Without a doubt, an essential condition for improving the quality of language and culture learning in the U.S. is an abundance of well-prepared language teachers in our primary and secondary schools, as well as in higher education. If we are to prepare teachers to deal with the demands of twenty-first century language teaching, we as teacher educators must redefine the scope of teacher development. We must think of ways to prepare teachers not just as language experts who can transmit knowledge about the languages and cultures they teach, but also as translingual and transcultural explorers—inhabitants of third places (Kramsch, 1993), surveyors of symbolic spaces—who can model the kinds of questioning, connection-seeking, hypothesis-testing mindsets that reflect emergent goals for language teaching. This means preparing them not just to teach grammar, vocabulary, formal conventions, and schemata as fixed stock items, but to teach them as variables whose values can shift dynamically in real contexts of language use. This in turn involves modeling for their students how to ask good questions about what they’re learning, how to tease out relationships between language use, communicative contexts, and larger socio-cultural contexts.⁴

Practical Issues

How do we prepare our graduate student instructors to do all this? I do not claim to hold the answers, nor have the language departments at my own university met all the challenges set forth in the earlier portions of this chapter. But I can describe a few steps taken at Berkeley that I think lead in the right direction, and which I offer here in the spirit of encouraging others to share information about parallel efforts on their own campuses.

In terms of broadening graduate students' understanding of what language teaching is about, the most important component, and one that most departments are likely already to have in place, is some form of *apprenticeship* with a mentor teacher. Teachers tend to teach as they themselves were taught. We cannot do anything about graduate students' past classroom experiences, but in our teacher education programs we can provide them with opportunities for focused, critical observation of experienced teachers in a variety of classroom settings, and combine this with postteaching analysis and discussion. In the French Department at Berkeley, beginning instructors regularly observe the Language Program Director's class to see how she manages specific components of teaching, such as presentations, activities, interactions, questions, corrections, and pacing. They continue to observe throughout their first year of teaching, although with steadily decreasing frequency so that by the second semester they only observe lessons in which key new material is being presented. The graduate student instructors discuss their observations in their weekly pedagogy seminar, reflecting on what they observed, what they themselves did in their own class, and what potential alternative paths might have been followed. Other faculty mentors also observe the graduate students' classes and meet with them to help them analyze and interpret classroom events. What is important is that this faculty feedback not just be given during the first semester or two of teaching, but that it continue in some form throughout a graduate student's teaching. In the Berkeley French Department, we do this by means of a Lower Division Visiting Committee, whose membership rotates among the faculty. This serves three purposes. First, it gives graduate students multiple perspectives on their teaching—they get feedback from faculty in literature, linguistics, and cultural studies as well as from their language course supervisors. Second, it fosters ongoing dialogue between students and faculty on teaching, which validates the teaching enterprise and creates a positive departmental ethos. These faculty–student discussions are, I think, among the most efficient and influential “training” practices, and there appears to be corroboration of this point in Brandl's (2000) research. Third, these class visits and follow-up discussions give faculty colleagues who are not otherwise involved in the language program a chance to learn about it through direct observation. This last point is particularly important at times when departmental decisions are made that affect the language program—moments at which the faculty's knowledge of the language program is crucial and should be informed by direct experience rather than impressions based only on hearsay (Allen & Paesani, 2010).

Another essential component, which addresses all three of the objectives mentioned above, is formal training in pedagogy. Methods courses as traditionally

implemented, however, may have more limited value than we think (Brandl, 2000; Tedick & Walker, 1994). One reason is that if they are literally “methods” courses, they tend to survey different strategies and techniques and focus on “what works” in some broad decontextualized sense that may not correspond to the realities of the specific students, program, and goals that the novice teachers are working with. A second reason is that they tend to be too short, often limited to one quarter or one semester (or even less), which is not enough time to provide the ongoing pedagogical support and impetus for pedagogical reflection that are needed to create lasting habits of mind and practice. Teaching assistants’ ability to think through the concepts they are exposed to in a pedagogy course may not develop until well into their second year of teaching (Allen, 2011). The French Department at Berkeley established a four-semester pedagogy course sequence (now trimmed to three in this era of tight budgets), which allows content to be custom tailored to the themes and issues that come up in different points of the two-year lower division language curriculum as well as professional development issues such as creating a teaching portfolio and designing Web pages. However, even with the relative luxury of three semesters, tough decisions have to be made in terms of what to leave out. In any event, a one-shot preteaching orientation, or a one-quarter/semester methods course is simply not enough to provide high-quality support for graduate student instructors. Chairs and deans need to hear this message, especially in light of the current job market, in which quality teaching experience is highly sought after.

Specifically to address the language awareness objective, either through the pedagogy seminar or other courses, graduate student instructors should have some familiarity with pragmatics, discourse analysis, conversational analysis, sociolinguistics, linguistic anthropology, and/or educational linguistics in order to sensitize them to the need of going beyond the teaching of grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation (Schechtman & Koser, 2008). It is not realistic to expect graduate students to take full courses in all these areas, but they can be encouraged or even required to attend lectures on these topics. In pedagogy seminars, these areas can be developed through an experiential approach, requiring learners to observe and analyze language in real contexts of use. Pedagogy (not just methods) courses must of course also deal with ways of teaching various kinds of materials for cultural interpretation at different levels of the curriculum: Films, poetry, popular press, literary texts, songs, music videos, advertisements, and realia all offer rich opportunities to look at how meanings are made with different semiotic resources across different media. Literature courses are of course highly valuable in this regard, as they foster an appreciation of the multiple levels at which texts signify, while familiarizing teachers with some of the most important stories told in the culture. Making explicit bridges between what students do in literature courses and what they do in pedagogy courses is of key importance if graduate student instructors are to be expected to make those kinds of connections for their students.

In terms of the breadth of their teaching experience, graduate student instructors typically only have the opportunity to teach lower division language courses designed and organized by the language coordinator, and they typically

get little or no experience in course or curriculum development. One solution we have developed in our department is to invite advanced graduate students who have taught the full range of lower-division French language classes to design and teach reading and composition courses for freshmen and sophomores, providing them an opportunity to organize a course from scratch around a theme of their choice and to teach French literary works in translation. Another option we have offered is for graduate students to design and teach “special topic” sections of our advanced intermediate course, French 4.⁵ As just one example, consider Gipson’s (2008) French 4 section on folklore and its adaptations in literature, music, and advertising. This course was specifically designed to address the MLA’s goal of translingual/transcultural competence by getting students to examine their own folklore traditions, the cultural assumptions they give rise to, and how those assumptions might influence their readings of French texts.⁶

These opportunities have been extremely well received by our graduate students, who really appreciate the challenge of organizing a semester-long course that will meet a set of standardized objectives but will do so via a path that they themselves have creatively conceived. We also encourage those of our graduate students who are multilingual to teach in other language departments, or to do team-teaching activities with peers in other language departments, in order to get new perspectives on pedagogical issues and new ideas for teaching. Finally, teaching abroad during graduate studies can be a positive experience if it allows students to get firsthand experience with a different educational system, making them all the more aware of the ways in which institutions influence how teaching gets done, and preparing them to make comparisons of educational values across cultures.

The more pedagogical practices can be shared and discussed across departments the richer graduate students’ teaching preparation will be. This brings us to the desirability of having some kind of central unit that can provide pedagogical resources to all language departments and language instructors, including graduate student instructors. At Berkeley, two key units that fulfill this purpose are the Graduate Student Instructor (GSI) Teaching and Resource Center and the Berkeley Language Center. The GSI Teaching and Resource Center provides regular workshops for all graduate student instructors on topics such as creating effective lesson plans, fostering student participation, grading writing, writing course syllabi, and creating a teaching portfolio. The Center also offers grants and teaching awards, and works closely with faculty to assist them in their efforts to mentor and train their graduate students in their teaching.

The Berkeley Language Center (BLC) provides opportunities for language instructors from all departments to learn about new developments in the fields of applied linguistics, language pedagogy, and second language acquisition theory through a lecture series, a workshop series, reading groups, travel grants for conferences, and a library. The BLC also supports research by graduate students and lecturers through its research fellows program, which gives each participant course relief to pursue a research project for a semester in weekly dialogue with BLC staff and other fellows. Some examples of recent projects are a “multivoiced” and multimedia approach to literacy in first-year Turkish that explored what it means to be Turkish

through poetry, film, folk songs, prose, and images (Dickinson, 2009); a student-produced film adaptation of Pushkin's short story "The Queen of Spades" in intermediate Russian that explored how verbal style relates to visual style (Porter, 2009); the design of translingual/transcultural instructional tasks for intermediate-level French (Pries, 2009); and developing lessons to sensitize students to the intimate relationship between register and context in Arabic, and the consequences of using forms in accordance with, or against, social conventions (Vivrette, 2010). This kind of immersive research experience can initiate a lifelong habit of reflection on teaching, and, significantly, it has proven to be very helpful with graduate students' success on the job market, since they can show that they have explored a pedagogical problem in real depth. An important aspect of the interdepartmental role of the BLC is that it does not promote any universal approach to language teaching, and recognizes that each language department has its particular goals and its own unique culture of teaching. One of the most important benefits of such a center is that it creates an intellectual community in which graduate students, lecturers, and professors from a wide variety of departments can regularly come together to discuss and evaluate issues related to language teaching, not just in terms of local institutional priorities, but in terms of national and international trends, controversies, and debates (e.g., the 2007 MLA Report, the teaching of history in foreign language courses, the status of the native speaker). And this dialogue is one in which today's graduate students in languages need to participate.

On the University of California campuses, we also benefit from an overarching system-wide Language Consortium (<http://uccllt.ucdavis.edu/>) which leverages all the resources from the individual campuses to address statewide language learning and teaching issues. This kind of supracampus consortium creates opportunities for graduate students on one campus to come into contact with those on other campuses through Consortium-sponsored conferences, collaborative materials development projects, and collaborative research initiatives, thus further enlarging the professionalization possibilities for graduate students. Some recent examples include workshops on teaching language and culture through film, a joint conference with the East Coast Language Consortium on theoretical and pedagogical perspectives, an international conference on heritage languages, and a conference on world language proficiency in the California context.⁷

Conclusion

In preparing today's and tomorrow's teachers for new goals such as those set forth in the 2007 MLA Report, in literacy-based language teaching, in the plurilingualism/pluriculturalism movement, and in calls for symbolic competence, foreign language teacher education programs need to foster a reflective brand of teaching that is focused not just on the *acquisition* of language (i.e., the internalization of vocabulary, grammar rules, formulaic expressions, genre structures) but also, and crucially, on the *relationships* that connect these aspects of language to the contexts that bring them to life in discourse. This is what I call a relational pedagogy—one focused on linguistic, cognitive, and social relationships,

relationships between form and meaning; relationships between language and culture, relationships between spoken and written communication; relationships between students, between teachers and students, and between students and the various social worlds (face-to-face and virtual) that they engage in. A relational pedagogy may be a tall order, but it is a necessary move if we who teach foreign languages are to remain relevant in today's academy. Our graduate students are eager to pursue such goals, and they are our best hope for effecting widespread change in the profession. I have indicated what I see as a few positive practical steps we have taken in language teacher education at my own university, but I know that many other institutions have made their own significant strides in this area, and my hope is that this volume will serve as a catalyst in generating the broad profession-wide discussion needed for rethinking and reshaping language teacher education in the years ahead.

Endnotes

1. These four curricular components were renamed by New London Group members Cope and Kalantzis (2009) as *Experiencing*, *Conceptualizing*, *Analyzing*, and *Applying*. However, I find the original labels more evocative of the specific goals and tasks envisioned in each curricular component and so have retained them here.
2. The English translation of the *Précis* is in press at the time of the writing of this chapter.
3. The Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) is a widely accepted set of international standards for language competence as well as related knowledge and skills necessary for communication in various situations and domains of communication.
4. See Dubreil (2006) on how computer-assisted language learning environments invite a redefinition of the role of the teacher in the foreign language classroom. Modeling and questioning are two key roles he identifies.
5. Graduate students develop course proposals in consultation with their advisors and submit their proposals to the department chair, who selects several each semester.
6. Sample lessons, geared towards instructors and students with no theoretical background in folklore, are available on the course Web site at http://dcrf-dev3.berkeley.edu/jennifer/?page_id=28
7. A complete list of events sponsored by the University of California Consortium for Language Learning and Teaching can be found at <http://ucclt.ucdavis.edu/events.php>

References

- ACTFL (1996). Standards for foreign language learning: Preparing for the twenty-first century (Executive Summary). Yonkers, NY: ACTFL.
- Allen, H. W. (2011). Embracing literacy-based teaching: A longitudinal study of the conceptual development of novice foreign language teachers. In K. Johnson (Ed.), *Sociocultural research on second language teacher education: Exploring the complexities of professional development* (pp. 86–101). Routledge.

- Allen, H. W., & Paesani, K. (2010). Exploring the possibility of a pedagogy of multi-literacies in introductory foreign language courses. *L2 Journal* 2, 119–142.
- Brandl, K. K. (2000). Foreign language TAs' perceptions of training components: Do we know how they like to be trained? *Modern Language Journal*, 84(3), 355–371.
- Byrnes, H. (2001). Reconsidering graduate students' education as teachers: "It takes a department!" *Modern Language Journal*, 85(4), 512–530.
- Byrnes, H. (2005). Literacy as a framework for advanced language acquisition. *ADFL Bulletin*, 37(1), 11–15.
- Byrnes, H., & Kord, S. (2002). Developing literacy and literary competence: Challenges for foreign language departments. In V. M. Scott & H. Tucker (Eds.), *SLA and the literature classroom: Fostering dialogues* (pp. 35–74). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Byrnes, H., Maxim, H. H., & Norris, J. M. (2010). Realizing advanced foreign language writing development in collegiate education: Curricular design, pedagogy, assessment. *Modern Language Journal*, 94 (Supplement).
- Byrnes, H., & Sprang, K. A. (2004). Fostering advanced L2 literacy: A genre-based, cognitive approach. In H. Byrnes & H. Maxim (Eds.), *Advanced foreign language learning: A challenge to college programs* (pp. 47–85). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Cook, V. (1996). Competence and multi-competence. In G. Brown, K. Malmkjær & J. Williams (Eds.), *Performance and competence in second language acquisition* (pp. 57–69). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (2009). "Multiliteracies": New literacies, new learning. *Pedagogies*, 4(3), 164–195.
- Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Dickinson, K. (2009). Literacy in first-year Turkish: A multivoiced approach. *Berkeley Language Center Newsletter*, 25(1), n.p.
- Dubreil, S. (2006). Gaining perspective on culture through CALL. In N. Arnold & L. Ducate (Eds.), *Calling on CALL: From theory and research to new directions in foreign language teaching* (pp. 237–268). San Marcos, TX: CALICO.
- Gipson, J. (2008). Innovating tradition: Folklore, literature, and translingual and transcultural competence. *Berkeley Language Center Newsletter*, 24(1), 12–14.
- Kern, R. (2000). *Literacy and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kern, R. (2004). Literacy and advanced foreign language learning: Rethinking the curriculum. In H. Byrnes & H. Maxim (Eds.), *Advanced foreign language learning: A challenge to college programs* (pp. 2–18). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Kern, R., & Schultz, J. M. (2005). Beyond orality: Investigating literacy and the literary in second and foreign language instruction. *Modern Language Journal*, 89(3), 381–392.
- Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kramsch, C. (2006). From communicative competence to symbolic competence. *Modern Language Journal*, 90(2), 249–252.
- Kramsch, C. (2009). *The multilingual subject: What foreign language learners say about their experience and why it matters*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kramsch, C., & Whiteside, A. (2007). Three fundamental concepts in second language acquisition and their relevance in multilingual contexts. *Modern Language Journal*, 91(5), 907–922.
- Kress, G. (2003). *Literacy in the new media age*. London: Routledge.
- Kress, G. (2005). Gains and losses: New forms of texts, knowledge, and learning. *Computers and Composition*, 22(1), 5–22.
- MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages. (2007). Foreign languages and higher education: New structures for a changed world. *Profession*, 12, 234–245.

- New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(1), 60–92.
- Porter, J. (2009). Filmmaking and foreign language instruction. *Berkeley Language Center Newsletter*, 24(2), 10–11.
- Pries, D. (2009). Translingual/transcultural competence: An operational approach to the MLA report. *Berkeley Language Center Newsletter*, 24(2), 8–9.
- Schechtman, R. R., & Koser, J. (2008). Foreign languages and higher education: A pragmatic approach to change. *Modern Language Journal*, 92(2), 309–312.
- Swaffar, J., & Arens, K. (2005). *Remapping the foreign language curriculum: An approach through multiple literacies*. New York: Modern Language Association.
- Tedick, D. J., & Walker, C. L. (1994). Second language teacher education: The problems that plague us. *Modern Language Journal*, 78(3), 300–312.
- Vivrette, J. (2010). Cultivating awareness: Register and awareness in first-year Arabic. *Berkeley Language Center Newsletter*. Retrieved from http://blc.berkeley.edu/index.php/blc/post/cultivating_awareness_register_and_context_in_first-year_arabic/
- Zarate, G. (2008). Contrepoint. In G. Zarate, D. Lévy & C. Kramersch (Eds.), *Précis du plurilinguisme et du pluriculturalisme* (pp. 59–62). Paris: Editions des Archives Contemporaines.
- Zarate, G., Lévy, D., & Kramersch, C. (Eds.). (2008). *Précis du plurilinguisme et du pluriculturalisme*. Paris: Editions des Archives Contemporaines.