



# 4<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Language Documentation & Conservation (ICLDC)

## Evaluation Report

**Jim Yoshioka & Andrea Berez-Kroeker**

University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

The contents of this NetWork were developed under a grant from the Department of Education (CFDA 84.229, P229A140014). However, the contents do not necessarily represent the policy of the Department of Education, and one should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government.

© 2015 Jim Yoshioka <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>

## Overview

The [4th International Conference on Language Documentation and Conservation \(ICLDC\)](http://icldc4.icldc-hawaii.org) (<http://icldc4.icldc-hawaii.org>) was held in Honolulu from February 26-March 1, 2015. The theme of the 4th ICLDC was “Enriching Theory, Practice, & Application,” with the aim to build on the strong momentum created at the previous three ICLDCs (<http://www.icldc-hawaii.org>) and to highlight the need to strengthen the links between language documentation (practice), deep understanding of grammatical structure (theory), and methods for teaching endangered languages (application). Because this popular biennial conference has quickly outgrown the Imin International Conference Center, the venue for ICLDC 4 was changed to the Ala Moana Hotel.

## Conference planning and organization

Conference planning began in the fall of 2013 and was led by the following ICLDC Executive Committee:

Andrea L. Berez, co-Chair (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)  
Victoria Anderson, co-Chair (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)  
Jim Yoshioka, Coordinator (NFLRC, UH Mānoa)

The Executive Committee also received guidance when needed from the ICLDC Advisory Committee:

Kenneth L. Rehg (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)  
Julio Rodriguez (NFLRC, UH Mānoa)  
Lyle Campbell (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)  
Larry Kimura (Hawaiian Studies, UH Hilo)  
Yuko Otsuka (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)  
Nick Thieberger (Linguistics, University of Melbourne)  
Andrew Garrett (Linguistics, UC Berkeley)

The ICLDC is a key part of the training and professional development of graduate students in the Department of Linguistics at UH Mānoa. The ICLDC is organized by a Student Steering Committee that meets with the Executive Committee members in a seminar class “Professional Development in Linguistics” in Fall 2014 and Spring 2015, three hours per week to discuss and carry out the main work of the conference. Students received graduate credit for this experience. For the 4th ICLDC, the 19 Linguistics graduate students who formed the Student Steering Committee were:

Kevin Baetscher (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)  
Anna Belew (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)  
Tobias Bloyd (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)  
Amber Camp (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)  
Brenda Clark (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)  
Meagan Dailey (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)  
John Elliott (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)  
Katie Gao (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)  
Melissa Gibson (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)  
Bryn Hauk (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)  
Raina Heaton (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)  
Ryan Henke (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)  
Kavon Hooshlar (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)  
Catherine Lee (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)  
Samantha Rarrick (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)  
Bradley Rentz (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)  
Nik Toler (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)  
Sarah Uno (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)  
Bonnie Windham (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)

We again took advantage of the social media sites Facebook and Twitter to keep in touch with interested attendees. Our Facebook page ([www.facebook.com/icldc](http://www.facebook.com/icldc)) and the Twitter account ([www.twitter.com/ICLDC\\_HI](http://www.twitter.com/ICLDC_HI)) were launched in October 2011 and have grown to a sizeable audience over the years (3,500+ followers on Facebook, 100+ on Twitter currently). Posts included the calls for proposals, reminders about conferences deadlines (e.g., pre-registration), updates about the conference program, and general news/announcements related to language documentation and conservation. We also used many international, national, and local email listservs to publicize the conference.

## **Sponsors**

The 4<sup>th</sup> ICLDC received generous support from the following agencies and institutions:

National Science Foundation (NSF)  
UH Department of Linguistics  
UH National Foreign Language Resource Center (NFLRC)  
UH College of Languages, Linguistics & Literature (LLL)  
Ka Haka 'Ula O Ke'eliko'ani College of Hawaiian Language (UH Hilo campus)  
Nāwahīokalani'ōpu'u Hawaiian Medium School  
'Aha Pu'ana Leo  
'Imiloa Astronomy Center of Hawai'i

The NSF grant that was awarded to us paid for the following:

- Two plenary addresses by major figures in the field of language documentation and conservation
- A Master Class series of 12 workshops on various topics in linguistics and language documentation at three levels of expertise: beginner, intermediate, advanced
- Four special sessions of 4 talks each, with each session on a particular topic related to pedagogy in language conservation
- Six travel scholarships for students and/or members of endangered language communities.

In addition, NFLRC offered some financial assistance in the form of supplies and materials but chiefly critical technical and organizational support. NFLRC Program Coordinator Jim Yoshioka provided invaluable logistical support for all aspects of conference implementation before, during, and after the event. The UH Department of Linguistics provided the expertise and workforce to run the conference, and LLL provided sponsorship for the team of American/International Sign Language interpreters, who assisted during the conference. Finally, the consortium of UH Hilo-affiliated sponsors organized and hosted the popular post-conference Hilo Field Study on the Big Island of Hawai'i.

## Outcomes

The 4th International Conference on Language Documentation & Conservation (ICLDC) exceeded previous ICLDCs in sheer numbers and ambition. The number of participants increased by 13% from last time, with a record-breaking 455 people attending the conference (up from 439 in 2013). Attendees included university faculty, students, speaker community members, researchers, and independent scholars from 27 countries: Australia, Austria, Canada, China, Colombia, Finland, Germany, Guatemala, India, Italy, Japan, Mexico, The Netherlands, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Korea, Sweden, Switzerland, Taiwan, United Kingdom, USA, Vanuatu, and West Indies.

We received 236 abstract submissions for our regular talks and poster sessions, and 28 abstract submissions for our Special Sessions on Pedagogy in Language Conservation. Our Abstract Review Committee, consisting of 31 recognized international experts in the field, together with UH Linguistics graduate students, anonymously reviewed and accepted 122 paper presentations, resulting in a program with up to six parallel paper sessions, 38 poster presentations, 15 electronic poster presentations, and 16 Special Session presentations. Selected papers are being solicited for the NFLRC-sponsored online journal *Language Documentation & Conservation*, and audio recordings/materials of the

presentations are archived in the University of Hawai'i digital repository ScholarSpace (<http://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/handle/10125/35354>).

## Conference highlights

*The full ICLDC 4 conference program, including schedule and abstracts, can be seen here: <http://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/handle/10125/25404>*

### Pre-conference events

- Pre-Conference Head-Start workshop: Deborah Shuey and Ruth Rouvier conducted a free 5-hour workshop and presentation on Head Start.
- Pre-conference Film Screenings: The evening before the conference, we screened three short films created by ICLDC participants as part of their documentary work. Topics included making Caribou dry meat, a fishing technique from the Guinea coast, and passing down Tahltan traditional knowledge. Approximately 80 people attended.

### Plenary talks

There were two conference plenaries.

- Lenore Grenoble (U Chicago) gave an opening plenary called "The hitchhiker's guide to documentation: communicative practices, cultural competence and proficiency guidelines," which talked about the linguist's role in community-based language documentation.
- Anthony Woodbury (U Texas) spoke about "Verbal artistry: the missing link among language documentation, grammatical theory, and linguistic pedagogy." In this closing plenary talk, he discussed the roles that verbal artistry might play in binding together language documentation, grammatical theory, and linguistic pedagogy.

### Master Classes

In accordance with the conference theme "Enriching Theory, Practice, & Application," the 4th ICLDC featured three afternoons of Master Classes in linguistic topics as they relate to language documentation and conservation.

Master Classes were taught in the following topics by the following experts:

#### *Non-specialist classes:*

- Patricia Shaw (U British Columbia): "What is linguistics? How can it contribute to language documentation and conservation?"
- Kamil Deen and William O'Grady (U of Hawai'i at Mānoa): "Introduction to first- language acquisition for language conservation"
- Theres Grüter (U of Hawai'i at Mānoa): "Introduction to second-language acquisition for language conservation"

*Intermediate-level classes:*

- Andrew Koontz-Garboden (U Manchester): “Elicitation and documentation of verb alignment and argument structure”
- Jürgen Bohnemeyer (U at Buffalo): “Elicitation and documentation of tense and aspect”
- Sarah Cutfield (Australian National University): “Elicitation and documentation of deixis”
- Sun-Ah Jun (UCLA): “Elicitation and documentation of intonation”

*Advanced-level classes:*

- Marianne Mithun (UC Santa Barbara): “Elicitation and documentation of valency-changing constructions and processes”
- Peter Jenks (UC Berkeley): “Elicitation and documentation of definiteness and quantification”
- Lev Michael (UC Berkeley): “Elicitation and documentation of evidentiality”
- Bert Remijsen (U Edinburgh): “Elicitation and documentation of tone”
- Judith Aissen (UC Santa Cruz): “Elicitation and documentation of topic and focus constructions”

## **Special Sessions on Pedagogy in Language Conservation**

The 4th ICLDC featured a series of four Special Sessions on Pedagogy in Language Conservation. Each session contained four talks focused on a theme relating to the notion of pedagogy for endangered language teaching. Special Sessions were selected via a special call for submissions by a specially-chosen panel of experts (Candace Galla, U British Columbia; John Hobson, U Sydney; Nancy Hornberger, U Pennsylvania; Judith Maxwell, Tulane; Richard Schmidt, U Hawai'i Mānoa).

**Special Session A:**

"From Technical to Teachable: Strengthening the Interface Between Documentation, Revitalization, and Teaching"

Organizer: Dylan Herrick (U Oklahoma) & Tracy Hirata-Edds (U Kansas)

1. Dylan Herrick (U Oklahoma): "From technical to teachable: Phonetics and phonology"
2. Tracy Hirata-Edds (U Kansas): "From technical to teachable: Tone and vowel length"
3. Christopher Cox (Yukon Education): "From technical to teachable: Teaching morphology without templates"
4. Olivia Sammons (U Alberta): "From technical to teachable: The role of texts in documentation and pedagogy"

Special Session B:  
"The Teachable and the Learnable: The Role of Linguistics in Endangered Language Pedagogy"

Organizer: Jordan Lachler (U Alberta)

1. Sally Rice & Jordan Lachler (U Alberta): "New school linguistics for practitioners of oral languages"
2. Jordan Lachler & Sally Rice (U Alberta): "Developing metalinguistic competence at CILLDI"
3. Dorothy Thunder (U Alberta): "My Plains Cree (nêhiyawêwin) language classes"
4. Eugene Alexis (Alexis Nakota Sioux Nation): "My Nakota/Stoney (Isga) language classes"

Special Session C:  
"Learner-Centered Pedagogy: Adapting to Dialect Variation, Multilingualism, and Social Dynamics in Endangered Language Education"

Organizer: Haley DeKorne (U Pennsylvania)

1. Haley DeKorne (U Pennsylvania): "Recognizing contextual resources: Post- method approaches to building on learner's communicative repertoires"
2. Janet Chávez Santiago (Research Library Juande Cordova): "Building communicative competence and motivation among diverse learners of Zapotec in Teotitlan del Valle"
3. Mario López Gopar (Universidad Autonoma Benito Juarez de Oaxaca): "Decolonizing pedagogies for Indigenous children: Valuing multiliteracies in classrooms"
4. Kiara Ríos Ríos (Universidad Autonoma Benito Juarez de Oaxaca): "Flexible pedagogical techniques for working with dominant languages, dialect diversity and prejudices in endangered language classrooms"

Special Session D:  
"Language Pedagogy and Practice in Indigenous Australia: Learning Observations from Infancy to Teenhood"

Organizer: Barbara Kelly (U Melbourne)

1. Barbara Kelly & Rachel Nordlinger (U Melbourne): "Acquiring a polysynthetic Australian language: From infancy to school"

2. Gemma Morales, Lauren Gawne & Gillian Wigglesworth (U Melbourne): "Bilingual education in Australian Aboriginal communities: The forty years of the Yirrkala step model"
3. Carmel O'Shannessy (U Michigan): "Informed pedagogy in light of Fishman's five questions"
4. Inge Kral (Australian National U): "Pedagogy or practice? Indigenous youth and language maintenance in out of school settings"

### **Office hours**

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

### **Opening evening reception**

An evening reception provided a wonderful opportunity for the conference participants to network, socialize, and enjoy a live Hawaiian music and hula performance. A special ti leaf lei-making class was offered by the Student Steering Committee during this time as well, which proved to be very popular.

### **Post-conference Hilo Field Study**

Following the very successful field trips in Hilo at the previous ICLDCs, UH Hilo offered another optional field study on Hawaiian language revitalization in Hilo on March 2-3, immediately following the conference. This field study, *He 'Olelo Ola, A Living Hawaiian Language: Look to the Source*, was organized by Nāwahīokalani'ōpu'u Hawaiian Medium School, 'Aha Pūnana Leo, 'Imiloa Astronomy Center of Hawai'i, and Ka Haka 'Ula O Ke'elikōlani College of Hawaiian Language University of Hawai'i at Hilo, Hawai'i.

### **Dissemination**

The ICLDC 4 website can be accessed at <http://icldc4.icldc-hawaii.org/> and provided ICLDC participants with conference logistical and programmatic information.

Audio recordings and PDFs of slideshows/handouts of presentations from ICLDC 4 are available to anyone for free download from ScholarSpace, the UHM digital repository: <http://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/handle/10125/35354>



## Languages discussed at the conference

Ainu, Alekano, Atikamekw, Berber, Blackfoot, Bukhori (Tajik), Buryad, Butchulla, Carolinian, Casiguran Dumagat, Cherokee, Chickasaw, Chimariko, Chini, Choctaw, Chuj (Mayan), Cook Islands Maori, Cosao (Yi), Cree, Creek, Cup'ik, Darkinyung, Dene, Dogon, Dyirbal, Filipino, Greek, Grenada Creole French, Guro, Gwich'in, Haida, Hañ, Hausa, Hawaiian, Hən'qəminəm, Hul'q'umi'num', Ikema (Mikayo), Innu, Japanese, Jejeuo, Judeo-Kashani, Juhuri, Kala, Kalaallisut (Greenlandic), Kanakanavu (Formosan), Kaqchikel, Karuk, Kaska, Koho (Mon-Khmer), Korean, Koyukon, Kumzari, Kunama, Kwak'wala, Lakota, Liq'wala, Lisu, Lokono, Lusoga, Máihiki, Maidu, MalakMalak, Maliseet, Mangarevan, Manx Gaelic, Mapuche, Michif (Algonquian), Mi'gmaq (Algonquian), Mingo, Mixe, Mixtec, Miyako, Mohegan, Mongsen (Ao), Musqueam, Mòòré (Gur), Nabit, Nahuatl, Nakota, Naskapi, Ngoni, Ngunawal, Nisga'a, Northern Pomo, Ojibwe, Okinoerabu, Omagua, Oroha, Passamaquoddy-Maliseet, Penobscot (Algonquian), Plains Cree, Portuguese, Rapa Nui, Saliba, Samoan, Sardinian, Scots, Scottish Gaelic, Secwepemctsin (Shuswap), SENĆOŦEN, Seri, She, Shiwí'ma (Zuni), Shoshoni, *Sign Languages (American Indian, American, Australian, British, Hawai'i, Nigerian, Peruvian, Yolngu)*, Sliammon, Somali, Spanish, Sumi, Tahltan, Tanana, Tetun, Thai, Tiwa, Tlingit, Tohono O'odham, Truku Sediq, Turkmen, Vietnamese, Xaad Kil (Haida), Yami, *Zapotec (Cojonos, Isthmus, Nigromante, Teotitlán del Valle, Yojoji)*

## A summary of ratings and comments from the evaluation form

We collected approximately 143 evaluation forms (out of 455 attendees – 31% return rate) at the end of the conference. Feedback was overwhelmingly positive. As one attendee stated, “Awesome conference – I want to come back. All events were applicable to our community to revitalize our language.” Summaries and sample comments from the different section of the evaluation form are listed below:

### Pre-conference publicity, communication, registration

	strongly disagree	disagree	agree	strongly agree	n/a
<b>Conference publicity was good.</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Conference website was informative and helpful.</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>66</b>	
<b>Response to email was timely.</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Registration fee was reasonable.</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>5</b>

#### Sample comments:

- (Conference publicity was good) from an Australia perspective. Fantastic price.
- Would be good to reach out more to language teachers.
- There possibly needs to be some action to draw more community-based participation. Linguists are becoming dominant.
- Great website. Great schedule layout.
- Communication (email) was excellent.
- Cost for registration as community worker was unaffordable.
- Could make conference fee a little higher for nonstudent/community.
- Could be higher. ↑ for full fee would ↑ cost coverage. (I understand it is a new venue and thus new costs are required).
- Higher than others I attend, but good value.
- Great conference, thank you! Mahalo

Summary: Publicity for the conference was deemed very good overall, though there were some suggestions to cast a wider net during future publicity efforts to bring in more community-based groups and language teachers. The ICLDC 4 website did an excellent job of providing information for conference events and logistics; only a few people complained of technical problems. Email

communications to presenters and attendees via the icldc@hawaii.edu account received the highest rating in this section for their timeliness and helpfulness. Regarding registration fee, the majority felt it was a very good value, but some from community-based organization who had limited sources for travel support or funding found it too expensive. In order to encourage attendees and presenters from developing nations to come, we created a greatly reduced rate for them (\$30). The organizing committee will consider the possibility of offering a reduced community participant rate in the future as well.

## Proposal submission procedures

	strongly disagree	disagree	agree	strongly agree
<b>The online proposal submission system was easy and convenient to use.</b>			<b>34</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>The proposal deadline was reasonable.</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>My proposal was judged in a timely manner.</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>34</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>I was generally satisfied with the proposal submission process.</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>The proposal submission guidelines were clear.</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>46</b>

Sample comments:

- All went as advertised.
- I've never applied to a conference before so I had nothing to compare to – that being said it was super straightforward and easy to do! Also that we were accepted as undergrads was super exciting and unexpected.
- Very fast

Summary: The entire proposal submission process garnered excellent reviews at all stages.

## Conference organization

	poor	fair	good	excellent	n/a		poor	fair	good	excellent	n/a
<b>Registration process</b>	1	3	35	81	1	<b>Transportation</b>	3	12	28	16	53
<b>Conference packet</b>	1	5	50	50		<b>Conference dates</b>	2	8	62	40	1
<b>Helpfulness of staff</b>	1		19	99	1	<b>Conference length</b>		5	57	49	
<b>Tech equipment &amp; support</b>	1	18	41	47	9	<b>Program schedule</b>		9	49	53	
<b>Conference facilities</b>	5	21	48	44		<b>Lodging availability</b>	2	5	49	44	13
<b>Food, Beverage, &amp; Coffee/Tea Service</b>	6	28	59	27	1	<b>Lodging convenience</b>	1	16	32	52	14
						<b>Lodging cost</b>	4	26	44	24	18

### Sample comments:

- Breakfast needed to be left out longer.
- Pity there was no tea/coffee in the afternoon.
- Needed to have tea and coffee available all day and possibly an afternoon tea snack as it was a long day.
- It would be nice to have snacks throughout, as well as green tea offered (rather than just black and herbal – one day it was there, but it ran out quickly). There wasn't enough time at lunch to go get our own food. Either extend the lunch hour or raise costs of conference to include lunch options (and vegetarian).
- Odd setup bottlenecked coffee service, needed more tables to sit and talk. Master Classes at the end of the day made it harder to focus for the two hours.
- Need a better place to congregate like the dining room at UH//Heard comments that people miss the box lunches.
- The food at the reception was great, but it ran out very quickly.

- This was super well organized! I was not impressed with tech issue and plenary talk but in a new venue hiccups are expected. ☺ Food was good but replacement trays were slow to come out, which is problematic when there's a long line (do you wait? do you take only melon?). Transportation was super useful! It made it super convenient to stay on campus. The bus wasn't always on time, which is why it got "good" not "excellent." Venue made axis to amenities super convenient, which was a big bonus! Weird things like hotel staff trying to bring chairs in during the middle of talks and the Ilima room being hidden away in a back hallway (I realize that isn't a full sentence.) Also, more seating outside of sessions (for things like breakfast).
- Should win the best organized big conference award. Easy to read schedule, nice time between sessions.
- 10 minutes between talks is excellent.
- I appreciated the 10 minute breaks between sessions!
- Wi-Fi not convenient across conference venue – this was really annoying. Location good for kama'aina - free parking at mall.
- No green tea on first day (Thursday), but that was addressed. Internet access in the Ala Moana rooms is spotty (not your domain, but still frustrating!)
- Tech equipment and support – mixed. No help at start of my session. No moderator/chair/tech help, and mic wasn't working at start ... solved in about 3 minutes with help from audience.
- Projectors and AV equipment were woefully inadequate in some cases, causing unnecessarily delay in a couple of presentations (including Plenary 1).
- Our session had no chair. The hotel was nice, but expensive. It would have been great to have had more on campus options/availability for lodging.
- Dormitory housing option is great and makes attendance possible for those of us with limited funds. The hotel setting was much less enjoyable than the campus setting.
- I stayed at Hale Manoa – it was great.
- The rooms were roomier than at UH, but I miss the space for lingering and socializing. Thanks for everything!!!
- I love the new location. Close to the beach – makes it easier to see what you want to see while still attending conference. Also the organization was wonderful! Thanks for hosting.

Summary: The conference received excellent ratings for its registration process, the helpfulness of its staff, and general organization (one attendee stated that ICLDC 4 “should win the best organized big conference award”). As with previous ICLDC conference, the scheduling (particularly the 10 minute breaks between sessions) and program continued to received praise.

However, the change of venue from the Imin Center to the Ala Moana Hotel resulted in some dips in ratings regarding food, tech services and support, and lodging options, compared to previous years. At the Imin Center, we offered abundant food and beverages for morning and afternoon breaks, boxed lunch options, and receptions because we were able to pick our own caterers and bring in items from Costco to keep costs down. At the Ala Moana, we had to use hotel catering, which was very expensive. To make our conference budget work, we decided to cut down on morning and afternoon coffee offerings and encourage people to eat in the Ala Moana Shopping Center next door during lunch. It was apparent, however, that our attendees wanted more food and coffee onsite, as well as a bigger social lounge area as before, so we will have to adjust things accordingly in planning for ICLDC 5.

We had difficulty with the hotel's wireless access, particularly in the registration area on the first day (for which the hotel apologized and reduced our wireless fees accordingly). Wireless in the presentation rooms worked, but because there was a different wireless router for each room, people had to continuously switch to a different network in each room to get the strongest signal, which was inconvenient. Most venues (like the Imin Center) have one building-wide internet network to be used, which is a far better procedure. There were also some complaints that tech support and moderators were not present when they were needed, so we will need to either better manage the tech volunteers or have more of them for ICLDC 5 and come up with a better system for reminding moderators of their duties.

Attendees who stayed in on-campus lodging were satisfied with the accommodations and cheap prices, but those staying in the conference hotel had mixed feelings. While they appreciated the convenience of having the lodging and presentations in the same place and the nicer hotel amenities, a number complained about the higher prices. For past ICLDC conferences, we had conference lodging at cheaper hotels (\$109-\$139/night), so the Ala Moana Hotel prices (\$159-\$179/night) were a steep jump especially for those coming to Hawai'i on a budget (students, community members, etc.). Unfortunately, the higher hotel prices came with booking the conference at the Ala Moana Hotel, and we had a room block quota to fulfill. We will try adding other nearby available lodging options next time.

## Conference events

	poor	fair	good	excellent	n/a
<b>Plenary talks</b>	1	2	32	83	1
<b>Master Classes</b>	1	16	35	35	15
<b>Paper sessions</b>		2	47	62	1
<b>Poster sessions</b>	10	11	36	37	19
<b>Electronic poster sessions</b>	4	3	26	19	56
<b>Special sessions</b>		5	29	34	39
<b>Conference Topics</b>			41	66	3
<b>Social events onsite (reception)</b>	2	11	36	50	22
<b>Social events offsite (grad. student mixer)</b>	1	2	16	11	74

### Sample comments:

- Opening plenary was excellent. Reception was a bit too crowded (hard to move around)
- Plenary was excellent! Poster session was cramped.
- The whole conference is great. I enjoyed the master sessions very much. Poster sessions were too crowded (poster/electronic poster). For special sessions and general paper sessions, there should have been a mention about whether the presenter were (1) students, (2) scholars and (3) linguists or (4) community workers as our backgrounds and theoretical assumptions might be different.
- Peter Jenks' master class was very clear and on-topic, being properly targeted to elicitation.
- Master classes on pedagogy would be very useful – Cognitive approaches to L1 and L2 acquisition do not meet education practitioner needs. I highly encourage more interdisciplinarity (applied linguistics, education, language policy and planning etc.)
- While the topics of the master classes were very good, many of them reflected university lectures and lack the extension to how we can document these aspects of language. Very few research methodologies were discussed. Two hour master classes at the end of the day made it difficult to get as much as possible from them. Needed more breaks and/or participatory activities during them.
- I loved the master classes. However, it would be great to have smaller roundtable discussion rooms for dialogue and brainstorming, rather than speaker-podium style. Reception was great – more tables to eat would be good. Graduate student mixer ran out of food before most were able to eat. But lovely spot, and great way to see that neighborhood. I think one of the plenaries should be about Hawaii, less theoretical, more

inspirational about tangible community-based revitalization or conservation. Especially the closing plenary.

- It would be nice to have more aboriginal speakers/linguists. It would be nice to have more poster sessions.
- Some paper sessions were excellent, some paper sessions were just okay or not as widely applicable.
- Technical hiccups mentioned above. Talks themselves were good, organized well. I really enjoyed the conference events that I attended!
- Space for poster session was way too small, very hard for people to move around and view posters.
- The venue for the poster sessions was horrible. Posters should have been in a comfortable area where visitors could study each one and interact comfortably with the presenter. Having everything squeezed into a dark corner made for difficult interactions and sparse ability of people to examine the work. Similarly, the electronic posters had too many people in too small a space, with too short a time (firm cut-off to clear the room, rather than allowing interesting discussions to reach a natural conclusion), and the timing was too easy to confuse with lunch for people who were not presenting. The reception had too little food for all the guests, cleared away too quickly – it felt like a formality, rather than a real chance to mix. Paper sessions were well organized and kept remarkable on time.
- Not enough room for interaction during poster sessions. Next time please consider using a room for the poster session.
- Poster sessions were very cramped. Is it possible to set them up in one of the bigger rooms? Also, having a light reception with posters encourages broader participation.
- Reception was great! Pupus and entertainment for reception were FANTASTIC. Would like more extensive pupus for grad mixer because this time it was very much at dinner time. Thought hands-on lei making went over fabulously (thanks Eve and Sarah!). And it was nice it was less structured and more flexible after a long day of structure.
- The ti-leaf lei making event was excellent and such a nice surprise. The master class offerings were really useful, though some were a bit too much of a lit review or attempted to be comprehensive, but it couldn't fit easily in two hours. Practical tools and tips in the master classes were very useful.
- For the grad student mixer was nice, but only a small portion of grad students got to have any appetizers before they ran out, so some of us had to choose to eat there or get food elsewhere and come back. It was nice to visit Chinatown area though. The Thursday reception was excellent, but a little crowded and stuffy being indoors. Anyways, I enjoyed the events quite a bit.
- Attended MC 2 and MC 10. Please list food ingredients, very important for all vegetarian, vegans and people with food intolerance.
- Amazing program. I am very impressed! Thanks for the opportunity to meet such great, like-minded people.

Summary: The plenary talks, paper presentations, and the topics covered at the conference received the highest ratings. The Special Sessions were also well received. The Master Classes received much appreciation and very good ratings overall for the content they covered, but a number of attendees commented that there was a need for greater discussion of methodological issues and practical



applications (pedagogy) and for a more interactive approach in delivery, rather than the standard lecture pattern that a number fell into. If we do Master Classes again for ICLDC 5, we will schedule them in the morning instead of the afternoon to avoid conference burnout. We like the suggestion of roundtable sessions to provide more opportunities for linguistics and community members to meet on mutual topics of interest, “talk story,” and share resources and ideas, which will likely be a new key feature of ICLDC 5.

The biggest problem area was with the facilities for the poster and electronic poster sessions. Quite rightly so, attendees complained that the poster space was too small, too cramped, not well lit, did not allow easy flow between posters, and limited space for interaction. The hotel had recommended the area for posters, but we did not realize that the poster board spacing was going to be a problem until Thursday morning when the poster boards were set up and we saw the limited space. To make things easier for the poster sessions on the following day, we modified the space for the adjacent registration desk and spaced out the posters more, so conditions were not quite so bad on the second day. Next time, we will have a larger dedicated space for the poster sessions and likely have fewer concurrent poster sessions spread out across more days. The electronic poster sessions, although in a larger room, also did not provide a space that was easy to move around in or conducive to interaction. We will need to re-think spacing and timing here as well.

Our social events received high marks. The Thursday reception food and entertainment were praised, although we underestimated the size of the room we would need and the number of guests who would stay for the Thursday evening event. Next time it should be in a full ballroom rather than a half. The ti leaf lei-making lesson, which was conceived, prepared, and conducted by members of the Student Steering Committee, was very popular and a highlight for many during the conference. The Graduate Student Mixer was a fun occasion in a fun setting, although the food we had budgeted for ran out quickly.

All in all, attendees were generally very satisfied with the conference as a whole, which was echoed (along with some good suggestions) in the open-ended questions from the evaluation form that follow. In particular, they appreciated the opportunities for networking and sharing ideas, resources, and common goals and commented on the need for inclusion of more indigenous perspectives and alternate forms of interaction.

## 1. Which aspects of the conference did you find most useful and/or enjoyable? Why?

Sample comments:

- going to the session that apply to me and my community
- inspiration for my work; feeling supported that others do the same work
- Networking (seeing old friends); variety of languages and topics
- Engaging and relevant content.
- Learning new things in known/familiar areas and in unknown areas. Fantastic mix.
- Interaction and participation by cross-generation attendants, graduate students to established scholars and elders.
- Sharing/presentation by natives were useful. Their comments were highly appreciated. Different strategies of revitalization presented/proposed by scholars/practitioners were useful as well.
- That all the venues were in one area-easy to find; great place for interaction
- Diverse participants. Generally good quality presentation. Sufficient question/interaction time.
- Loved the opening plenary (closing hasn't taken place yet). Master classes (particularly Marianne Mithun's) were great.
- The plenary and the paper sessions – informative, inspiring.
- I enjoyed listening to all of the presentations I attended. I always love listening to the plenary sessions because they are so inspirational. Would love to hear someone from your own aboriginal people too. Chief, linguist etc.
- I like inclusion of master classes – it is not common in linguistic conferences and was great addition.
- Master classes—content not offered at my university
- I found the master classes to be the most rewarding part of the conference overall. It was nice to leave them and feel like I was ready to carry out a research plan (especially Sarah Cutfield's one on demonstratives!).
- Master classes were incredible. Networking and visiting with colleagues and making new contacts and acquaintances was invaluable.
- Master classes were all wonderful. It was interesting people were using them as a forum to get feedback on their own descriptive problems, which was very useful.
- Paper sessions – liked that special sessions carried a theme throughout the day.
- I really enjoyed the special sessions because they offered looks at multiple aspects/parts of a larger area of endangered language work. Also proximity to beach allowed me to enjoy both conference and location and not feel like I was missing out on either!
- the paper sessions and well-executed time management.
- As a non-linguist I appreciate the inclusion of presentations and posters that included STEM-curriculum or pedagogy. I walk away with great tools and ideas that will improve my projects and grant write-up opportunities.
- Paper/poster sessions. Great content! Wonderful to see all the research that is being done!
- I appreciate the generous 10 minute break between sessions. This not only made it easy to move between sessions but also facilitated interactions/meeting/networking.
- E-posters are wonderful.

- Great program booklet. Great helpers.
- The volunteers were very helpful. I particularly enjoyed being able to attend the Master Classes to get more background in certain areas, and practical tools for documenting them in the field.
- Proximity to shopping center and beach and food court. The lei making workshop during the reception.
- All – master classes especially. Music and dance at reception were great! And lei making.
- The talks! The people! The whole package.
- The plenaries were excellent; special session presentations brilliant. The space between talks was great to have. The reception was simple but good. The master classes were embedded in the program – like this format.
- Everything! As a first-time attendee to this conference, I was like a kid in the candy shop, running from session to session.

## 2. Were you able to attend all parts of the conference that you wanted to?

Sample comments:

- Yes (63)
- Mostly (8)– often I wanted to attend sessions in the same timeslot. Good problem to have. ☺
- Almost (3). Sometimes, there were more than one paper at same time.
- Sometimes – it was hard to decide which master class to attend (because they all looked interesting).
- No (but only because there were so many great papers!) (16)
- No. Unfortunately my work schedule precluded some sessions on Thursday and Friday. (3)
- No. One session on “technology (apps),” space was too small and I could not get into the room. I was very disappointed. (2)
- No – Poster sessions were too short.
- No, I really wanted to attend the electronic poster sessions, but it was scheduled for the same time as my poster session. This was especially unfortunate since so many of the electronic posters in the Friday session were on themes that were relevant to the themes of the Friday paper poster sessions, so none of the poster presenters (e or paper) could see each other’s presentations. (3)
- Ran out of energy for master classes - maybe have some in the mornings?

## 3. What would you like to see included or changed at future ICLDC conferences?

Sample comments:

- Special tracks, clear identification of audience for paper sessions. There are themes, like tech that exist but it is not clear at first. Need more native field research. Too little native work, too much tech babble. Include an optional linguistic science ‘primer’ session that introduces basic concepts and terminology for we native community researchers/workers. This will allow us to ask relevant questions to exploit the knowledge base of the researcher.

- More food available, coffee and tea. Schedule should also include title of presentations.
- I would like a re-cap and announcement email at the end of each day, as the conference gets longer. Informal closing reception would be nice to make sure and connect with new/old friends in parting.
- Master classes-at end of day 2 hours was too much, even with a break. Those I attended were minimally interactive and with jet lag it was too easy to doze. Perhaps more workshoppy topics where participants can get hands-on practice. The interdisciplinary ones at ICLDC3 were more engaging.
- More space and time for posters and e-posters. More special interest group meetings. Show a film like “Language Matters”.
- Put the electronic poster session at a time that it does not coincide with the paper poster session. For example, there were no poster session scheduled for Saturday, so why put two at the same time on Friday?
- Indigenous: As a Native American interested in indigenous language revitalization, it was disappointing to see mainly “old, white men” talking about us. It would be nice to see more indigenous representatives of their language efforts. To accomplish this, there would need to be more outreach and also financial help. 4) Transparency: Add subtitles as a categorization, of the papers, i.e., “documentation,” “theory,” “pedagogy,”... That would make it easier to decide which presentation fits better to the interests. Cut out “linguistese”! Add more practical application! What we need right now is more of how to efficiently teach the language and less of theoretical linguistic models!
- Indigenous forum — organized as the various indigenous peoples choose. Others attend to listen and maybe ask questions if appropriate. Indigenous plenarists/daily plenaries.
- Increase representation of indigenous researchers.
- Circle settings for discussions. Natives don’t do well at desks; we do better when woven into presentation.
- Younger generation on their thoughts of learning their traditional language. Their perspectives as a community learner and what they thought about why and how this is important as part of their journey and how this completes their identity.
- I really appreciated the fact that ICLDC has responded to requests to include more revival-oriented content and revival pedagogy in particular. Mahalo!
- I can’t think of anything new to add. Please keep the master classes – those are wonderful. Special sessions were excellent too.
- More African language documentation and conservation topics.
- Microphones for questions from the audience so that everyone can hear and the presenter can stay in situ. Doors were noisy during the presentations when they’re opened and closed.
- Add another social event.
- Included lunches, perhaps affordable bento/box lunch for purchase on site.
- Names on name tags larger!
- Hearing more indigenous language – more acknowledgment of territories. Thank you for putting on this conference – so useful! So needed!
- Keep up the amazing work!
- Don’t change a thing! ☺ ♥

**4. For previous attendees of ICLDC: In 2013 we “outgrew” our original venue at the Imin Conference Center, and we chose to move to a bigger location rather than limiting registration. How would you compare this year’s venue to the previous one? How well do you feel our new venue accommodated our growth in attendance?**

*In favor of the Imin Center (better presentation and social space, charm, limit registration)*

- I preferred the East-West center
- I like the old venue better.
- I greatly preferred the campus venue, both in terms of presentation space and social interaction spaces. I missed the involvement of student groups performing music and dance that occurred in previous years. The hotel venue did not see much more convenient in terms of restaurant/quick lunch options.
- Ala Moana is bland and confining. I feel like I am attending a medical technology conference in Cincinnati. PLEASE move back to Imin and consider limiting attendance.
- I found it disappointing. Delegates drifted into Ala Moana Center or back to their rooms defeating the purpose of the move to gain space. That, the spaces, and being in a guest transit way was antagonistic to social interaction. I would favor a ceiling on registration/attendees if it would allow a return to the Imin Center. Sending folks into Ala Moana Center for lunch was always likely to see delegates go missing...
- Poster session was very crowded and poorly lit. Hibiscus 1 had a generator running most of the time, which was distracting; all rooms had very squeaky doors and chairs, which made the large amount of latecomers to each talked very distracting too. Some presentation rooms were very large and some quite cramped.
- Big step down.
- Food, registration, posters cramped in a small space. Evening reception room too small. Ballroom space too large for paper lectures.
- The new venue, while allowing for more participants, many aspects of it took away from the informal networking and sharing times. The lack of tables in most meeting rooms made effective note taking difficult.
- Prefer Imin. Some rooms were very noisy, esp. Hibiscus 1, with ratting and hum. Difficult to hear. Need microphones for question time. Prefer tables to facilitate taking notes.
- I greatly prefer the venue last year. The plenary talk room only seemed slightly larger than in Imin Center; the poster sessions and reception had less room this year. One draw of this conference for grad students and community linguists in particular with the cheap and convenient lodging on campus. This was much more inconvenient this year. Most importantly, I thought the university setting last year captured the spirit of the conference better – the hotel seems very corporate/touristy and is more away from nature. I understand the need to accommodate a larger audience but I prefer a different venue if possible.

*In favor of the Ala Moana Hotel (location, convenience, facilitated conference growth)*

- Worked out very well! It's nice to have lodging and conference in the same place.
- 2011 conference at UH versus 2015 conference at Ala Moana – the rooms for break-up sessions are very accessible here (at Ala Moana) all on the same floor! Thanks a lot!
- Good location. Nice to have the beach and mall close by.
- It was great!! Closer to the beach too!
- Better place. I liked it very much.
- I like the new location. Diversity of audience is a strength. Please: LARGER PRINT on namebadges! Ask hotel to supply green tea. ☺
- I really like that the conference was in the same building as my hotel room so that I did not have to carry a lot of stuff with me all day (e.g., clothing layers, hat for outdoors, sunscreen, sunglasses, etc.) A map showing the different venue rooms should be added to the program next time or it could be posted or hung in the foyer.
- Staying at the hotel, everything was very convenient this year.
- Location this year is much more convenient for me. Though I thought poster session area was too small – should be more spacious. Also, the doors of the presentation rooms make loud clicking noise when people go in/out during presentations.
- Excellent venue — very convenient. Only complaints – often too cold, not enough space for posters, update info for visitors for meeting off-campus. Great job! Congratulations to all. Excellent student support.
- It was good—easier to move around—all rooms were close to each other. It was convenient to be located close to the mall.
- The food/beverage options were great – although it took us away from the venue a lot, I actually enjoyed getting to choose what I ate. It's also nice to be near the beach! It's a bit of a shame student accommodation is so far away – but I understand it's beyond control.
- Excellent. I loved U of H and Lincoln Hall etc. but this has been really good. The chats in the lift, foyer, cafe have been a welcome surprise.
- I thought it was a surprisingly good venue.
- Overall it was very smooth for the 1<sup>st</sup> time in a new venue. Thanks!
- I am a first-time participant. Conference program was well organized and easy to use!! Mahalo for a great conference!
- For presentations and plenaries, yes; for posters, no. But overall a great job to all of you and thanks!
- I believe the new location positively facilitated the growth. The plan to make presentations available via institutional depository will invigorate further research.

*Mixed reaction / Each has their own value:*

- #F.A.N.C.Y. It accommodated the growth but felt less intimate ☹ an unavoidable growing pain. I think it all seemed more formal.
- It accommodated the growth, but there were too many distractions.
- I miss the intimate atmosphere and convenience for faculty of the Imin Center (as I can easily go back-and-forth between office/class and the conference). But this venue is big enough to accommodate more – increasing attendees, good facility. Thank you for your hard work! This was a very well organized, successful conference.

- More space at the hotel was great, but I missed the feel of being on campus. This time felt much more like an LSA conference. Thanks so much for a wonderful conference!
- I prefer the vibe of the old venue. I also thought that this venue had some acoustic difficulties. It was hard to hear audience questions even in the smaller rooms. It's those noisy chairs. But it all still worked well and this venue is nice too.
- I honestly didn't think the poster session could be more crowded than last year. I was wrong. Could the posters be put around the edges of the ballrooms and other large rooms? I horribly miss the open room with long tables at UH for lunch was served and it was natural to meet people, hang out during break times or when skipping sessions. It was great for networking and provided a central place, a "dorm" or "hostel" feel. Was good to see the tables that took the place of the poster boards on Saturday. Wish it had been that way from Thursday. Size-wise and comfort-wise the hotel was great! But it did not stimulate the same quality of social interactions.
- It seemed like it accommodated the number of attendees well. The other venue was somehow cozier though.
- In general, the new venue is very nice and conveniently located. However, something I miss from the old venue is how many of our events were outdoors. It made it easier to stay awake during long conference hours when I was making contact with the breeze. This is especially the case with the reception, which I liked more at the old venue (where it was outside and less formal in general since we largely sat on the ground and weren't confined to tables). Of course, the reception we had this year was great, too – the entertainment was awesome, the food delicious and plentiful, and the company great, so I am expressing a preference only. I really appreciated the increased efforts this year to have non-disposable dishware used. I often find conferences stressful because I'm basically forced to create a trail of garbage (and compromising my moral values) and going hungry or thirsty. Thank you! Any increased emphasis on this is very appreciated ☺
- I really liked the Imin venue – but I understand the need for bigger space. The second floor of the Ala Moana hotel was fine – only a few talks I attended were too packed, so I think this was a good space. Poster session space was inadequate. Bigger space needed.
- Almost everything was okay. But I missed the big room we had before where registration was situated, and breakfasts and coffees, because there were tables where we could sit to eat. It was a very good means to encounter new persons and chat. Here, without real coffee breaks and lunches together, it is less convenient to meet other people. Days are long, with master classes, and no breaks. It may not be possible to do differently, because of the number of papers, but it is exhausting. Thanks for everything. I really enjoyed the conference.
- Fine. I like both.

We will take these ratings, comments, and suggestions under advisement for planning the theme, venue, and so forth for ICLDC 5 in 2017.

For a full listing of all ICLDC 4 evaluation form data, please contact us at [nflrc@hawaii.edu](mailto:nflrc@hawaii.edu)