



**ESRC Researcher Development Initiative (RDI - Round 4)**  
**3 year project in advanced research training, May 2010-April 2013**  
***Researching multilingualism, multilingualism in research practice (RES 046-25-0004)***

***Researching multilingualism: key concepts, methods and issues.***

**5-9 July, 2010, MOSAIC Centre for Research on Multilingualism, University of Birmingham**  
**First five-day residential course**

**SUMMARY OF EVALUATIONS**

(28 completed forms and follow-up comments)

**1. Marketing and publicity.**

Q: How did you hear about the residential course?

- From a friend (2)
- From the MOSAIC website (1)
- Via e-mail (3)
- Via the BAAL mailing list (4)
- From the organisers (5)
- Via a school or department in a British university (e.g. Sheffield, Leeds, Lancaster) (3)
- From a colleague (2)
- Via the UKLEF discussion list (2)
- From a supervisor/former supervisor/mentor (4)
- Via the HERA project (3 participants had just been appointed to a project funded by Humanities in the European Area (HERA) and coordinated from the MOSAIC Centre, University of Birmingham (by Professor Adrian Blackledge) (3)

**2. Positive features** (*organisation and content*)

Q: What were the positive features, in your view?

***(Where points were mentioned by several participants – this is indicated below. Points are also illustrated using a selection of the wordings used by individuals, so as to convey the tenor of the remarks)***

- There was a good balance between different types of activities [mentioned by 15 participants]. *In the words of one participant: “A satisfying mix of sessions and styles/types”.*
- The course was well organised, the timetable was varied, there was good time-keeping [mentioned by 14 participants]. *In the words of three participants: (1.) “It has been a very*

*professionally-guided, well organized course”; (2.) “The work was organised well into manageable chunks”; (3.) “I liked the ‘effective’ timetable”*

- The course was informative and interactive, with high quality input and rich contributions from a variety of speakers [mentioned by 10 participants]. *In the words of four participants: (1.) “They [the speakers] have been extremely stimulating and challenging at the same time”; (2.) “All the input was outstanding – truly”; (3.) “I’ve got a lot of useful hints, ideas and inspiration”; (4.) “Hugely engaging with very rich contributions from all participants”.*
- The sessions that combined input with group-work were particularly valuable. [mentioned by 3 participants]. *In the words of two participants: (1.) “They enabled us to reflect on our own work in productive activity-based ways”; (2.) “Well planned, participatory structure”.*
- The readings and reading list were particularly valuable. [mentioned by 3 participants]. *In the words of two of them: (1.) “The reading list provided was extremely useful”; (2.) “Good background reading”.*
- The data workshops were useful for sharing ideas [mentioned by 5 participants]. *In the words of one participant: “The data sessions were a very big highlight for me”.*
- The poster presentations were also valuable. [mentioned by 1 participant]. *As this participant put it: “The poster presentations and data workshops were very useful”.*
- Participants were quite satisfied with the course. Expectations were fully met or exceeded [mentioned by 20 participants]. *In the words of three participants: (1.) “My expectations have been exceeded. I did not expect the sessions to be relevant to me, nor to be so well targeted and carefully designed. I learnt a lot and felt privileged to have the benefit of knowledge and advice from such experts in the field”; (2.) “My expectations were more than met. It was an inspirational week. The presentations were wonderful”; (3.) “Thanks to the whole team for their willingness to share their experiences and for their openness/transparency. I really appreciate this”.*
- Participants found that the course was relevant to their own work [mentioned by 5 participants]. *In the words of three participants: (1.) “This course is important input in theory and methodology for my study”; (2.) I got some ideas about data I have available. Now I plan to undertake a new research project; (3.) “I am excited about now being able to use my new knowledge in my teaching and research”.*
- The course provided an opportunity for networking [mentioned by 6 participants]. *As two of them put it: (1.) “An excellent opportunity for networking and sharing my work with my peers”; (2.) “Very good networking among the course participants and good atmosphere. There’s been a constant ongoing discussion about multilingual matters among participants from breakfast until late dinners”.*
- The members of staff were very friendly and helpful and there was a welcoming atmosphere [mentioned by 10 participants]. *In the words of 2 participants: (1.) “Staff were extremely accessible and helpful, very generous, welcome human contact”; (2.) “Impressive how quickly the staff knew us by name”.*
- It was a confidence-building experience [mentioned by 3 participants]. *In the words of two of them: (1.) I now feel more confident about what I understand by linguistic ethnography and I am pleased to be involved in this innovative contemporary field; (2.) “I feel more confident about my research approach now and how it fits into existing and developing frameworks. This will help me situate my work better in the field.”*
- It would be useful to take part in future events of this kind [mentioned by 4 participants]. *As two participants put it: (1.) “More data workshops might be organised soon. Please make this*

happen; (2.) “Do plan on keeping in touch with course participants. We will value advice on the ethnographic side”.

3. **Areas for improvement** (organisation and content)

Q: Is there anything that could have been improved?

*(Where points were mentioned by several participants – this is indicated below. Other points were just raised by one person)*

- It would have been useful to have had the programme information further in advance
- Those volunteering data for the data workshops could have been briefed prior to the course about the procedures, format etc.
- More time could have been set aside for each data workshop (e.g. an extra hour) [mentioned by 3 participants]
- More time for discussion would have been welcome [mentioned by 2 participants].
- There could have been more on data analysis [mentioned by 2 participants]
- More time could have been set aside to discuss the readings circulated before the course. [mentioned by 2 participants]
- There could have been some input on theoretical underpinnings.
- Input on different models of Critical Discourse Analysis would have been great.
- The poster session could have come earlier, since it was a way of getting acquainted with each other’s work.
- It would have been useful to have a separate room for the posters to facilitate interaction with the presenters.
- It was not a good idea to schedule a lecture in the last hour of the day. It was difficult to concentrate.
- It might have been good to have some more moving around e.g. activities out on the lawn
- It felt weird to have a course about multilingualism entirely in English...I would have liked to have had some multilingual activities.

4. **Comments received later** (e.g. via e-mail, from two early careers researchers at the University of Luxembourg)

We both very much enjoyed the summer school which continues to inspire us in our work. I am regularly in touch with a bunch of people I met at the summer school and hope to catch up with some of them at Sociolinguistics Symposium 19 in Berlin, later this year.



**ESRC Researcher Development Initiative (RDI - Round 4)**  
**3 year project in advanced research training, May 2010-April 2013**  
***Researching multilingualism, multilingualism in research practice (RES 046-25-0004)***

***Researching multilingualism: key concepts, methods and issues.***

**4-8 April, 2011, MOSAIC Centre for Research on Multilingualism, University of Birmingham**  
**Second five-day residential course**

**SUMMARY OF EVALUATIONS**

(32 completed forms and further comments)

**1. Marketing and publicity.**

Q: How did you hear about the residential course?

- Via e-mail (3)
- Through my supervisor (11)
- Via this ESRC project mailing list (1)
- Via the Linguist List (2)
- From the postgraduate student representative in my university department (1)
- Via the University of Birmingham website (1)
- Via the MOSAIC Centre website (2)
- Via a circular from the School of Education, University of Birmingham (3)
- Via the CHILDES network (1)
- From the organisers (2)
- Via the UKLEF discussion list
- From colleagues
- Via the BAAL mailing list (1)
- From a friend
- From publicity included in the delegates' pack for a previous event (the Master Class by Professor Alastair Pennycook)

**2. Positive features (organisation and content)**

Q: What were the positive features, in your view?

*(Where points were mentioned by several participants – this is indicated below. Points are also illustrated using a selection of the wordings used by individuals, so as to convey the tenor of the remarks)*

- The course was well organised and very informative [mentioned by 9 participants]. *In the words of two participants: (1.) “A really good combination of theoretical input, activities and discussion”; (2.) “A great balance between lectures and group activities”.*
- The positive features of the course included the level of research innovation, the quality of the presentations and the student involvement [mentioned by 23 participants]. *In the words of four of them: (1.) “Outstanding content and teaching. World class experts”; (2.) “The talks were interesting and I liked that they were used as a starting point, not an end”; (3.) “Very useful initial lecture on the foundations and theories surrounding multilingualism”; (4.) “The positive features were the composition of the course, consisting of key areas within the field of multilingualism and ‘hands-on’ tasks related to data analysis (data workshops)”.*
- The data workshops were useful for sharing ideas and considering approaches to data analysis [mentioned by 4 participants]. *In the words of one of them: “The data workshops gave the opportunity to work on real practical issues”.*
- The group work led to productive discussion [mentioned by 4 participants]. *Two of them said the following: (1.) “Group activities were a positive feature giving time to discuss and share”; (2.) “I enjoyed sitting in a group of four people and engaging in group activities”.*
- The poster sessions were also valuable [mentioned by 2 participants], *as noted by this participant: “The poster presentations and data workshops allowed me to learn about other research projects”.*
- Most of the participants found that the course was relevant to their own work [mentioned by 4 participants]. *In the words of two of them: (1.) “The course content covered theoretical and methodological issues relevant to my doctoral project”; (2.) “All this information about ethnography is coming at exactly the right time for me (now preparing the ethnographic case studies in my Ph.D. research)”.*
- The members of staff were friendly, open and helpful and created a welcoming atmosphere [mentioned by 11 participants]. *In the words of three participants: (1.) “I appreciated the great openness of every lecturer to discuss multilingualism linked to their own research projects”; (2.) “One positive feature was being able to share different points of view in a comfortable environment”; (3.) “A great environment to ask questions, whatever our stage of research”.*
- The course provided an opportunity for networking and sharing work with peers [mentioned by 14 participants]. *In the words of two of them: (1.) “This has been an excellent opportunity to meet like-minded researchers and learn together from experienced academics”; (2.) “Listening to people’s work and views from different countries was very enlightening”.*
- There is a need to future events of this kind and a research network [mentioned by 4 participants]. *One participant put this as follows: “Establishing some network for researchers working on multilingualism across contexts is very important – to understand this phenomenon (the marvel of multilingualism) better, we would need to start to relate findings across contexts”.*

### 3. **Areas for improvement** (organisation and content)

Q: Is there anything that could have been improved?

*(Where points were mentioned by several participants – this is indicated below. Other points were just raised by one person)*

- It would have been helpful to have had the programme information further in advance [mentioned by 5 participants].

- More time could have been devoted to the poster presentations [mentioned by 2 participants]
- It would also have been useful to have had the poster presentations on the first day or earlier in the week – either with or instead of the ice-breaker session [mentioned by 4 participants]. *As one participant put it: “At the beginning of the week, very brief presentations could be included in the plenary session using the posters, so that you find out very quickly who is doing what and whose research might be relevant to yours – just a suggestion”*
- There could have been more data workshops.
- The management of some of the data workshops could have been a bit better. *This point was made by just one participant who said: “Dominant voices monopolized and I felt very inhibited by this, though I had a lot to say”.*
- More space should be given to discussion [mentioned by 2 participants].
- More attention could have been given to methods of data analysis [mentioned by 2 participants].
- A session on multilingualism in home domains would have been valuable.
- Something on ethical issues would have been welcome.
- Perhaps a little more on issues not strictly related to language learning or education e.g. translation studies, intercultural communication.
- If available, DVDs of research in action would have given another perspective for discussion.

#### 4. **Further comments** (at the end of the course)

- I have really enjoyed every session
- Super week, perfect!
- I really enjoyed the whole week. Well planned and executed. Enriched my knowledge, my thinking and my network. I was happy to meet the team. I am very inspired by your work. *Merci beaucoup!*



**ESRC Researcher Development Initiative (RDI - Round 4)**  
**3 year project in advanced research training, May 2010-April 2013**  
***Researching multilingualism, multilingualism in research practice (RES 046-25-0004)***

***New times, new mobilities and communicative practices: challenges for  
minority language research***

**2-3 May, 2012, MOSAIC Centre for Research on Multilingualism, University of Birmingham**

Two-day thematic workshop (organised in collaboration with *IAITH: The Welsh Centre for Language Planning*). The workshop included a Master Class by Professor Monica Heller (University of Toronto) on the theme: ***Mobilities, multilingualism and methods***

**SUMMARY OF EVALUATIONS**

(15 completed forms and follow-up comments)

**1. Marketing and publicity**

Q: How did you hear about the workshop and Master Class?

- From the organisers (4)
- At the *New Speakers* conference in Edinburgh (3)
- Via the BAAL mailing list (1)
- From my supervisor/former supervisor (3)
- Via this ESRC project mailing list (1)
- From a colleague (2)
- Via the Language Policy listserv (1)

**2. Positive features (organisation or content)**

Q: What were the positive features, in your view?

- Outstanding presenters, interesting discussions, good mix of researchers, an excellent experience
- Opportunity for discussion in small groups, meeting doctoral researchers doing similar research
- Excellent opportunity for networking
- Presence of Ph.D. students, diversity of presentations
- Opportunity to discuss and learn about new methodologies – have enjoyed the workshop and hope to attend something similar in the future
- World class researchers, small scale event – thank you for an enriching two days
- Very dynamic, friendly environment, great networking opportunity, excellent ideas and debate
- New research products & interesting discussion – as a continuation of the previous workshop, this one is as enlightening, educating and inspiring

- Very welcoming to newcomers, interesting & varied presentations, great question and answer sessions
- Another excellent workshop, a chance to get together and a great range of talks
- Opportunities to speak & work with fellow researchers (junior and experienced)
- So much information, fantastic, a wide diversity of speakers, a great open atmosphere, very approachable & friendly set-up, encouraged discussion
- The many different ‘voices’, the broad variety of contexts & projects involving ethnographic approaches
- A very interesting and informative workshop, innovative and thought-provoking
- The focus on research methodology was most valuable

### **3. Areas for improvement** (e.g. organisation or content)

Q: Is there anything that could have been improved?

*(Where points were mentioned by several participants – this is indicated below. Other points were just raised by one person)*

- More opportunity for group work (5)
- Maybe receiving abstracts, programme and bio-data for participants beforehand (2)
- Inclusion of non-European minority languages (an example or two) & receiving a summary of research at MOSAIC (incl. Ph.D) & possible Ph.D. presentations
- Clearer announcement of schedule/venue changes
- More frequent and shorter breaks
- Smaller rooms for group work – it was difficult to hear/participate
- The Master Class group work did not work well, not enough focus or feedback
- Slightly more time for questions and discussion

### **4. Comments received later** (e.g. via e-mail)

I found the seminar and the Master Class very useful and inspiring. Having so many ‘minority language’ researchers in one place is quite rare (Doctoral researcher from Austria).

Thank you so much for organising and hosting a splendid seminar and Master Class in Birmingham last week. The dialogue between researchers was very valuable. (Member of the Advisory Group).

Many thanks ... for such a stimulating and successful training event last week. I found both days extremely useful and came away from Birmingham feeling inspired and (re)-motivated (Doctoral researcher from Scotland).

It was great to be there – very stimulating indeed and so nicely organized as well (Senior researcher from the USA).

Thank you for a rather stunning and very well organised Master Class. I thoroughly enjoyed it and it gave me much food for thought (Mid-career researcher in the UK)



**ESRC Researcher Development Initiative (RDI - Round 4)**  
**3 year project in advanced research training, May 2010-April 2013**  
**Researching multilingualism, multilingualism in research practice (RES 046-25-0004)**

***Responding to contemporary multilingual realities, recasting research methodologies***

**Final conference**

**25-26 March, 2013, MOSAIC Centre for Research on Multilingualism, University of Birmingham**

## **SUMMARY OF EVALUATIONS**

(38 completed forms and further comments)

### **1. Marketing and publicity.**

Q: How did you hear about the conference?

- From the organisers (11)
- Via the BAAL mailing list (6)
- From the MOSAIC website (8)
- From a colleague (3)
- Via e-mail (2)
- From my supervisor (4)
- Via the UKLEF discussion list (3)
- Via this ESRC project mailing list (4)
- Via a circular from the School of Education, University of Birmingham (2)

### **2. Positive features** (organisation and content)

Q: What were the positive features, in your view?

***(All points were mentioned by more than one participant – as indicated below. The points are also illustrated using a selection of the wordings used by individuals, so as to convey the tenor of the remarks)***

- The presentations were of high quality and intellectually engaging, with a strong focus on methodology [mentioned by 18 participants]. *In the words of three participants:* (1.) “*Stimulating and thought-provoking presentations*”; (2.) “*excellent presentations*”; (3.) “*highly inspiring presentations*”.
- The programme included a broad range of topics and speakers, capturing different aspects of sociolinguistic change [mentioned by 6 participants]. *In the words of two participants:* (1.)

*“The positive features of the conference included the array of scholars from different strands of research on multilingualism”; (2.) “the quality and range of presentations”.*

- There was a good mix of senior researchers, doctoral students and early and mid-career researchers – an inclusive event [mentioned by 3 participants]: In the words of one of them: *“A gathering of creative and well-established academics and of young upcoming graduate students and junior scholars. Clearly a worthwhile and formative experience for the next generation of ‘multilingual’ researchers but also a very stimulating experience for established academics”.*
- The discussion was rich and very stimulating and there was plenty of time for it [mentioned by 15 participants]. *As three participants described it: (1.) “Superb level of discussion”; (2.) “lots of time for discussion”; (3.) “open discussion about the challenges about doing research in multilingual places and spaces”.*
- There was evidence of cutting-edge thinking [mentioned by 4 participants]. *In the words of three of these participants: (1.) “State of the art research and research methods”; (2.) “the conference really accomplished its purpose i.e. to reflect on the way research methodology has changed”; (3.) “as always, new ideas and new epistemologies are apparent in such sessions”.*
- There was a welcome interdisciplinarity – appropriate for the theme of the conference [mentioned by 4 participants]. *In the words of two of them: (1.) “Some interdisciplinarity – good”; (2.) “one positive feature was the multi-disciplinary range of speakers”.*
- The small-scale nature of the event (circa 50 participants) was seen as a positive feature and conducive to more intellectual engagement and dialogue than large-scale events [mentioned by 4 participants]. *Two of them put this as follows: (1.) “Small size means good opportunities to share ideas”; (2.) “right size, enough people, not too many”.*
- The conference provided a good opportunity for learning about research in different contexts [mentioned by 2 participants]. *In the words of one of them: “One positive feature was being able to hear about studies from different contexts and how researchers dealt with methodological issues (e.g. researcher positionality, reflexivity, balance between emic and etic perspectives”.*
- The conference was very well organised [mentioned by 12 participants]. *In the words of two of them: (1.) “Thoughtfully-designed programme”; (2.) “Splendid organisation”.*
- There was a welcoming atmosphere, good hospitality and the venue was pleasant [mentioned by 6 participants]. *In the words of three of them: (1.) “Really welcoming ethos”; (2.) “hospitable gathering”; (3.) “comfortable setting”.*
- It was a valuable two-day experience [mentioned by 2 participants]. *In the words of one of them: “As an early career researcher I found this workshop quite useful. Overall, quite an enriching experience for me”.*

### 3. **Areas for improvement** (organisation and content)

Q: Is there anything that could have been improved?

*In the bullet points below, we have reproduced the words of the participants from the evaluation forms they completed. Each point was made by one person.*

- Plenary sessions might be combined with workshops to allow junior and senior researchers to interact/exchange ideas.
- More time for discussion.
- Digital resources could be made available afterwards.

- It would have been nice to receive handouts of power point presentations...sometimes difficult to take notes quickly enough.
  - A list of participants would have been nice.
  - It would have been helpful to urge discussants to introduce themselves (name, institution)
  - Perhaps there could have been a slot of paper presentations in smaller groups that would prompt more people to engage in discussion
  - Perhaps include discussion in small groups to include the participation of more people
  - Maybe recording the sessions.
  - Many of the sessions could have been a bit longer to facilitate further understanding
4. **Further comments** (open ended question at the end of the evaluation form)

*In the bullet points below, we have reproduced the words of the participants from the evaluation forms they completed. Each point was made by one person.*

- I hope to organize as stimulating an event in my own research centre. Exemplary!
- For me, the academic community can benefit from more of these small scale events – they contribute more to academic thinking than large-scale conferences. I wish the ESRC would fund more of such initiatives.
- Very pleased and honoured to be part of the event.
- Everything was positive, well-organized, focused and absolutely interesting.
- MOSAIC is right at the cutting edge of the field. Excellent multi-faceted research that makes a difference.
- Loved the 2-day intensive event. Fantastic to engage on methodological issues. Need more of this!
- Thanks for the opportunity to participate in such a fascinating conference!
- The atmosphere was very friendly and the conference was really useful and productive. It was almost like a workshop in which the newest methodologies, trends were discussed.
- This has been a very enjoyable academic exercise from which I have gained a lot.
- Thank you for the wonderful conference. The organisation was great
- Thank you very much. I look forward to the next conference.
- Thank you for a great conference.
- A thought-provoking two days
- Hope to attend more workshops of this nature
- Congratulations for the organization and content of the conference

5. **Comments received later** (e.g. via e-mail)

Many thanks for a superb conference (Senior researcher at a British university).

Thank you for all the effort you took to make the two days possible. It was thought-provoking and illuminating in equal measure (ESRC-funded doctoral researcher).

Thank you both for having provided the opportunity to attend the wonderful residential courses you offered at the School of Education as part of the ESRC Researcher Development Initiative project, and the one-day workshop, *Researching language in education in diverse, twenty-first century classrooms* held at the University of Edinburgh last year. The final conference last March was excellent, and sadly it was the end of the project, but I do hope the initiative continues, for the good of

all of us sharing the same research interests in this part of the world. (Senior researcher from a university in Colombia, South America)

I feel very privileged to have taken part in this wonderful intimate gathering of international scholars around multilingualism. It was a fabulous meeting with many opportunities to chat with colleagues informally in addition to taking part in the excellent program of presentations. (Senior researcher from a Canadian university).

Thank you so much for organising the event and inviting me. I really enjoyed it and everyone was so welcoming and hospitable. It was also really stimulating and has given me lots of ideas for teaching and research (Senior scholar at a university in Ireland).

We all thoroughly enjoyed the rich two days of presentations and discussion. The conference was well organised, and the discussion at the end of the sessions was excellent....it was a privilege to be among a group of world class scholars and engage with their research and ideas (Senior researcher at a British university).