Happy New Year to all of you! I’d first like to suggest that it’s not too late to make a New Year’s resolution—resolve to make MITESOL an important part of your 2003. This is your professional organization, and as in so many areas, what you get out of it is directly in proportion to what you put into it. Active members interact with other ESL professionals, develop important friendships, reap the benefits of a statewide support network, gain a political voice, and feel a sense of pride and belonging. There are many ways you can become more involved, so resolve to get started now by taking just one small step.

Resolve that this year you will volunteer to help in just a small way. For the next conference you could:

• man the registration or membership tables

(Continued on p.6)

"Use It or Lose It": Part 2
The Confound of First Language Loss in ESL Children
Christen M. Pearson, PhD Grand Valley State University

In Part 1 of this two-part series (MITESOL Messages, 28(2)), the situation was raised of children who appear to be having difficulty learning English as a second language. In such a situation it is important to determine the source of the problem. If the source involves learning a second language, further support services from the ESL specialist are indicated. However, if an underlying language processing problem is the source, then the child is in need of services from the school speech-language pathologist (SLP). It was noted that a typical way of differentiating second language issues from underlying language processing problems is to assess the child’s first language. Yet, by the time an assessment is made, the first language could have stagnated or undergone attrition, giving the possibility of an erroneous diagnosis of language disorder. That is, characteristics of language loss can mimic features of language impairment.

One way to start disentangling this puzzle is to understand what structures of the language are typically lost early on. With this knowledge base, a team approach

(Continued on p.4)
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From the Co-Editors
by Fabiana Sacchi & Silvia Pessoa

When at the MITESOL 2002 Fall Conference we were offered the position of Co-Editors of MITESOL Messages, we were very excited about it, but we had no idea what we were getting ourselves into! Little did we know that putting together a newsletter would be such a challenging and time-consuming endeavor. Despite the hard work, we are very glad to contribute to MITESOL in this way, and we hope you enjoy this newsletter as much as we enjoyed co-editing it.

This newsletter features Shari Weisbaum’s first President’s Corner where she calls on members to get involved with MITESOL as part of their New Year’s resolutions.

In Use It or Lose It Part 2 Christen Pearson discusses how evaluating a child’s native language development, especially a child’s L1 loss, can help teachers and language specialists understand why the child is having difficulty learning ESL.

If you didn’t go to the 3rd Symposium on Second Language Writing at Purdue University last fall, read Marian Gonsor’s detailed report on it.

As usual, many MITESOLers have kept themselves busy traveling and experiencing teaching overseas. Lisa Morgan had a wonderful experience in Kazakhstan where she gave presentations on ESP, interactive teaching techniques, and using technology in the classroom. Patricia Mathews describes her experience and that of six other Grand Valley State University students doing their practicum in Xi’an, China.

John McLaughlin reports on the University of Michigan’s Migrant Farmworker Outreach and Education Program which was restarted with two grants awarded to the English Language Institute at the beginning of this year. Congratulations John for getting the grants!

February is that time of the year when MITESOLers are getting ready for big TESOL. Check out TESOL at a Glance for presentations from MITESOLers, the MITESOL party in Baltimore, and the third Graduate Student Forum co-organized by Eastern Michigan University. We hope to see you in Baltimore!

On page 14 is a new column: Where TESOL Takes You. This column is meant to give recent TESOL graduates the opportunity to share with MITESOLers their experience teaching overseas. We are opening this column with Jodi Holeton’s experience teaching in Japan.

This newsletter also highlights a book review from the TEIS Newsletter. From an ethnographic perspective, Teaching and Learning in a Multilingual School: Choices, Risks, and Dilemmas offers teaching strategies for educators working with multilingual and multicultural students in English-dominant school settings. Thanks Wendy Wang for sharing this article with MITESOL!

We wouldn’t have been able to complete the challenging task of editing our first newsletter without the help of former newsletter editor Diana Phelps-Soysal who was always very willing to cooperate with us. Thank you Diana for all your support and expertise! We also want to thank the MITESOL Board, especially Immediate Past President Maggie Phillips who was constantly answering our questions and offering great ideas. Thanks Maggie for all the help!

If you would like to contribute to the next MITESOL Messages, the submission deadline is July 14 for the August newsletter. Make yourselves heard!

The Newsletter Editors reserve the right to edit any material submitted for publication to enhance clarity or style. Submissions may also be shortened to fit available space. The author will be consulted if changes are substantial. Potential changes in content will be verified before publication.
My Experience in Kazakhstan
By Lisa Morgan, Aquinas College

In our busy and demanding lives as ESL teachers and teacher educators here in Michigan we are often left with little time to think about anything except the daily needs of our own teaching situations and those of our students. We sometimes forget the immensity of our profession, the huge number of people worldwide who teach English to speakers of other languages. As a participant in the U. S. State Department’s Academic Specialist program, I am fortunate—time has been permitted to consider the implications of our teaching profession in the world with whom we can have common conversations about English teachers’ lives and practices.

Last October I was given such an opportunity when I spent two weeks in Kazakhstan where the U.S. Embassy’s Cultural Affairs Office scheduled presentations for me with thirteen groups of English language professionals in the northeastern city of Ust-Kamenogorsk and the former capitol, Almaty. The sheer number of ELT professionals I met and institutions I visited provided me with a broad overview of ELT in Kazakhstan. English is widely taught and English programs and teaching are popular in both the public and private sectors. Teachers are blessed with small class sizes, a luxury for many in our profession. While in Ust-Kamenogorsk where I gave five consecutive sessions to fifteen English teachers in the Kazakh and American programs at the Kazakh-American Free University (KAFU), I had a chance to get an especially close up view of ELT. To readers interested in the activities of TESOL organization affiliates abroad, I can say unequivocally that the Ust-Kamenogorsk chapter of TESOL is alive and well. The organization’s offices, located in the city’s well-appointed Pushkin Library, is a small but busy place and on a cold Thursday morning, nearly 60 local members eagerly participated in a discussion on the differences between Content-Based Instruction and ESP.

Based on the initial request I received from the English Language Program office in D.C. and subsequent topics requested by seminar participants, I chose to combine the areas of ESP, interactive teaching techniques and the effective use of varying levels of technology for my presentations. The uneven availability of technology seen in most institutions I visited supported my choice of topics. For example, at KAFU I focused on how to best utilize no/low, mid and high-level technologies. Using the chalkboard as an interactive tool in ESP lessons as a topic at the other institutions, I showed how we often overlook the most obvious or reliable of sources. This is not to suggest that we downplay Kazakhstan ELT professionals’ right and access to high tech ELT. Those teachers who are not already proficient in the use of computers as a tool for language learning and teaching are ready and willing to create such learning environments for their students and themselves. At the same time, programs should realistically address the current state of technology in the typical language classroom. This approach prepares for the future yet doesn’t minimize how effective readily available low-tech equipment can be.

A visit, although brief, with our many colleagues in Kazakhstan helped widen my professional horizons and once again made me realize the wide circle of friends every English language teaching professional has in the world.
Use It or Lose It  (Continued from p. 1)

consisting of the regular classroom teacher, the ESL specialist, and the school SLP is more likely to be able to determine what is hindering the child in his/her second language acquisition.

Areas of L1 loss include interlingual, intralingual, and discourse characteristics. Interlingual characteristics are those that occur between the L1 and the L2. For example, code-switching is a normal feature of proficiency across both languages. However, when code-switching occurs that is unrelated to topic choice, listener, or context, it may be an indication of difficulty with one of the languages. Related to this is borrowing L2 words into the L1. A child who uses random English words incorporated within the L1, or switches back and forth between the two languages when talking to a monolingual parent may be showing signs of arrested first language development. Another indication of L1 loss would be the transfer of the L2 syntax (word order) to the L1. For example, in Spanish, adjectives follow nouns, yet in English the reverse is true - adjectives precede nouns. An ESL child whose Spanish L1 is undergoing attrition might transfer English word order to the Spanish, with the result, for example, being grande perro instead of perro grande.

Intralingual characteristics involve features within the L1. One area of intralingual loss involves a reduction of inflectional morphology. Indications of this type of loss might include the collapse of the L1 case system or the verb inflectional system. Concurrent with this type of loss is the incorporation of more rigid word order, especially in languages where the case system indicates grammatical functions.

A second type of intralingual loss involves the regularization of irregular forms. If one was losing English, marking regular past tense on irregular verbs - for example, saying goed for went - might occur. The same situation could occur with plural formation of irregulars, where the procedure for marking plural would generalize to the form typically used for regulars, such as goose becoming gooses instead of geese. This is a pattern frequently seen in early first language acquisition, but in the case of L1 loss, it occurs after the irregular forms have been firmly acquired. That is, the child appears to be reverting back to an earlier stage of language development. A further progression of language loss in verbs would occur when both regular and irregular forms revert to just the base form, that is, no verbal morphology indicating tense is used, though time might be marked lexically (e.g., yesterday we go).

Another area of intralingual characteristics of language loss involves the collapse of the lexicon. Indications include the creation of new words out of necessity, rather than word play. Using general words in place of more specific terms also occurs. An example might be using bugs for the previously known butterfly, mosquito, or firefly. This, again, is a feature of first language acquisition. However, in a child who had already acquired a large, diverse lexicon, it would be an indication of a system reverting back to earlier stages. And, as with the collapse of case and inflectional systems, the collapse of the lexical system can be confused with characteristics of word retrieval difficulties, a language impairment of the lexicon and memory.

In addition, the syntactical system also starts to collapse. More rigid word order was noted above. Further indications of loss include a decrease in complex sentence structure (subordination/embeddings) and an increase in compound sentences - a more basic pattern. For example, instead of saying The dog who is spotted chased the cat, the child might say The dog has spots and the dog chased the cat.

The third area of language loss involves discourse characteristics. These are actually strategies the child uses to deal with the language loss, indicating the child is consciously aware that linguistic skills have been

(Continued on p. 5)
lost. The child might make comments about his/her lack of linguistic knowledge, for example, I forgot how to say... The child might also ask for help: How do you say...? Sometimes children knowingly give wrong answers in hopes of being corrected (i.e., provided with the right answer), a face-saving strategy along the lines of a wrong answer is better than admitting to having lost the ability to answer correctly. Children also avoid certain lexical items or word orders that are no longer known, for example only using active voice rather than previously used passive constructions.

A heavy reliance on nonverbal communication and contextual cues might also be used. These give the appearance of comprehension, but upon further examination it is often found that knowledge of one or two lexical items along with the context were enough to provide understanding. For example, a child told to - Run upstairs, get your red sweater, and bring it down here - might actually carry out this task, supposedly indicating comprehension of a sequence of tasks. In reality, the child might simply understand red sweater and make the correct assumption that it is needed.

Armed with this additional knowledge, we come back to our children from Part I of this article and the multiple factors which might contribute to their slow L2 development. Working with the school SLP, we would not want the child to receive a diagnosis of a language impairment if none existed, just as we would not want the child to be assessed as having a lower IQ, which would result if more traditional measures were used which rely on verbal skills. On the other hand, we would not want to not provide services (additional ESL support and speech-language services) if the child indeed has a language processing problem.

Regarding Sung-Eun (fictional child), we know that she seems to be developing English skills at a slower rate than her peers, yet we also know that in other general ways she appears to be a normal 8 year old. Her nonverbal analytical reasoning ability is in the normal to above-normal range, so cognition should not be a factor. We also know that her L1 development is what would be expected for a child first exposed to English on a regular basis. Since it's been 3 years since English was introduced, we know that her L1 may in fact have been developing normally prior to the introduction of the L2; the other alternative is that she might have a language processing impairment. Referring to the options provided in Part I of this article, it is determined that the next step will involve two parts: an interview with the parents and a further analysis of her L1 capabilities.

If the parents state that Sung-Eun's first language development was similar to her siblings (who do not have any problems in L1 and L2 development) prior to the introduction of English, and if the missing features of her L1 are what we would expect in typical L1 loss, then we might conclude that Sung-Eun may be a shy child, an introvert, and not a risk-taker - a child who needs to be watched, but who might simply need more time to attain the levels of proficiency exhibited by her peers. However, if the parents state that her first language development was slow and/or unusual, or if the features absent in her L1 are not what would be expected in typical language attrition, then we would be concerned that an underlying language impairment might indeed be the reason for her atypically slow L2 development. As her advocate, we would want to work with the school SLP in securing speech-language services for her, along with supporting this therapy in the classroom environment.

As can be seen in the above case, two very different situations could possibly exist, each with very different interventions. Understanding what is involved in first language attrition can often offer the critical piece of information needed in order to differentiate between the two, and thus help us best serve the needs of our students.
• volunteer to help set up or clean up
• organize the raffle
• investigate hotel rooms and rates
• make signs
• format the program
• be responsible for nametags
• collect lunch tickets
• proofread the program
• take charge of session evaluations
• offer to do whatever’s needed for a couple of hours before the big day
• participate in a discussion group
• lead a discussion group
• present a session
• provide transportation

In 2003 you could...

• serve on the nominations committee
• participate in an e-mail discussion
• answer a member’s query
• make a suggestion to a board member
• organize a workshop
• become a SIG leader
• contact your SIG leader to see what’s going on
• write a short newsletter article
• attend a workshop
• help organize a workshop
• be a more active member
• accept a board position

As the 2002 Conference Chair, I was excited and pleased when an e-mail discussion about teaching grammar evolved into a conference session. I’m even more excited that this successful discussion group at the conference appears to be further evolving into a late spring workshop. Both the conference session and the workshop are member generated activities. As this year’s president, I hope to foster additional discussions, workshops, seminars and/or informal small group gatherings which target the specific concerns and interests of the membership. Such activities will only happen if you, the members, take an active role. Please contact me with your ideas, and please offer your energy to make them happen.

The MITESOL Board will continue its practice of not sponsoring any mid-year workshops. Instead we will encourage member initiated activities which respond to a clear need. In addition, we will encourage members to participate in conferences and workshops sponsored by MABE, MwALT, MAFSA and MACAE. Continued collaboration with these organizations should be beneficial to all.

Finally, I resolve to do my best as your president. I promise to be accessible to you, and I ask you to contact me with your ideas, your requests, your needs and your wishes. This is a great organization and a wonderful resource for all of us. Our membership is made up of experts in all areas of ESL and we should be proud to take an active role. Resolve now to be part of it. To paraphrase the popular song, when you have the chance to “sit it out or dance, I hope you’ll dance.”

BOARD TALK

By Ildi Thomas, Secretary

Since I came on board (or on The Board), there have been two meetings, full of energy, excitement and anticipation. At the transition meeting in November of 2002, officers whose terms had expired passed on their wisdom to us newcomers. They clarified job responsibilities and suggested future directions in which MITESOL can serve the membership. Brenda Imber, Exiting Past President, for example emphasized the need for advocacy on behalf of part-time instructors. Maggie Phillips, Past President, pointed to the recent focus on K-12 issues at the Fall 2002 conference and expressed a need for continued growth in this area.

The second meeting was characterized by several short-term and long-range planning issues. Of the immediate priorities, three agenda items centered around the TESOL 2003 Convention. A number of officers of the Advisory and Executive Board will present in Baltimore. To make travel to the conference easier, the Michigan Marckwardt Travel Grant is available each year to one graduate student to pay for conference registration. Finally, again there will be a MITESOL reception, so keep an eye out for an announcement of the time and place. One long-term project for the Board is to revitalize the relationship between MITESOL and
Board Talk (Cont. from p. 6)
other regional organizations for increased mutual benefit.
Being involved with MITESOL and serving on the Board, in however great or small capacity, is a highly rewarding experience. Come and join us at the next meeting; learn about statewide issues, volunteer to stuff envelopes or to design flyers or simply meet fellow ESOL professionals from around the state. Call or e-mail any Board member for the time and place. ♦

Seated from left to right: Margaret Weinzapfel (Memb. Dev. Coordinator), Jennifer Craft (President-Elect), and Maggie Phillips (Past-President).
Standing from left to right: Susan Glowski (Com. Coordinator), Shari Weisbaum (President), Ildi Thomas (Secretary), and Carolyn Fike (Treasurer)

THANK YOU! By Maggie Phillips

MITESOL would like to extend a big, heartfelt THANK YOU to three extraordinary MITESOL volunteers who left their posts in 2002 but not their influence on the organization.

First, Karen Gilbert who ably led as Exhibits Manager for three years and established firm and happy relationships with the many book publishers who are such a draw at MITESOL conferences. She then sat on the Executive Board for two years as Secretary and dutifully picked up MITESOL’s mail for many years.

Diana Phelps-Soysal did a superlative job as Editor of “MITESOL Messages” for three years and six issues and even asked her baby daughter to delay coming until the last issue was sent to the printer.

Finally, Carol Wilson-Duffy managed to begin her stint as MITESOL’s Website Information Manager while teaching in Micronesia. She continued to be our web wizard through moves to Belleville and Lansing. She is still hanging in as the new CALL SIG representative. We’re glad you’re still on board, Carol. ♦

What will Hands-on English do for you??
- bring you copyable, ready-to-use lessons and puzzles;
- inspire you with ideas you can use for adult ESL;
- help you teach multi-level groups or tutor individuals;
- inform you about practical resources for adult students;
- give you a helping hand.

This publication will:
- bring you copyable, ready-to-use ESL activities for adult students—6 times a year!

Subscribe and get copyable, ready-to-use ESL activities for adult students—6 times a year!

Contact us for a free sample issue!
Hands-on English, P.O. Box 256, Crete, NE 68333
1-800-ESL-HAND
samples@handsonenglish.com
Order on our website: www.handsonghlish.com
Subscribe for $29 (1 year=6 issues), back issues $7 each.
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In addition, a Contrastive Rhetoric Roundtable was held on Sunday.

As the conference theme was “Constructing Knowledge: Approaches to Inquiry in Second Language Writing,” many of the presentations focused on research methodology. Several presenters spoke about how an evolving understanding of appropriate research emphases in L2 writing caused them to re-think previous studies in the area. Sarah Hudelson (Arizona State University), for example, spoke of wanting to revise her research on literacy development in Spanish/English bilingual classrooms, published in TESOL Quarterly in 1994. To her original study, she wanted to add such questions as: 1) How do children collaborate with their teachers to become users of English?, 2) How do peers influence language choice?, and 3) What are the linguistic/social/political contexts that influence children’s literacy practices? She wanted to ask the L1 Spanish-speaking children in her study, “What’s it like when you write in English?,” and she wanted to note the loss of Spanish language fluency that paralleled the children’s increasing use of English. Hudelson confessed that she no longer finds “the cognitive/constructivist framework” under which the study was conducted adequate for study of L2 writing.

A similar subject-based research focus was called for by Christine Pearson Casanave (Keio University-Japan), in her session “Uses of Narrative in L2 Writing Research.” “The narrative is the primary means by which humans construct meaning in their experiences,” Casanave declared; therefore, the narrative should be a natural choice for an approach to inquiry. She referred to the recently published Reflections on Multiliterate Lives (Multilingual Matters, 2001) and her own Writing Games: Multicultural Case Studies of Academic Literacy Practices in Higher Education (Erlbaum, 2002) as examples of using this method. In Writing Games, for instance, Casanave draws from case studies of students dealing with the demands of L2 academic writing at Keio University and The Monterey Institute of International Studies.

Other presenters also made a case for narrative as a viable research method. Both symposium co-chair Paul Kei Matsuda (University of New Hampshire) and Dana Ferris (California State University) spoke about their own stories as L2 writing researchers they had contributed to ESL Composition Tales: Reflections on Teaching (University of Michigan Press, 2002), a collection of autobiographical essays written by leading L2 composition researchers. In Matsuda’s talk, “A Story of One’s Own: Historical Inquiry in Second Language Writing,” he also shared research he had compiled while studying the split between composition studies and ESL, when the ESL workshop was dropped from the annual Conference on College Composition and Communication. He passed out a helpful bibliography of “L2 Academic Literacy Auto-biography” and suggestions for incorporating students’ own autobiographies into composition classes. For instance, he recommends that students in first year college composition courses write a 4-5-page literacy autobiography reflecting on their "experience as a writer." Matsuda tells students to “become fully aware of what you do as you write, paying attention to various aspects of your writing experience.” For a second semester college ESL composition class, Matsuda recommends students “write a 3-4-page exploratory essay on writing in your native language and writing in English.” These types of metacognitive assignments concentrate the students’ attention on their own writing, adding personal significance to the act of writing.

Ferris’s talk focused on how she entered the L2 writing field. She related how she managed to complete seven major research projects in ten years and publish her results in several academic journals. For those hoping to publish in the ESL writing research field, Ferris offered “Five Principles for Sustainability.” The first of these is “Pursue the burning question.” In Ferris’s case, the burning question was teacher response to student error. Her persistent excursions into this topic cumulated in publication of her Treatment of Error in Second Language Student Writing (University of Michigan Press, 2002). Her other principles include: 2) "Keep at it.", 3) "You got to want it.", 4) "No whining.", and 5) "Take the long view." She suggests busy educators take advantage of (Continued on p.9)
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vacations and breaks to complete writing tasks. She also advised staying focused on the goal of publishing, even when it means revising/resubmitting a manuscript several times before it is accepted.

Several presentations touched on the issue of identity in second language writing. Ken Hyland (The City University of Hong Kong) spoke about work included in his article, “Authority and Invisibility: Authorial Identity in Academic Writing” (Journal of Pragmatics, 34, 8). In this study, he investigated his observation that L2 writing "students were unable to construct a credible self in academic writing." When he compared a corpus of Hong Kong undergraduate theses with a sampling of published research articles in several disciplines, he discovered that the articles included four times as many uses of the first person pronoun as in the student texts. He concluded "that the individualistic identity implied in the use of I may be problematic for many L2 writers." In addition, he speculated that the results of his survey clearly confirmed the idea that “group membership and experiences shape writing practices.” In other words, not being fully initiated into what Frank Smith (1983) referred to as the “club” of writers, these students feel they simply do not have the authority to use the first person pronoun. Hyland’s research further suggests the error in the claim, often advised in composition text-books, that research writing must be impersonal.

The theme of identity in L2 writing also surfaced in the presentation Richard Haswell (Texas A & M University). He questioned the validity of the traditional ESL composition profile that judges students’ writing on content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. Would it be possible/ permissible, he questioned, to include other important traits in this scale? “What about humor? What about cleverness? What about creativity?” In his study, L1 and L2 writing teachers rated an essay based on ten essay-writing traits. These traits included audience, documentation, inquiry, integration, purpose, situation, sources, structure, surface, and voice. The teachers were asked to rate the essay using a Likert scale that judged each trait as being more or less central to “judging first-year writing accomplishments ... at your university.” Although the essay was written by a Korean ESL college-freshman, the L1 writing teachers were told it was written by an L1 writer. Similarly, the L2 teachers were told the same essay was written by an L2 writer. Haswell found that while surface was deemed the least central to the success of L2 writers, it was near the top of the list for L1 writers. Voice was considered less important as a criteria to judge L2 writing than to judge native language writing. Does our concentration on L2 writers “getting it right,” de-emphasize the one aspect of writing that would let them insert a little of their own individuality into their writing?

At the Contrastive Rhetoric Roundtable, Ulla Connor opened the discussion with a survey of thirty years of research in CR, and her opening address was followed by six more presentations. For information on these presentations, see http://web.ics.purdue.edu/~silvat/symposium/2002/cr.html. Dwight Atkinson’s “TESOL and Culture” (TESOL Quarterly, 33 (4)) and Matsuda’s “Contrastive Rhetoric in Context” (Journal of Second Language Writing, 6 (1)) give wonderful overviews of current thinking on contrastive rhetoric and its importance in the ESL writing classroom.

Obviously, the content of the talks was the major contribution to the success of the symposium, but many other aspects of the conference were just as wonderful. For example, attendees were treated to a bountiful breakfast/snack tables throughout both days and an equally wonderful dinner Friday night. In addition, the Purdue University campus and its facilities provided an excellent environment. Best of all, the informality of the conference offered opportunities that a larger conference could not. By the end of the conference, I had chatted with conference co-chair Tony Silva, lunched with Spanish philologist Rosa Manchón of the University of Murcia, and dined with ESL writing professionals from Georgia, Massachusetts, and several different countries. The experience connected me with the worldwide community of those involved in ESL writing, and made me feel like a member of a very fortunate club. ♦
Teaching in Xi'an, China
By Patricia Mathews, Grand Valley State University

In July 2002, seven graduate students from Grand Valley State University participated in a supervised practicum at Xi'an Foreign Language University (XFLU) in Xi'an, China. As part of a study abroad program, the five-week practicum included three and a half weeks of daily teaching experience and tours of Shaanxi Province, Beijing and Shanghai.

Six of the participants were experienced ESL teachers from the Grand Rapids and Holland area school districts. I am one of a preservice ESL teacher with some experience as an adjunct at GVSU and experience overseas in development education. None of us had been to China; we did not speak Chinese, but we had the advantage of Dr. Shinhun Wu of the English Department at GVSU, as an expert cross-cultural guide and practicum supervisor. Before my departure I was often asked how teaching in China would help me be a better teacher with ESL students in Michigan. I was curious to see how I would answer this question on my return.

We began our journey by climbing the Great Wall and visiting sites in Beijing. It is still hard to believe that I have actually visited the Forbidden City. As tourists we saw Chinese culture from the outside; we stayed in our group and shared our impressions with each other. As we settled into our dorm rooms in Xi'an, China became a more personal experience. We took a small step inside the culture of Chinese higher education, the culture of the city of Xi'an, and the culture of our students.

This was a new summer program for the XFLU and GVSU; there were many unknowns. We were not assigned classes until we arrived. We did not know the number of students, their age, or their English level until the first day of class. I was assigned two classes for two-hour sessions each morning. The class size ranged from 29 - 36 students, ages ranged from 17 - 50 years old. The students in my advanced class were primarily professional teachers from another university in Xi'an. The students in my intermediate class were primarily recent high school graduates. Every student was excited to have the opportunity to study oral English with a native speaker. Their level of motivation prevailed over any frustrations encountered. Their excitement made my work a joy.

Classrooms had ceiling fans but no air conditioning. With daily temperatures between 90 - 100°F, everyone was hot. Long rows of tables were fixed to the floor. There was closed circuit television and headphones outlets for the students, but audio players were difficult to procure. We had chalkboards and an abundance of chalk dust. We fought the sounds of the ceiling fans and the construction on the streets below. Copies of handouts needed to be ordered at least 24 hours in advance. There was limited access to computers and the Internet, and less access to printers. We searched the stationary shops for markers and paper thick enough for name cards. These were not serious problems but were enough of a change to show us how much our usual teaching practices depend on technology and an unlimited availability of paper-related products.

My more experienced colleagues brought a wide assortment of teaching materials with them. We shared these materials and developed lesson plans following the initial assessment of our student's oral skills levels. Assessing the students with a questionnaire gave me a picture of how the students related to their knowledge of the sound and experience of speaking English. In general, their literacy skills were high, but with little opportunity to speak English, their oral proficiency with a native speaker was limited.

When enrolling in the program, students placed themselves in undefined levels of Beginner, Intermediate, and Advanced. Inaccurate placement was frustrating for teachers and students. Teachers would recommend changes that were not implemented and students would float between classes looking for one that fit their level. In such a short program the quality of instruction was sacrificed by inaccurate placement. Since our return, three of the participants taking a Second Language Assessment course have developed a self-assessment tool to be piloted during the next practicum in the summer of 2003. This assessment is designed to more accurately place students according to their listening comprehension and speaking abilities. In this follow-up to the practicum, the participants have used their experience in Xi'an to compare the different requirements of an ESL and EFL assessment tools. This type of comparison reflects one of the major advantages of an overseas practicum; teachers have practical experience in addressing the specific needs of their students without the constraints of a sometimes too-familiar teaching and administrative framework.

Our role as students of China allowed a more equitable classroom discourse than occurs in Michigan. The Chinese students were patient and understanding as I tried to pronounce their names during the first week of classes. Small group discussions were often based on comparing Chinese and American lifestyles. The students loved to
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spend free time with us, taking us shopping, site-seeing and out for meals. I was reminded that simple hospitality is an important factor in the elimination of affective filters for language students and teachers.

Another advantage to the practicum in Xi'an was the process of socialization that occurred as we learned to cope with a language completely different from our own. For three and a half weeks we faced the daily language tasks that confront our ESL students at home. I knew no Chinese before I arrived and had never traveled in a country where I couldn't read numerals. We needed to learn to find and understand the postal system, the monetary system and how to identify different kinds of food and other products in the supermarket.

So, how will supermarket shopping in Xi'an make me a better ESL teacher in Michigan? Working outside of a familiar teaching environment forced us to reconsider the value of the linguistic theories we study in graduate classes, and the pedagogies we employ in our classrooms in Michigan. Too often the everyday demands of our teaching jobs in Michigan overshadow the cultural realities that our students are facing; in Xi'an we experienced those realities ourselves. We were able to draw on sociolinguistic and L2 acquisition theories to understand our own experience and to develop effective lesson plans. The bi-directional element of the practicum pressured us to become critical observers of the language teaching and learning process as it occurs in the classroom and in the university community. As we return to teaching in Michigan and complete our TESOL training, our experience in China will continue to expand and strengthen our perspective of teaching English.

The ESL Kaleidoscope—A Successful Fall 2002 Conference
By Shari Weisbaum

Just over a year ago, I was in a state of panic realizing that I had undertaken the huge responsibility of chairing the 2002 MITESOL Fall Conference, feeling that I was “in way over my head” and desperately wanting it to turn out well. Thanks to the terrific response of members willing to present, volunteers offering to work, and especially my OCC colleagues rescuing me whenever I despaired, the conference was, in fact a huge success. I am eternally grateful to everyone who contributed to the event.

There were nearly 250 attendees at the conference, which took place at the Auburn Hills Campus of OCC last October 18 & 19. We received 147 conference evaluations and 72% of them rated the conference “Excellent” or “Very Good.” Thank you so much to everyone who presented sessions. You are the most essential conference ingredient.

Diane Larsen-Freeman received effusive praise for her plenary address in which she discussed the changing patterns in language and, therefore, in language teaching. Her comments inspired many of us to think about language beyond the daily activities of the language classroom.

Joan Morley’s Friday night presentation was especially well received. In fact, one member told me that if nothing else about the conference had been good, it would not have mattered because Joan’s presentation was so valuable to her. I want to state my personal thanks to Joan and my admiration for her. For years she has given her time, her expertise, her efforts to MITESOL. When I asked her if she might be able to present because I feared we would not have a big enough program, Joan changed travel plans to accommodate us. When, at the last minute, Tim Collins could not present because his plane was late, Joan most graciously delayed her talk to allow his audience to come into to hear her, and then paused midway so his audience could leave to hear Christen Pearson who was to speak after Tim. Joan is an inspiration because of her knowledge which she so readily shares, her generosity, and her graciousness. Thank you, Joan.

Many of the evaluation comments focused on the excellent facility. I offer special thanks to Bob Bruhn, Site Coordinator for all his work planning and organizing before the conference and for his troubleshooting throughout the day. Once again I want to acknowledge OCC’s generosity in waiving over $2000 in rental fees for the facility and allowing us to add additional rooms when it became clear that we would be able to offer more sessions than originally anticipated. OCC’s maintenance, security, and media services people were friendly, helpful and always professional.

The food, especially the Saturday lunch, received high marks. Thanks to Pat Hand who made all the necessary arrangements and to Ambrosia, the catering service from Beverly Hills. Charlott Couch and Kathy Reilly also are due my appreciation for their part in the Friday night buffet and Saturday morning continental breakfast.

I can’t take more space to thank individuals for specific contributions, but please be assured that your proofreading, envelop stuffing, typing, driving, delivering, telephoning, scheduling, setting up, cleaning up and advising were greatly appreciated and there would have been no conference without you. In particular thanks to Karyn Baran, Connie Cohn, Jennifer Craft, Carolyn Fike, Diane Frangie, Lisa Hutchison, Carol Kubota, JuliAnne Pardon, John Taylor, Idi Thomas and the MITESOL Board. 
ELI Funded to Redevelop Migrant Worker Outreach Program

By John McLaughlin, ELI University of Michigan

The English Language Institute at the University of Michigan was awarded two grants in January 2003 to restart and redevelop its Migrant Farmworker Outreach and Education Program. During the first phase of the program, from 1996-2000, students were trained and supervised to teach ESL at farm camps mainly in Lenawee County. Other programs at the University of Michigan also sent medical interns and Spanish majors to conduct health and safety presentations and interpret for medical examinations. Some of these programs were put on hold or scaled back due to changes in funding and personnel in 2001-2. Last year, Diane Larsen-Freeman, the new ELI Director, and Carolyn Madden, who started the program, expressed their desire to continue offering this unique service learning opportunity to undergraduates contingent on funding for the complex logistics of transporting them to several farm camps and reinitiating community partnerships. A program evaluation conducted in 2000 and a needs analysis done in 2002 noted that the farm growers and workers were sometimes confused by the many separate university groups visiting their camps and that community-based teachers would benefit from our materials and training. Thus, the ELI applied for funding to coordinate language-related aspects of migrant worker programs run by the University as well as to develop bilingual migrant ESL materials and TESL workshops with Lenawee County schools and agencies.

The Center for Research on Learning and Teaching awarded a $10,000 Faculty Development Fund grant to the ELI and Mabel Rodriguez, a Spanish Lecturer in the Residential College, to develop a new curriculum which combines training and experience in teaching ESL with preparation for presenting important health and safety information in Spanish and interpreting for doctors in small groups. One new development is that the spring term course, which covers the situation of migrant farmworkers nationwide and particularly in Michigan as well as how to teach ESL to this population, will include more bilingual activities in Spanish as well as critical reflection on these experiences of mixed language use in relation to social identity. Although a high level of proficiency is not a prerequisite, the flexibility in what our students can do in teams will enable us to be of service as needed by our community partners for any given week or evening during the summer term.

The second grant was awarded by the Michigan Campus Compact for $2,000 (to be matched by the University) for developing a collaboration on materials and professional development with a school district and/or community organization. The ELI is now working with multicultural educators in Lenawee Intermediate School District and representatives of the Southeastern Michigan Migrant Resource Council to create a bilingual migrant farmworker resource booklet and a series of TESL workshops for community-based teachers.

Many events in relation to migrant ESL are planned for this year. The Michigan Department of Career Development is holding a Migrant ESL workshop for Southeastern Michigan teachers at the Lenawee Vocational Technical High School in Adrian on February 7. The TESL materials and workshops will be ready for delivery by May when the migrant season begins. July will be the second annual Migrant Farmworker Appreciation Month in Michigan. The ELI is interested in exchanging materials and ideas with other programs in Michigan this year and would welcome participants for a panel presentation or colloquium on Migrant ESL at the MITESOL conference, which will be hosted by the ELI this fall. Please contact John McLaughlin at johnmcl@umich.edu if you are interested in helping to put this topic back on MITESOL’s socio-political concerns agenda.

MITESOL in Lansing

by Maggie Phillips

MITESOL will be represented in Lansing on two upcoming committees sponsored by the Michigan Department of Education.

Starting in February, there will be a series of workshops on implementation of President Bush’s No Child Left Behind Initiative. Eastern Michigan University professors Betsy Morgan and Cathy Day will be the official representatives. Both were key players in the ESL Endorsement saga, and know their way around the corridors of power at the Dept. of Ed.

Professor Wendy Wang, also from EMU, will represent MITESOL on the Title III Ad Hoc Advisory Committee.
PRESENTATIONS & OTHER BRAGGING RIGHTS

• Scott Culp of the Michigan Language Center will be presenting "Simplifying Authentic News Articles for Advanced Readers."
• Sallee A. Prieto of Diverse Voices will be presenting "Language code switching and cultural code switching" and "Cross-cultural bridging in mediation."
• Brenda Imber and Sarah Briggs of the University of Michigan will be presenting "Unionization and its impact on ITA training."
• Kathy Reilly and and Shari Weisbaum will be presenting a workshop "Teaching Students to Use their Own Words."
• Silvia Pessoa, Fabiana Sacchi, Lucie Moussu, & Alejandra Reyes will be presenting "Empowering NNS MATESOL graduates in career development."
• Wendy Wang, Thom Cullen, and Silvia Pessoa will be presenting of Eastern Michigan University "Negotiating and appropriating pedagogical tools."
• (Jean) Penny Wheeler of Ferris State University will be speaking at one of the plenary sessions as Coordinator of the Heinle Excellence in Teaching Award Committee.
• Congratulations to Lisa Hutchison for winning the EMU Buckheister TESOL Travel Award.
• Congratulations to Andwatta (Nika) Barnes who has been awarded the 2003 Michigan Markwardt Travel Grant. The award is the amount equal to the conference pre-registration fee for students. Nika is an elementary school teacher in Grand Rapids. She has taught EFL/ESL in Japan and in China. Now a fifth grade teacher, half of her class are ESL students. Nika’s degrees are in Group Social Sciences and Elementary Education as well as TESOL. She hopes to be ESL endorsed soon. Because of financial constraints, Nika’s school district is unable to financially support her attendance at TESOL, so the grant is very welcome.

We’re Having a Party!

The MITESOL Reception in Baltimore will be held on Thursday, March 27, 2003 from 5 to 7PM at the Phillips Harborplace Restaurant. Look for fliers at the convention or see your MITESOL board representatives for directions.

Maggie Phillips, Reception Coordinator.
TESOL GSF (Continued from p. 13)

In organizing a conference, community/students/EMU GSF conference guided by members of Teacher Education Interest Section. The goal of the Forum is to provide a venue at the TESOL convention for masters-level graduate students to do the following: 1) share the results of their research, their teaching ideas and experiences, and the materials they have developed; 2) meet and network with graduate students (and faculty) at other universities; 3) formally participate in the TESOL convention without having to meet the early deadlines for submitting regular proposals or compete with experienced professionals for time on the convention program; and 4) experience the process of organizing a conference, adjudicating proposals, etc.. (see GSF web site at http://www.tesol.org/mbr/community/students/gsfl.html)

Eastern Michigan University (EMU) has been part of the GSF since 2001. The leadership for the Forum is shared by three or four institutions that rotate annually for three years. This allows an institution the opportunity to be involved for two years before taking the “lead” in organizing the GSF. This year EMU shares responsibility for the Forum with Indiana University of Pennsylvania (the lead), California State University in Los Angeles, and Southeast Missouri State University. This year’s EMU team consists of 9 MA TESOL students. Working under the guidance of our faculty advisor Dr. Wendy Wang, we have been diligently fulfilling our role in the organization of the 3rd GSF. This year we have received an unusually large number of proposals from around the world, and have accepted 101 paper presentations and poster sessions. We truly enjoyed the adjudication process. As team member Catherine Marcos commented, “Not only have I learned about what makes up a good proposal, but I was also reminded of how interesting and rich this field is. It was amazing to me to find such a diversity of topics. It is also encouraging to see that there is a community of students who are carrying out research and eager to share their work.” Our biggest responsibility this year is to create and publish the Program Book. Without teamwork, this task would have been overwhelming! From compiling the presenters’ names and school affiliations to reformatting presentation abstracts and titles, this project meant a lot of time and work from the EMU GSF Team.

Once we are in Baltimore at TESOL 2003, we will enjoy the opportunity to meet with fellow M.A.-level students as well as faculty from other institutions. Hearing about research in so many areas within the field of TESL will greatly expand our education as well as our vision for the future of TESL. Being members of the GSF Team has contributed to our professional development in a way that classroom instruction never could. The chance to be a part of what others are doing in the field has been very exciting and rewarding.

See you in Baltimore! ♦

Where TESOL takes you...

My Experience in Japan
By Jody Holeton

I graduated from EMU in December 2001 and three months later I was teaching English in Japan. In the last year I have done volunteer work at Japanese orphanages, sang songs to pre-school children, prepared Japanese adults for the TOEFL and made the curriculum for one of Japan’s biggest private schools. My students range from basic beginners to advanced English experts looking to focus on certain language skills. Most of my students have had experience with English or have some sort of American interest. Baseball, American movies (especially Harry Potter), food (from pizza to McDonald’s) and music (like Eminem) are all extremely popular here in Japan. Every day here in Japan is an adventure and every class I teach is an opportunity for me to share the world of English.

I currently live in Utsunomiya, which is a city of about a million people just about an hour north of Tokyo. Living in Japan has been really different than living in Michigan. Riding the bus to festivals, buying groceries from local farmers, playing sports with local clubs have all been great experiences for me. Interesting enough, I have found my Japanese language has improved dramatically and last December I took the third level Japanese certification test. Every year I hope to improve my Japanese ability little by little and every week I spend a good portion of my time studying Japanese. Even though in my classroom I prefer to keep it “English only”, I still find that some ideals need to be expressed in my students’ native language. Japan is very beautiful and I am just beginning to explore its language and culture. I personally consider Japan
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a great point of interest for linguists and English teachers. For over fifty years Japan has had major involvement with America and English. Japan is saturated with American fashion, merchandise and culture. English has not only found a cultural niche in Japan but also in its ease of use in business and on the internet. Japan's main alphabet is nearly two thousand characters and that large amount of information makes computer use and written communication (like for contracts) kind of difficult. Also, much to the dismay of Japanese teachers, popular foreign words are being transformed into a form of Japanese. Words like "fight" and "cunning" not only take on whole new pronunciations but also brand new meanings. From what I have seen I think English is not only changing Japanese culture but evolving with it.

The day I started teaching English in a Japanese classroom has been a major turning point in my life. I really have seen first hand how my teaching style works, how a teacher can affect the life of students and how different cultures can find understanding. I am very glad for this opportunity to teach here in Japan and I hope to do it for years to come.

Grammar Workshop
Carole Poleski and Jeannine Lorenger are putting together a one-day grammar workshop aimed at secondary and post-secondary teachers. The idea for the workshop has evolved from the discussion group at the fall conference.

The workshop is tentatively set for Saturday, May 10, 2003, and it will be held at Orchard Lake. Plans include a presentation on the use of authentic materials in grammar classes, tips and techniques on tough grammar points, and some pedagogical grammar.

If you would like to volunteer to help Carole and Jeannine, they would be happy to hear from you: poleski@ili.net or jlorenger@yahoo.com

Book Review: Teaching and Learning in a Multilingual School: Choices, Risks, and Dilemmas
Reviewed by Angel Lin, City University of Hong Kong
(Reprinted with permission from the TEIS Newsletter v.18, n.2, p.5)
Tara Goldstein, a critical ethnographer and teacher educator, deserves to be congratulated for her new book, Teaching and Learning in a Multilingual School: Choices, Risks, and Dilemmas. Rarely do we find such a successful integration of ethnographic research data, critical theoretical analysis, and practical pedagogical suggestions in a single volume as this one. The book is organized into seven chapters, each with four subdivisions: (1) ethnographic excerpts, (2) commentary, (3) pedagogical discussion, and (4) further reflection and discussion. This unique format of presenting her research materials allows for a systematic translation of ethnographic findings into concrete pedagogical strategies for those working with multilingual and multicultural students in English-dominant educational settings.

In her book Goldstein tackles convincingly the very difficult and yet very real dilemmas of speech and silence, and dilemmas of racial and linguistic discrimination in a Canadian school with a linguistically diverse student population. The persistent questions facing many classroom teachers who are teaching a multilingual and multicultural student population include: Should teachers enforce a speak-English-only policy in the classroom? What are the sociocultural, linguistic, and educational consequences of such a policy? Why are students resistant to such a policy? Should teachers create spaces in the classroom where students can draw on their L1 resources as scaffolding for completing L2 tasks? How can teachers successfully address the identity politics of students? How to create an inclusive classroom atmosphere? How to resolve racial tensions resulting from colonialistic, racial stereotypes and cross-cultural misunderstandings? How can teachers both affirm the ethnic minority student’s linguistic and ethnic identity, and at the same time provide them with access to the linguistic and cultural capitals associated with the mainstream language—English?

Tara Goldstein addresses these thorny issues in her ethnographic description and analysis. Her creative use of drama-writing workshops to discuss these controversial issues with students in a multilingual school is an innovative way of translating ethnographic research into situated pedagogical explorations. Drawing on a wide range of theoretical sources such as the recent model of language learning with an emphasis on understanding identity politics and sociocultural forces in second language education, Ebonics studies, cultural theories, and (auto)biographic writings of ethnic minority immigrants, Goldstein successfully speaks to educational researchers, critical theorists, and front-line practitioners on these timely, important issues with ethnographic clarity, theoretical acuity, and pedagogical cogency rarely found in the literature.

This book is a must-read for mainstream teachers, ESL/ESOL teachers as well as teacher educators, critical education theorists, critical applied linguists, and anyone who has an interest in anti-racist and inclusive education.

MACAE Spring ESL Professional Development Workshop
Presenter: Sue Fenton Location: Clarion Hotel of Lansing
Date: May 16, 2003: 8:30-3:30 Conference Fee: $65.00
Guest Speaker: Dianne Dutchie
For more information contact MACAE at 1-888-214-0131 or at learn@macae.org
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