From the Co-Editors

It is with great pleasure that we offer you the February 2012 issue of MITESOL Messages. As always, we are extremely happy with the articles we have received in response to our call for submissions. This issue promises to have something for everyone.

We’d like to especially highlight the signs of activity and growth within our own organization found throughout this issue. Please check out the latest details on the planning going on as Madonna University in Livonia continues to make arrangements for the MITESOL Conference, October 12-13, 2012. Be sure to read the Call for Proposals on page 3. In accordance with the conference theme of “Serving for a Better World,” they’ve included a specific request for proposals addressing service learning. Of course, proposals covering the gamut of English language learning and teaching situations are welcome. For submission guidelines, please see the MITESOL website. For those wanting to get everything planned as soon as possible, we’ve also included hotel information for the weekend of the conference, with special discount offers for those needing a place to stay. Please see page 22 for these details and a general map of the area. Why not plan to see the sights of Southeastern Michigan while you’re in the neighborhood? Madonna University’s main campus is just off I-96, so getting to the excitement of Downtown Detroit, the RiverWalk, Greektown and Mexican Town is easy and just minutes away. Of course, there are plenty of restaurants, parks, and shopping available even nearer. We’ve also included information about the MITESOL reception at the TESOL International Conference in Philadelphia next month along with a list of all the MITESOLers presenting at the conference. It’s great to see all the representatives our organization will have in Philadelphia.

Of course, we’d like to thank all the contributors to this issue, including board members and others, for making our job so much easier. This time we feature articles from Molly McCord (HFCC), James Perren (EMU), Patrick T. Randolph (SIU-Carbondale), Lisa Hutchison Lockart (Lamphere Schools), and Leze Djokay (MU-Graduate student). The next issue of MITESOL Messages is schedule to be published August 15th (deadline for submissions: July 15th). Please consider submitting something to the next issue.

Valerie Weeks and Marian Woyciehowicz Gonsior, Co-editors
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In his third State of the Union Address, President Barack Obama highlighted two points about education: the critical role it plays in the U.S. economy and the vital role that teachers play in setting students on a path to success as adults. The importance of education in supporting the U.S. economy cannot be overstated; therefore, the United States must reverse the current trend of cutting education funding. Instead, the United States should follow the example set by other countries and increase its investment in education for learners at all levels, especially English learners.

Similarly, the importance of teachers cannot be overstated. Teachers are the life force of the education system, and they play a vital role in shaping learners' lives. Yet their contribution is often overlooked or taken for granted. TESOL International Association appreciates the president’s comments recognizing this and applauds his call to stop scapegoating teachers. TESOL also welcomes the president’s offer to support good teaching, especially his offer to provide schools and teachers the flexibility "to teach with creativity and passion [and] to stop teaching to the test."

The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) highlighted achievement gaps and helped ensure that schools supported all students equally. However, NCLB's rigid testing policies and punitive measures have narrowed the curriculum and hampered innovation in the classroom. It is past time to fix what is wrong with NCLB, and so TESOL International Association urges the president and congress to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

To read the statement in its entirety, please go to the TESOL website at www.tesol.org. Look under “Association News.”
Call for Proposals

MITESOL 2012 Conference
“Serving for a Better World”

October 12 - 13, 2012
Madonna University
Main Campus
Livonia, MI

*Michigan Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages* (MITESOL) invites professionals involved with English language learners to submit proposals for presentations at the annual conference to be held on the campus of Madonna University in Livonia, the evening of Friday, October 12 and all day Saturday, October 13.

As MITESOL boasts 37 years of service to learners and teachers of English and Madonna University celebrates its 75th Anniversary of service to all learners, it is fitting that we focus this year on serving for a better world. The MITESOL 2012 Conference welcomes proposals from diverse perspectives that address current issues related to English language proficiency assessment, standards-based instruction, ELL students in mainstream classrooms, and funding for quality ESL programs in these tough economic times including short-term and other alternative format programs. The conference also invites proposals related to all aspects of ESL/EAP/IEP/CALL/EFL best practices for instruction, materials development, program administration, teacher training, and professional development in various settings. In keeping with this year’s theme, we also welcome proposals addressing service learning.

Proposals are being accepted for the following formats: paper, poster, panel discussion, exhibitor, teaching/tutoring demonstration, and workshop. Online submissions only will be accepted at [http://www.mitesol.org/proposal](http://www.mitesol.org/proposal). The proposal deadline is Saturday, June 23 (11:00 p.m.), 2012 with notification of acceptance via email by mid-August.

If you have any questions about the 2012 Conference or would like to volunteer to help out with the preparations for the conference, please contact:

- **Andrew Domzalski**, Conference Chair, at adomzalski@madonna.edu (general inquiries)
- **Marian Woyciehowicz Gonsior**, Conference Co-Chair, at mgonsior@madonna.edu (proposal inquiries)
- **Hadeel Betti**, Conference Local Chair, at hbetti@madonna.edu

Please include “MITESOL Conference” in the subject line of your email.
Exploring Effective Feedback Techniques in the ESL Classroom
by Molly McCord

Project Rationale
As an English as a Second Language Composition Instructor at a community college, I spend countless hours providing written feedback to my students on their writing assignments. I provide some direct grammar and sentence structure/punctuation instruction in my ESL classes, which is one reason I believe I feel the need to comment on student usage of these structures. Most assignments are expository in nature, so I also spend a great deal of time discussing more content-based topics, including thesis statement formation, topic sentence formation and placement, and organizational techniques. However, I have recently found myself questioning the usefulness of both surface error correction and content-based feedback in my ESL classes. Since I began teaching, I have subscribed to the “more is better” idea when it comes to providing feedback on ESL student writing; I feel it is my job to guide them through the writing process, and more feedback means more guidance. But due to time constraints, I do not always see multiple drafts of all student essays. Therefore, I am often unaware of actual student uptake of my written feedback. I am wondering if the information I glean from looking more closely at the value of my written feedback will lead me to more critically examine my teaching practices as well, and perhaps make some changes that would have a more noticeable impact on the progress of my students’ writing.

Research Question
Given the many hours I spend reading and responding to student writing, I suppose what I would really like to know is if I am wasting my time. But coming to a more informed conclusion about my feedback practices is not a purely selfish pursuit; discovering the most efficient way to provide feedback would benefit both my students as learners and me as their time-challenged instructor. Is direct grammar/sentence structure instruction really helping to reduce the occurrence of various errors in their written work? What about other types of feedback (content/organization/coherence/unity)—do students really understand and make use of these comments? I believe gathering data from a case study about student use of all forms of my feedback might begin to help clarify these questions, and in turn offer me insight into more appropriate pedagogical techniques.

Methodology
To help illuminate the effectiveness of comments on student essays, I chose one student for a case study in my ESL Composition course. I examined an assignment that called for the student to write a five-paragraph Comparison Essay on a topic of his choice. This student chose to compare his home city of Cairo, Egypt to Cedar Rapids, Iowa (the first city he lived in when he moved to the United States). I first collected an essay plan, or outline, from the student, and provided feedback on content only: thesis statement, topic sentences, and details/examples. The student received the outline with my feedback and proceeded to hand in a “rough draft” of his final essay two days later. Upon providing various written remarks on the “rough draft”, including grammar, punctuation, and content, I returned the paper to the student, who proceeded to compose a “final draft” of the essay. I collected both the rough and final versions of the essay to help establish a better understanding of the student’s uptake of my feedback. I also gave him a questionnaire that addresses his use of and feelings about the comments in order to gain a better understanding of the affective dimension of revision. For the purposes of this short-term study, I am defining “effectiveness” as the student’s ability to make appropriate revisions to his essay based on my feedback comments; right now I am interested in immediate student uptake of my feedback, and the implications this uptake might have for my instruction.

Findings
On the student’s first draft of his Comparison Essay, I provided the following feedback:
1. Seven content-based comments, including thesis statement and topic sentence clarification, paragraph coherence, wording clarification, and suggestions for avoiding repetition.
2. Thirty direct coded surface error comments, including indication of comma splices, sentence fragments, and run-on sentences, spelling errors, subject-verb agreement errors, verb tense errors, and word choice errors.
3. Eight indirect uncoded (underlined and circled) surface error corrections, including capitalization and apostrophe deletion/addition.

The revised final draft of the essay indicated that the student made use of the majority of my feedback. He appropriately revised 24 of the 30 direct coded surface errors, eliminating all but one punctuation-based error. He also revised all eight of
the indirect uncoded surface errors, and addressed five of the seven content-based comments, either through re-wording, deletion of awkward phrases, or adding explanatory detail. His ability to accurately revise many of his errors is encouraging to me as his instructor and feedback provider.

The student’s answers to the Feedback Questionnaire offered some additional insight into his thought process while revising his essay, and described in general his feelings about my feedback:

**Question #1:** What feedback did you feel was most useful on the essay plan? What feedback was least useful? Was there feedback you did not understand? If so, please specify “The most useful is that I realized that I still have some issues with fragments and punctuation.” By drawing his attention to the type of errors through the direct coded method, the student was able to recognize an area for improvement. I’m not sure if the less explicit indirect feedback method would prompt the same kind of recognition. This is a question for further research. “I did not understand on the second page about question of [is this detail related to your main comparison?] because I just compare the weather in a general way.” The student indicates some confusion about my inquiry-based content feedback. I have always been concerned about students understanding my questioning on their essays, so this statement leads me to analyze the wording of my feedback on content.

**Question #2:** When revising your rough draft, did you focus more on grammar and sentence structure, on organization and content of the essay, or did you spend equal time on both tasks? What area (grammar or content) did you feel the feedback indicated was more important? Why?

“I focused on grammar and sentence structure. The punctuation and sentence fragments is most important. Because there are a lot of common mistakes I did in the essay.” In this answer, the student suggests that the sheer number of surface errors warranted closer attention than the fewer content-based comments. His attention may have been drawn to punctuation and fragments as a result of my recent mini-lessons on these topics; he appears to be more aware of these types of errors due to our class discussions.

**Question #3:** Describe your feelings when reading the feedback on your rough draft. “Actually, I did not expect a lot of comments as I thought I did a tough job. But after I read it again, I found it’s very helpful for me to notice my mistake and improve it.” I worry about raising my ESL students’ affective filters when I provide feedback on their writing, and in turn lowering their confidence as writers. This student’s initial positive thoughts about his first draft changed when he saw my comments, but his indication of the helpfulness of the feedback make it appear as though the corrections did not impede his desire to write the final draft.

**Question #4:** Did you receive any outside help (from a tutor, friend, relative, etc.) when revising any of your work? If so, how did this person/people help you interpret the feedback? “I did my own writing.” Knowing that the student revised his essay individually helps me to understand that his interpretations of my feedback are his own, and not achieved through negotiation with another party.

**Question #5:** Describe how you feel about your final draft, and why you feel this way. “I feel it will be fine to grade and no more mistakes because I follow the feedback comments.” This answer appears to indicate that despite feeling like his first draft was initially his best effort, he was actually even more confident following the revision. I am particularly encouraged by this answer, since my hope is that my students’ confidence is increased through the revision process.

**Conclusion**

This case study helped me come to some preliminary conclusions about my own feedback techniques as well as implications for further research surrounding my feedback provision. Because this case study was conducted with only one student and in a restricted time frame, the results are obviously inconclusive. I propose extending my definition of “effective” to mean not only immediate student uptake of feedback on same-essay revisions, but also student retention and employment of the feedback on future unrelated writing assignments. I believe further, more longitudinal studies conducted with this extended definition in mind would help me come to a more informed conclusion about the longer-term effectiveness of my written corrective feedback.

**Author Bio:** Molly McCord, English/ESL Instructor, Henry Ford Community College, Dearborn, MI

Email: mbmccord@hfcc.edu McCord has a BA in Linguistics and Spanish from the University of Michigan Ann Arbor, and an MA in Applied Linguistics from UMass Boston. She is currently working on a certificate in Written Communication (emphasis on Teaching of Writing) at Eastern Michigan University. She has taught ESL both in the USA and abroad (Turkey, Switzerland) and has been working as a full time English/ESL instructor at HFCC since 2009.
K-12 SIG

IMPORTANT DATES
SIOP Training –
- Session #1 Novi June 18-21, 2012
- Session #2 Oakland Schools June 25-28, 2012

TESOL ACADEMY
TESOL Academy 2012 will be hosted by Eastern Michigan University on Friday and Saturday, June 22-23, 2012 at the Student Center at EMU. The TESOL Academy consists of 10-hour workshops focused on key issues and areas of practice in the TESOL profession. Each workshop is an intensive course led by a well-recognized TESOL leader.

Confirmed Topics are:
- Developing a Culturally & Linguistically Responsive Response to Intervention (RtI) System for English Language Learners (Barbara Marler)
- Literacy strategies (Dotti Kauffman)
- Assessing and developing rubric for oral language (Lorraine Valdez Pierce)

Other possible topics include:
- Teaching math and science for ELLs
- Developing Academic Readiness Skills
- Differentiated Instruction

Stay tuned for further information concerning this important professional development opportunity.

Heads up on the World Language Requirement
The Michigan State Board of Education expects all students, beginning with the graduating class of 2016, to complete two credits of a world language other than English prior to graduation, or demonstrate a two-year equivalent proficiency. This will affect all students currently in the 8th grade this year. ELL students will be allowed credit for learning beyond the K-12 classroom (for example: formal schooling abroad, study abroad programs, college coursework, home or heritage languages, online courses, or other life experiences). Formal documentation of equivalent proficiency is required.

ELL students, if they have had at least one year of schooling in all content areas (math, social studies, ELA, and Science) in their home country/language, may use this time to meet the new world language requirement. Students will need a report card from the school in their home country to document their language experience. If students do not have a report card, students may be assessed for credit. One semester of schooling in their native country will equal one credit in high school. Two semesters of schooling in their native country will equal two credits in high school. ESL teachers of 8th grade students can assist and expedite this process by taking a copy of an ELL’s transcript to high school counselors prior to course selection and placement for next year.

Title III Directors Information
Please refer to the Title III Directors Memo sent by Shereen Tabrizi for important information regarding AMAOs, program improvement, ELP and Common Core Standards, communication regarding Title III and ELL programs, and accuracy of LEP coding and reporting. The memo will be sent as an email on the listserv.

Lisa Hutchison Lockhart and Karen Morrison, Co-Leaders, K-12 SIG
Greetings and Happy New Year, IEP/Post Secondary SIG Members!
I hope your new semesters are looking good, and that you're dealing with the overwhelm with calm and good humor! Mmm-hmm - I can hear the "Yeah, right!" resounding from Great Lake to Great Lake!!

I have submitted an article to the MITESOL newsletter just discussing some of the concerns that I believe many IEPs share at this time. However, Post Secondary ESL education is not confined to university IEPs, so I'd like to hear from you about what issues you'd like to see discussed in future newsletters. Now is also the time to start thinking about taking advantage of our SIG sponsored slot at the MITESOL conference next fall. I'll have details about how that slot can be filled in another email this winter/spring.

Meanwhile, good luck to you all, and please remember to write your SIG leader with your ideas and concerns. That is the only way I can be of use to you!!

Thanks!
Andy

Please email Andrew S. McCullough at mccullo4@msu.edu

MITESOL Website and Webmaster News

In the eight months since “going live” with the new MITESOL Website in April 2011, we have been working hard on improvements to http://www.mitesol.org and trying out new ideas as follows:

Job postings on the MITESOL website
info@mitesol.org general-purpose organization email address
Calendar of MITESOL and TESOL events
Conference planning tool
Links to other professional organizations
Implementation of a Board-only Access Level
MITESOLspace networking (closed December 2011 due to new cost structure)

Additionally, after the 2012 MITESOL conference we plan to implement a membership access level for the website which will include an on-line membership directory. We will invite suggestions from the MITESOL membership to add to our communications project list this spring!

We are pleased to welcome our new Webmaster Justin Dykhouse! Justin is well-prepared to make updates as well as continued improvements to the current MITESOL website. He will also be the technical point person for the MITESOL proposal system used each year for the conferences. We look forward to working with him and learning from his ideas!

We are thankful for the support of two technical experts again in 2011, Vineet Bansal and Russ Werner. Vineet has been the administrator and technical guru for the conference proposal system which he developed several years ago. The conference planning teams have appreciated his quick responses and practical solutions. We have also greatly appreciated Russ Werner’s six years of dedicated service as Webmaster. In 2012, he will continue to care for the physical infrastructure, database backups, updates, and security for the MITESOL website which resides on the ELC servers at Michigan State University.

Kay Stremler, Communications Coordinator
Marta Halaczkiewicz, CALL SIG Leader
Pamela Bogart, Listserv Manager
Intercultural Communication Learning Tools for English Language Education

By James M. Perren, Ed.D.

How well are we representing the intercultural communication needs of our English language learners and teachers? As MITESOLers, what should we do to incorporate inclusive intercultural communication instruction and research? This article is about my experiences teaching ESL here in Michigan and potentially useful pedagogy for MITESOL constituents.

Interpreting different cultural values and shared beliefs accurately during intercultural communication is important for MITESOL because the process of producing and understanding messages accomplishes numerous goals and tasks in English language education (ELE). Traditional intercultural communication theory fails to provide a comprehensive account of communicative behavior and perpetuates hegemonic principles that lack an emphasis on a participant-relevant viewpoint. One response to this problematic situation is to develop and integrate more alternative intercultural communication theory and practice into ELE throughout the state. These concepts have greatly influenced the way I teach and conduct research as a MITESOL representative.

An accurate definition of culture is elusive since there are several hundred available. Culture is “difficult to define due to its unavoidable subjectivity and relativity” (Kramsch, 1991, p. 217). A useful definition of culture is “a learned set of shared perceptions about beliefs, values, and norms, which affect the behaviors of relatively large groups of people” (Lustig & Koester, 1996, p. 35). Thus, interaction between people incorporates the sharing of cultural beliefs, values, and norms including guidelines for how to act and react during communicative encounters as well as how to interpret the importance of these interactions. A related and equally relevant point is that intercultural communication “occurs whenever a message produced in one culture must be processed in another culture” (Porter & Samovar, 1991, p. 6). Processing a message is not necessarily done the same way universally across cultures; interview-based data/information about perceptions of how specific ‘message thought processing’ in certain ELE contexts can be of use to MITESOL educators.

Nevertheless, traditional intercultural communication theory is based primarily on Western positivist social science that excludes issues of social power and privilege (Chuang, 2003; Holmes, 2006; Kittler, Rygl, & Mackinnon, 2011). Intercultural communication definitions frame communicative interactions between native and international speakers of English as a particular type of communication with people possessing desirable levels of knowledge, skills, and attitudes. These definitions fail to consider the social power underlying the relationships between interlocutors that may have a determining influence on the outcome of an interaction. This strand of research limits the concept of communication to simply the sending and receiving of messages which have identical meanings for both the sender and the receiver, culture being perceived as research ‘noise’. This perspective is inadequate and may influence numerous highly troublesome assumptions about research participants and their relationships with others (Gustafsson & Blasco, 2004). Criticisms have been raised against the associated value systems, social relation patterns, and dominant cultural group ideologies as well as the overwhelming patterns of ‘Othering’ based on cultural differences (Chuang, 2003; Hibler, 1998; Kumaravadivelu, 2008a, 2008b). One closely connected argument from critical applied linguistics stresses an expanded understanding of historical social relations (and development or lack thereof) between cultural groups (Pennycook, 2001). In sum, positivist social science in traditional intercultural communication theory underscores “colonial ideology and cultural hegemony” and does not focus on issues of correcting these inequities (Chuang, 2003, p. 25).

This could be especially relevant to English language education and MITESOLers because traditional intercultural communication theory and practice minimizes or omits crucial factors regarding communication between people from different cultures, primarily in L2 learning and use. Providing ESL/EFL teachers and students with associated educational opportunities can facilitate further development of their intercultural communication skills. Furthermore, the positivist paradigm might not adequately account for human experience nor common world-view specifically regarding the multifaceted nature of culture (Chuang, 2003). Critiques of the low/high context and the individualism/collectivism dichotomies indicate lack of validity in a number of research samples resulting in oversimplified theories. This research was the point of departure for “virtually any research based on or intending to explore issues relevant to cross-cultural and/or intercultural communication” (Chuang, 2003, p. 29). Hall’s (Hall, 1959, 1966, 1976) earliest approaches to the low/high context distinction for categorizing cultural differences led to excessive labeling and generalization that had “little relationship to complex realities faced by the individuals involved when dealing with intercultural interactions” (Casimir & Asuncion-Landé, 1989, p. 280). Cartesian, linear and logical reasoning might not apply to how individuals actually position themselves nor does this theoretical stance “allow for the Others to speak for themselves” (Chuang, 2003, p. 31).

These gaps create a robust opportunity for examining intercultural communication in ELE from a poststructural and critical perspective. I have attempted to integrate these useful learning tools into my own educational experiences to foster the development of speaking by oneself and for one’s self as an important ‘co-participant’ in intercultural communication (Perren, 2007, 2009, 2010; Perren & Ouano, 2010). I have also utilized course readings in ESL instruction and teacher training that come from an intercultural communication ‘global’ course reader including articles written by international authors (Jandt, 2004). A number of recent texts are available for exploration by the MITESOL community that can serve similar purposes (Birch, 2009; Nakayama & Halualani, 2010; Nunan & Choi, 2010). I sincerely hope these ideas and tools are useful MITESOL educators.

(Continued on page 9)
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Developing the Art of Observation: Using Ethnomethodology in the ESL Classroom

by Patrick T. Randolph

Part I: The Background Behind the Ethnomethodology Project

The ethnomethodology project primarily focuses on three components: (1) pure observation, (2) critical thinking, and (3) analytical writing. The whole idea of ethnomethodology was developed by Harold Garfinkel (1917-2011). He attempted to show the importance of using the members of a society to answer the question “Why do we do what we do?” That is, instead of asking “outsiders” to comment on the actions of “others”, he stressed the idea of asking the actual participants themselves why they do specific things and why they do what they do in everyday life. In this way, he felt we could make sense of people and their actions in the everyday world.

Humans, however, although immensely intellectual creatures, are actually poor observers (Eagleman, 2011; Medina, 2009). We do see the world, but we also take it for granted and are often blind to what is going on around us. Hence, ethnomethodology helps to foster an awareness of one’s surroundings and tries to hone the art of observation through going into local communities and seeing “what is going on”.

The use of ethnomethodology is the perfect tool for English language learners. When international students first arrive to the U.S., their senses are heightened, and they naturally observe many interesting phenomena. But soon after their arrival, the reality of ESL classes and hours of homework set in. They no longer have the time to freely observe the fascinating elements of their host culture. The use of ethnomethodology project, however, gets them back on track in terms of getting out into their local communities and making observations about their host culture and the use of their host language.

Part II: Prejudices and Stereotypes

This project starts with a class discussion on defining the terms “prejudice” and “stereotype”. The instructor elicits the general definitions from the students, helps them formulate clear definitions, and writes them on the board. This is done for one of two reasons: many students are not completely familiar with both terms, or they often think that the terms are synonymous with each other. It is therefore a good idea to clarify the definitions and differences between prejudices and stereotypes.

The instructor then makes pairs and asks the students to list stereotypes and prejudices that they may have formed in their home country about the U.S. before coming to the States. These are announced to the class and written on the board. The instructor goes over each stereotype and prejudice. The class looks at the truth-value of the stereotypes, and either dismisses them or confirms that such elements exist in the culture. The prejudices are also discussed and analyzed. Questions are entertained and examined, such as “Why are these prejudices developed?” “Have the students gone beyond these prejudices since they have arrived?” and “Why are some still true in their minds?”

Part III: Working with Advertisements

The students are next introduced to an American advertisement; i.e., a soft drink, perfume, or travel ad. It should be pointed out that the more interesting the photo in the ad, the more interesting it is for the students. During this segment of the activity, the instructor helps the students describe the ad, analyze what it is trying to sell, and decide whether or not it is effective.

The class then discusses the target audience of the ad. They also address questions such as “How, if used, will the product solve the consumer’s problem?” “What kind of qualities will the consumer acquire if he or she buys the product?” and “What social class might he or she enter “vicariously” if the product is purchased?” For a nice discussion of advertising and consumer appeal, see Andrew Goatly’s Critical Reading and Writing, 2000; chapter seven, pages 183-213.

The homework assignment for the students is to find an ad of interest and bring it to class the following day. The pairs from the previous day come together, analyze and discuss the ad. The following list is a set of possible questions the instructor gives the students to help them analyze the ad.

(1) Describe the ad in detail: What photos are used? Why are they used? How much text is used? Is it useful? Is it distracting?
(2) What kind of product is the ad trying to sell?
(3) Who is the target audience?
(4) Is it effective? Why? Why not?
(5) Would you buy the product? Why? Why not?

(Continued on page 11)
(Continued from page 10)

(6) Would this ad be successful in your home country?
(7) What desire is produced by looking at the ad?
(8) What kind of power is evoked?
(9) How will the consumer’s problem be solved by purchasing the product?
(10) What kind of qualities/lifestyle will the consumer acquire if he or she purchases the product?
(11) Do you like/dislike the ad? Why?

The purpose of this segment is to get the students to “observe” and look closely at an aspect of American culture. As referred to earlier, Eagleman noted that people are inherently poor observers. This is not to say, however, that we cannot become good observers. This ad activity helps the students for four specific reasons: first, the students are “interested” in American advertisements and are easily motivated to examine them; second, the students learn to “see” what is in front of them and hone their “critical” and “analytical” eye; third, it helps them with critical thinking and pushes them to ask why things are the way they are; and fourth, it prepares them to become observers of what it is that we call the “everyday dynamics” of American society.

The students are then asked to write a short paragraph or two about the ad. Any one of the above questions can be addressed, but it is best to get the students to focus on one specific point and develop it as much as possible in order to nurture the skills needed for an in depth analysis. Once the background or foundational work has been done, the students are ready to turn to the ethnomethodology project. Soon they will begin to see that ethnomethodology is a crucial tool for language acquisition as well as a necessary device for penetrating the elements of their host culture.

Part IV: The Project

It is important to go over the term “ethnomethodology” and give a brief background on its history so that the students see its immediate importance. It should also be discussed why observing things in the host culture is important. This, in itself, can be an entire lesson. Why do students need to know about their host culture? What can they learn from it? And most importantly, how does this “observation of culture” ultimately help them as language learners? This last question is one of the main reasons why this project is so fundamental to the enhancement of the language learners’ minds. This project allows the students to observe and make hypotheses about culture, which in turn helps them to do the same with a language’s grammar and syntax rules. Students can formulate their own “rule book” of a language by observing when and how the language is used by native speakers and writers.

The ethnomethodology project begins with an assignment in which the students are to go out and observe something in their own building or on their own campus. For example, students might see “recycling” bins on all the floors of their building, or they might notice professors’ doors open in the hall. They write this observation down and briefly explain why it is of interest. The students then bring their observations to class for discussion. Next the students create a hypothesis about their own observation. For instance, they might say, “I believe that recycling cans are abundant on the campus because Americans care about their natural environment, and they want to limit the amount of trash that they throw away”, or, with respect to the second topic, they might say “I think that American professors are more willing to meet with students and therefore keep their doors open to the public.” The class, as a whole, discusses the hypotheses to see if they are legitimate or not, and to see if they should be edited in terms of grammaticality or syntax.

Once this preliminary “observation test” is done, the instructor can then move onto the first assignment for the actual project; that is, to have the students go out into the local community and observe one thing that they find of interest. It must be explained to the students that this cannot be something that they thought about in their home country or on the plane ride on the way to the States; rather, it must be a point of interest that unfolds during the actual observation assignment. The observations can be about how Americans act, how they react or respond to each other, or even about how group dynamics seem to work in the States. Essentially, they are required to “observe” something of interest. Again, it should be emphasized that the observation must be pure or spontaneous and not something on which the student has meditated beforehand. The idea of doing a spontaneous observation must be stressed in order for this to follow the true path of ethnomethodology.

Once the observation is accomplished, the students write the act or event down as clearly as possible. They should also include the time of day, the place, the kind of people who were present or not present, and draw a simple map of the area that they observed. Next, they formulate a hypothesis about the observation. They bring both of these to class for discussion. If their observation and hypothesis lend themselves to further questions and research, then the students can enter the next stage, which is developing a list of questions (demographic and core) to ask people about their observation. These questions help the observer to (1) learn more about the topic/event; and (2) gather information that will help to confirm or negate the hypothesis. Next, the students return to the site and
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MITESOL Reception at TESOL 2012

Come join us at
Nodding Head

5:00 p.m.– 8:00 p.m., March 29, 2012
1516 Sansom St., 2nd Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19102-2811
(between 15th and 16th Street)

If you plan on attending, please RSVP at:
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Cornerstone University
Dept. of World Languages, Eastern Michigan University
TCArTE, Eastern Michigan University
The English Language Center, Michigan State University
The English Language Institute, Saginaw Valley State University
The English Language Institute, Wayne State University
CELCIS, Western Michigan University
Soo Hyon Kim is a PhD student in Second Language Studies at Michigan State University, where she serves as a graduate teaching and research assistant. She is currently conducting her dissertation research on second language (L2) writers’ metacognitive knowledge. Her main research interests are issues at the intersection of Second Language Acquisition and L2 writing, English for Academic Purposes, L2 writers in the writing center, and TESOL teacher education. Examples of her work in these areas can be found in TESOL Quarterly, ELT Journal, Studies in Second Language Acquisition (SSLA), the TESOL SLW and CALL Intersection Newsletter, and NCTE and TESOL Publications. A frequent presenter at MITESOL and TESOL conventions, Soo Hyon is extremely honored to be attending TESOL 2012 in Philadelphia as this year’s Michigan Marckwardt Award recipient, and looks forward to continuing her involvement with the MITESOL and TESOL community through her academic and professional activities.

Cornerstone University (Grand Rapids, MI) is pleased to welcome Dr. James Asher to give a workshop on the Total Physical Response method. He will be joined by Todd McKay who will be giving a workshop on using TPR Storytelling. The workshop will be held in the Gainey Conference Center at Cornerstone University on Saturday April 14, 2012 from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Information, including schedule and registration information, can be found at www.cornerstone.edu/esl. Questions may also be directed to Dr. Michael Pasquale at michael.pasquale@cornerstone.edu. Space is limited.

WHAT TO BE PUBLISHED?

Plan to submit an article, book review, lesson plan, teaching tip, or other item of interest to MITESOLers to the next issue of MITESOL Messages. The deadline for the next issue is July 15th.
conduct interviews about their observation.

A point of emphasis should be noted here: the students’ observations should be of the nature whereby they can go back to the place of interest and ask someone directly about the initial observation; that is, someone who “participated” in the actual event or act that was observed or at least someone who participated in a “similar” situation. For example, one student’s observation was that a significant number of elderly work at Wal-Mart as greeters. He hypothesized that they do this for financial reasons and to stay physically active. He then went back to his observation site and asked people who he had previously observed working at Wal-Mart to confirm his hypothesis. In this particular case, two respondents confirmed his hypothesis and one did not. The point here is not to ask a common individual’s mere opinion “about” something they have no relation to, but rather, to ask the participants themselves of the observed act why they do what they do—this is, as above, the heart of ethnomethodology.

To recap, the first four steps of this project are to (1) observe a phenomenon in American culture, (2) write up a hypothesis about the observation, (3) create a list of questions that will add to the knowledge of the observation and either confirm or disprove the hypothesis, and (4) interview the participants of the observation or the observation site. The list of questions is divided into two categories: (1) demographic questions and (2) core questions specifically related to the observation.

Next, the students analyze the results of their interviews. To help prepare them for this crucial task, a lesson should be devoted to methods of examining data. Questions concerning the demographics, such as race, sex, age, and occupation should first be addressed. For example, what are the ages of the participants, and does this influence the data? Do all men and women answer the same or differently? Why is this the case? The instructor should also spend time with the students looking at connections within the questions. For example, do all men and women of the same race answer the same way, or does this information even matter?

After the students analyze the data, they write up a paper on the observation. This includes the following: (a) an introduction of their observation which includes a statement or two about ethnomethodology, an explanation of their observation and why it is of interest to them, their hypothesis, and what they hope to learn from the observation; (b) a methods section which lists their questions and what kind of information each question hopes to elicit; (c) the analysis of the observation and the results of the interview: i.e., does the data confirm or negate their initial hypothesis and (d) a discussion section which highlights what they learned, how this observed phenomenon is different than their home culture, and what they might do differently—or what they might advise others to do differently—if the same topic was researched by another student at a later date.

After the papers are submitted, it is ideal to have the students present on their projects. Alternatively, the presentations might be done before the papers are written to help the students organize their thoughts on the topic. Often times the questions from the students’ peers during the presentations add much to the written papers and insights into the topic.

Previous Topics for Ethnomethodology Projects

1. Why do the Elderly Work at Wal-Mart?
2. Group Dynamics: One Female with Four Males
3. “Bless You”: Why Do Americans Use This Greeting?
4. “You Can Get Yourself a Beer”: Making Others Feel at Home
5. Running with Your Dog: Why Americans Love It
6. Free Lunch? Do College Students Work for Free Food?
7. How Americans Train Their Children to be Independent
8. Eating in America on National Holidays: Is It Healthy?
Concluding Remarks

There are number of variations which can be done on the ethnomethodology project. For example, instead of observing an “act” in American culture, the students can videotape conversations and do a form of “conversation analysis”, or students can compare and contrast various observed teaching methods based on the different instructors at the respective ESL institute.

Whatever theme is used, the students and the instructors will benefit greatly and develop the art of observation through critical thinking and analytical writing. Both the students and the instructors will find that the art of observation is a mentally active task that motivates interest and excitement in learning more about language and culture.
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Diane Ravitch begins by recounting her personal experience working under President George H. W. Bush as assistant secretary of the U.S. Department of Education. Dr. Ravitch began to “see like a state” (p. 10) and became a proponent of choice and accountability as the means to reform public education; however, as she has since observed these movements put into practice around the country, she has recognized the more critical role played by curriculum and instruction. Thus, she shares her changed perspective on the correct path for truly improving American public education.

The author lays out the historical context of the passage of NCLB in 2002. Her summary of the 1983 report *A Nation at Risk* sheds light on the struggles and ultimate “hijacking” of the national standards movement. By pausing here to review the specific findings and recommendations in *A Nation at Risk*, Ms. Ravitch clearly illustrates how the path to strengthening our schools could have been centered on content and raising high school graduation requirements rather than accountability and testing. Following this contrast, in-depth case studies of reform in District 2 of NY Public schools and San Diego public schools are shared. Dr. Ravitch then critiques NCLB, focusing on the punitive manner in which the law deals with unsuccessful districts. A chapter is devoted to both choice and accountability, so often touted as the panaceas for failing public schools, and how they have taken us down the wrong path. An examination of one of the Ravitch’s high school teachers highlights the short-sightedness of our system’s teacher evaluation system for determining a “highly effective” instructor. The text continues with an examination of the million-dollar philanthropic groups that have become powerful catalysts for reform in our public education system, noting that the reforms and the results have been less than impressive. The final chapter includes recommendations for future direction in policy starting with broadening our nation’s vision of quality education, and moving away from the policies that only value what standardized tests measure. The author concludes that a substantive national curriculum is imperative, and should be designed by education professionals rather than leaving it up to the textbook publishers.

It is frustrating to be an educator and discover the media and bureaucrats’ idea of good education. The “report cards” and narrow measuring sticks (AYP) put into place by NCLB, all centered on testing, are just one small part of what
makes a school great. However, in many politicians’ eyes, these are the only indicators considered when judging the quality of education in a school building or district. Dr. Ravitch brings to light the errors in judgment that happen because of this system – schools that focus on test preparation so much that they lose their focus on good, well-rounded instruction in all the content areas. There is a great need for our country to recognize that this myopic focus on Reading and Math is a detriment to teaching other content knowledge and skills. The data Dr. Ravitch shares about the performance results of students in states with a strong, coherent curriculum serve as solid evidence of the need for a nation-wide focus on such. Particularly insightful is the historical background the author gives on the current belief in and use of tests for critical decision-making. The flawed logic behind the use of standardized test scores as a measure of a teacher’s effectiveness is agreed upon by testing experts and psychometricians alike. A test will always have a margin of error; additionally, a test can only reliably measure what it was designed to measure. The human factors present in both test writing and taking means that tests do not have scientific validity, and yet government officials as well as the general population often believe they do. The consequences of NCLB’s focus on testing are pointed out: schools that aggressively focus on test-preparation activities, students who are experts at taking state tests but cannot demonstrate content knowledge in other ways, states that change the raw score needed in order to reach “proficiency,” districts allowing answers to be given to test-takers, others discarding tests taken by its lowest achievers. This message of the ills of NCLB needs to become more readily available to the public.

The direction that NCLB took our country’s educational policy is so ill-informed. The focus on accountability and choice has weakened the nation’s public schools. If only the federal policy makers would listen to some of their states: “Somewhere along the way testing isn’t aligning with excellence” (p. 162). Working with English Language Learners, I see the amazing potential and growth in my students but understand the unfortunate way that the state and nation judges them. Students who have not yet attained proficiency in the English language are still required to take state assessments which more accurately show their lack of literacy and/or cultural knowledge than any measure of their knowledge of the content area. Further, the state-mandated assessment of their English language skills has been a huge disappointment. From grammatical errors in the test to poorly written, non-published reading and listening texts, this assessment tool is deemed worthy enough to determine if my district has met its Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (similar to AYP for general education students). The state has adopted substandard and unprofessional tools to use for evaluating me, while I face ever more stringent criteria of evaluation.

Thefocus on raising standards for teacher preparation was “swept away by [NCLB’s] singular focus on raising test scores” (p. 178). Instead, tying teachers' evaluations to their students’ test scores as a means of teacher evaluation is being implemented; a practice strongly warned against by a report from the National Commission on Teaching & American’s Future in 1996.

The growth of charter schools also continues to have profound affects on neighborhood public schools. I previously taught in Southfield, Michigan, a city mentioned by name in the book due to its large proportion of charter to public schools. Competing for students is a poor way to spend district time and money when the focus should be on content and effective teaching strategies, districts are spending more money on marketing campaigns. Dr. Ravitch correctly points out that public education is NOT corporate America and should not be forced to be run like it is. By subscribing to the belief that choice and a “free-market” system would improve our schools, politicians have only served to weaken public education. As Ravitch states, “Going to school is not like going shopping” (p. 221). Draining needed resources from public schools, charter schools offer select children an education while public institutions are mandated to educate every child within its jurisdiction. The public school system based in neighborhood schools makes the most sense, albeit with needed reforms.

Dr. Ravitch aptly named this book, for she clearly outlines the “death” of our public school system. The frustration so many of us professional educators feel stems from the bad policy from the top, not from the challenges of teaching our students. The wrongly placed emphasis on accountability as found only in high-stakes test scores further emaciates a robust, well-rounded curriculum by forcing districts and teachers to concentrate their efforts at raising test scores instead of truly educating kids. I struggle with the second half of Ms. Ravitch’s title: I cannot yet see the “life” coming back into our system in terms of policy. President Obama’s Race to the Top program illustrates a continued federal mindset of treating
public education like private enterprises. The whole program as a “reform” is a joke; it’s a simple way to coerce state education departments into doing what Secretary Duncan wants, whether it is research-based or not. Educators’ time and energy should be on ensuring quality, consistent curriculum from K-12, not grant-writing and jumping through even more bureaucratic hoops. The idea that schools should be run like companies misses the whole point.

I would have liked to have read practical measures for me as a classroom teacher to take to advocate for federal education policies that actually strengthen our school system. While exposing the fallacy of the idea that “the teacher is everything” (p. 184), Dr. Ravitch doesn’t necessarily indicate what we can do to fight this belief. Clearly, the family and community in which a child grows up have a profound impact on her success in school, and yet educational reforms want shortcuts in which all responsibility is on the teacher and/or district. My professionalism, content knowledge and skill as a teacher can all be called into question while issues of poverty, trauma (most of my students are war refugees from Iraq), interrupted prior education, and level of English proficiency all remain outside of the scope of what is considered by the Department of Education. Dr. Ravitch’s logical arguments give me hope that other intelligent, analytical people will see the false conclusions on which some education policies are based, and yet what I see in reality is that we’re alone and fighting powerful forces that continue to promote these theories of “reform”, including the “big three of education philanthropy – Gates, Broad and Walton” (p. 201).

(Continued from page 16)

Game Review: Truth or Dare for English Language Learners by Leze Djokaj

Leze Djokay agreed to review “Truth or Dare for English Language Learners,” a game created by Brian Grover, a language teaching professional and materials designer living in Vancouver, British Columbia. For more information about the game see: http://www.speekezy.ca

“Truth or Dare for English Language Learners” is a game that inspires real communication. This game, used with adults, gives them the time to shine. A sense of familiarity is spoken through words with ELLs. The learner is constantly being loaded with spontaneous responses. The elements of this game give the players a chance to share cooperative learning with each other and build confidence with their target language. This game gives the players a chance to be confident and active learners. The group I played this with could not have felt more satisfied during and after the game, and every time we played, the excitement was greater than the first! It was very engaging and reinforcing. As a current teacher with ELL students in my classroom, I know games provide highly motivating tasks to learn concepts. They are engaging, challenging, and at the same time, very motivating to the learner. “Truth or Dare for ELLs” gave my group a chance to lower their anxiety level while speaking their 2nd, 3rd, or 4th language in front of others. This game provides meaningful English practice and targets all different learning styles of the learner. I would recommend this game to Adult ESL teachers and anyone with ELL students.

This game was played at home with friends and was passed to colleagues of mine that have Adult ELLs in their daily lives; here is what some of them said:

“The games generated a routine and in a couple of days you were able to notice the fluency of the speakers.”

“This game was so much fun! I enjoyed it and so did my friends!”

“Learning a foreign language needs games like this to reinforce spoken language skills.”

“This game gave my cousins a chance to not be overwhelmed with learning the language; they were relaxed, stress free, and enjoyed the game, while not knowing they were supplementing their language learning.”

“Adult ESL teachers, BUY this game!”

Leze Djokaj is a Kindergarten Teacher for Birmingham Public Schools; her classroom consists of 4 ELL students. She works with ELL students at the college level that are mastering their target language and preparing for their TOEFL exam. Her first language is Albanian and learned English simultaneously. Leze is a graduate TESOL student at Madonna University.
MITESOL and ATECR (the Association of Teachers of English of the Czech Republic) has enjoyed a successful affiliate partnership since 1993. The MITESOL Travel Grant, awarded every other year, is to support a recipient’s professional travel to present at an ATECR conference. The award is in the amount of $750.

ATECR will cover the conference pre-registration fee and provide affordable accommodations within their budget. The 8th International and 12th National ATECR Conference “New Ways to Teaching and Learning” will be held on September 14 and 15, 2012 in the premises of the University of Hradec Králové, Rokitanského 62, Hradec Králové 500 09, Czech Republic. The town is around 71 miles from Prague.

For more information about the Conference, please visit the ATECR website at http://www.atecr.cz/ or e-mail to atecr@centrum.cz

Who's Eligible: MITESOL members

Criteria: Applications will be evaluated by MITESOL Board representatives according to: 1) the quality of the proposal, (b) the applicant’s involvement in and commitment to ESL/EFL teaching and the profession, (c) MITESOL service, and (d) financial need.

To Apply: Submit your application online at http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/ATECR2012
The application requires a summary of the presentation (Max. 100 words) and an abstract (Max. 300 words).

Due Date: The deadline for applications is Saturday 11:00 p.m., March 17th, 2012. The travel grant recipient will be announced by April 23rd. Please note that once your application and proposal has been accepted by MITESOL, you must register with ATECR by May 31, 2012.

NEW WAYS TO TEACHING AND LEARNING
8th International and 12th National ATECR Conference
Presentations by MITESOLers at the 2012 TESOL Conference

Thursday, March 29

Support for In-service Teachers' Mobile Computing
Jeff Popko, Kristen Jatkowski & Jing Jing Wei, Eastern Michigan University
8:30-9:20 a.m., Electronic Village Session, Mac 3-4

Strategies in Searching and Evaluating Online Sources
Katherine Wu, Michigan Technological University
8:30-9:20 a.m., Electronic Village Session, Mac 9-10

Weebly for Teachers
Marta Halaczkiewicz, Western Michigan University
8:30-9:20 a.m. Electronic Village Session, Laptop

Online Resources for the Sheltered Instruction Classroom
Kristin Jatkowski, Trina Manty & Jing Jing Wei, Eastern Michigan University
10:00-10:50am, Electronic Village Session, PC-5-6

Grammaring Along Using E-Resources
Wendy Wang, Sara Okello & Allison Piippo, Eastern Michigan University
10:00-10:50 a.m., Electronic Village Session, Mac 3-4

Putting Function before Grammar: Content-Based Curriculum Development for Beginning ESL
Kate Nearing, Stacy Sabraw & Ryan Lidster, Michigan Technological University
1:00-1:45 p.m., Convention Center - 115 C

Merging ESL and STEM
Kay Stremler & Kim Anderson, Eastern Michigan University
2:00 -2:45 p.m., Room 112-A at the Convention Center.

Friday, March 30

Pronunciation with Oddcast and Voicethread
Marta Halaczkiewicz, Western Michigan University
8:30-9:20 a.m. Electronic Village Session, Laptop

Documentation Styles and Practices across Cultures and Language
A panel presentation by Birch B., Kostka, I., Mott-Smith, J., Tomáš, Z. (EMU), & Williams, H.
10:00-12:45 p.m., Franklin 8 in the Marriott

Quality Assurance in Language Teaching Organizations at Diverse Levels
A panel presentation by Kyungsook Yeum, Bailey Kathleen, Mary Ann Christison, Kimberly Anderson (EMU), Kay Stremler (EMU), John Balbi & Christopher Stillwell
10:00AM – 12:45p.m., Franklin 7 in the Marriott.
Presentations by MITESOLers at the 2012 TESOL Conference

Get a Voice! –Speaking Activities with Voicethread
Marta Halaczkiewicz, Western Michigan University
10:00-11:50 a.m. Electronic Village Session, Laptop

Saying No to Cookie Cutter Tutoring: Writing Center Tutor Training
Helena Hall, Lucie Moussu, and Marian Woyciehowicz Gonsior (Madonna University)
3:00-3:45 p.m., Marriott--Independence Ballroom II

Saturday, March 31
Incorporating Podcasts into the EAP Listening Syllabus
Jeff Popko, Eastern Michigan University
8:30-9:20 a.m., Electronic Village Session, MAC 5-6

Teaching Slang in the ESL Classroom
Allison Piippo & Kristin Jatkowski, Eastern Michigan University
10:00-10:50, Electronic Village Session, MAC 1-2

Incorporating Online Mind-reading Games in ESL Classroom
Shihua Zhu, Katie Coleman, Jessica O’Boyle, Eastern Michigan University
11:00-11:50 a.m., Electronic Village Session, PC 3-4

ESL/EFL Class Publications and TESOL Technology Standards
James Perren, Eastern Michigan University
11:00-11:50 a.m., Electronic Village Session, MAC 5-6

Free Technologies for Online Exchange Programs
Nguyen Thi Khoi Bui, Eastern Michigan University
11:00-11:50 a.m., Electronic Village Session, MAC 7-8

Teaching Digital Citizenship to ESL Students-Creating Class Social Networks
Marta Halaczkiewicz, Western Michigan University
11:00-11:50 a.m. Electronic Village Session, Laptop

From Novice to Professional: L2 Writers in Graduate Writing Groups
Soo Hyon Kim and Shari Wolke, Michigan State University
1:00 p.m., Independence Ballroom II at the Marriott

Beyond the Five-Paragraph Essay: Engaging Students in University Writing.
Schmidt, D., Wald, M., Bennett, G., Frodensen, J., and Tomaš, Z. (EMU)
3:00-4:45pm, Independence Ballroom 3 in the Marriott
Presentations at the Graduate Student Forum, TESOL 2012
Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Paper Presentations

Chinese EFL Students' Perspectives on Writing Instruction
Yue Chen, Grand Valley State University

ELLs Use of Clarification Questions
Lauryn Navarre, Eastern Michigan University

Grammar Along Through Lexical Bundles & Song
Sara Elizabeth Okello, Eastern Michigan University

Learner Noticing and Recasts in Group Tasks
Kirtland Eastwood, Eastern Michigan University

Free Technologies for Online Exchange Programs
Nguyen Bui, Eastern Michigan University

Vocabulary Learning Strategies of Chinese University Students
Jing Guo, Eastern Michigan University

Accent Recognition among Adult Chinese Listeners
Peter Andrew Stern, Eastern Michigan University

Past and Present Perspectives toward Team-teaching
Micheal Manuszak, Eastern Michigan University

Does an American Tongue Mean Everything?
Meng Wang, Eastern Michigan University

Poster Presentations

Reading While Listening for Arabic ESL Learners
Sui Sui Cao, Eastern Michigan University

Gender Roles in Second Language Learning
Jessica Nicole Shamberger, Eastern Michigan University

Chinese College Students’ MI and English Textbooks
Jingjing Wei, Eastern Michigan University

Creating Literate School Identity with Parental Engagement
Katherine S. O'Keeffe, Eastern Michigan University

Online Resources for the Sheltered Instruction Classroom
Kristin Jatkowski, Eastern Michigan University

Developing Online Resources for Sheltered Area Instruction
Trina Manty, Eastern Michigan University
Hotel Information for MITESOL 2012

For your convenience, MITESOL has blocked rooms with the following hotels. Ask for MITESOL Fall Conference Rates when you call to reserve your room. NOTE: Group rates below are listed for King / Double-Double.

Marriott Livonia
17100 Laurel Park Drive North Livonia, MI 48152 (734) 462-3100
$86 / $96
Phone reservations: 1-800-228-9290 and ask for the MITESOL Fall Conference Room Block at the Livonia Marriott.

Online reservations: Use the reservation links below:

King Room: Group Code: MTSMTSA
Detroit Marriott Livonia >>
Double-Double Room: Group Code: MTSMTSD
Detroit Marriott Livonia >>

Best Western Laurel Park Suites
16999 S Laurel Park Dr. Livonia, MI 48154 (734) 464-0050
$69.99 Double-double
http://bestwesternmichigan.com/hotels/best-western-laurel-park-suites
Please call to receive the MITESOL group rate.

Comfort Inn
40455 Ann Arbor Road; Plymouth, MI 48170 (734) 455-8100
http://www.comfortinnplymouthclocktower.com/
$71 / $71
Please call to receive the MITESOL group rate.