Portland State University

PDXScholar

Dissertations and Theses

Dissertations and Theses

Summer 9-2-2015

Perspectives on the College Readiness and Outcome Achievement of Former Intensive English Language Program (IELP) Students

Meghan Oswald
Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds

Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#), [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), and the [Educational Methods Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Oswald, Meghan, "Perspectives on the College Readiness and Outcome Achievement of Former Intensive English Language Program (IELP) Students" (2015). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 2512.
<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.2509>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

Perspectives on the College Readiness and Outcome Achievement of Former Intensive
English Language Program (IELP) Students

by

Meghan Oswalt

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages

Thesis Committee:
Nike Arnold, Chair
Kathryn A. Harris
Linnea Spitzer
Kristi Kang

Portland State University
2015

© 2015 Meghan Oswalt

Abstract

Program evaluation (PE) is important for ESL programs but also difficult. As the scope of PE has grown, student voices have increasingly been included. Alumni provide unique perspectives, but Portland State University's (PSU) Intensive English Language Program (IELP) currently has no exit survey. Furthermore, little research uses alumni data, so this constructivist, mixed-methods study used data triangulation to compare the perceptions of former IELP students with those of three other stakeholder groups—the topic: IELP student preparedness for PSU. Both online surveys and interviews were conducted, and participants included 63 former and 33 current IELP students, 27 IELP faculty members, and 29 PSU faculty members. Overall, respondents often praised the program with regard to how it prepares international students for mainstream classes. However, many also expressed that students were less ready for reading, in comparison to other language skills. Additionally, there was agreement regarding emotional challenges, limited faculty supportiveness, vocabulary, and speaking to and in front of native speakers, among other topics. While there are implications for the IELP, perhaps more importantly, there are implications for PSU.

Dedication

For Dan and Noel who both hopefully know they're the best part of my life, even though
I neglected them in my efforts to finish this thesis.

Acknowledgements

Thank you to Dan for encouraging me to go back to school and supporting me throughout, and to Noel, especially for playing well by himself when I was busy—Noel whose love of the kids' show *Bob the Builder* inspired my thesis editing mantra: *Can we fix it? Yes we can!*

A big, sincere thank you to Nike for not only agreeing to work with me and continuing to work with me, but also for her kindness, patience, expertise, time (so much time), constructive feedback, guidance, and sense of humor. Thanks also to the rest of the committee—Kathy, Kristi, and Linnea—I'm glad I had each of them to help shape this research and to assist me. Additionally, I appreciate the contributions and support of the IELP administrators, including Julie Haun and Wayne Gregory.

If it hadn't been for Jeanne Enders' wisdom or for Kristen Pedersen and Melissa Endicott's giving me extra time and space at work, who knows how long I may have been in this program.

And without the moral support of friends and co-workers, I'd have lost my mind, so in particular, thank you, Monika Mulder, Jeff Maxwell, Eric Dodson, Margo Russell, Josh Reed, Reese Glasscock, Carmen Schwisow, and Sarah Straub for all the chats, high fives, and beer.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	i
Dedication.....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iii
List of Tables.....	v
List of Figures.....	vi
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Research Questions.....	1
Context.....	2
Chapter 2: Literature Review.....	3
Trend Evolution in the Program Evaluation Field.....	7
Student Voices in Program Evaluation Literature.....	11
Lack of Research and Internal Studies.....	14
Conclusion.....	16
Chapter 3: Methodology.....	18
On Resistance.....	18
Participants.....	20
Mixed Methods Research.....	20
Materials and Instruments.....	22
Data Collection Procedures.....	29
Data Analysis.....	31
Chapter 4: Results.....	35
Quantitative Results.....	35
Qualitative Results.....	60
Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusion.....	77
Overlap.....	77
Pedagogical Implications.....	84
Limitations.....	89
Suggestions for Future Research.....	91
Final Thoughts.....	93
References.....	94
Appendix A: IELP Curriculum Level 5 Outcomes (Full List)	98
Appendix B: IELP Curriculum Level 5 Outcomes Condensed into Survey Questions..	102
Appendix C: Original Former IELP Student Survey Questions.....	104
Appendix D: Original Current IELP Student Survey Questions.....	106
Appendix E: Original IELP Faculty Survey Questions.....	108
Appendix F: Original PSU Faculty Survey Questions.....	110
Appendix G: Pilot Survey Questions.....	112
Appendix H: Final Official Former IELP Student Survey.....	114
Appendix I: Final Official Current IELP Student Survey.....	118
Appendix J: Final Frames and Domains.....	122

List of Tables

Table 1: Decisions in the Study Design Process.....	6
Table 2: Examples of Semantic Connections Between Final Themes and Domains.....	34
Table 3: Assessment of Students' Overall Preparedness for Undergraduate Work.....	38
Table 4: Difficulty Rankings of Broad Skills (Based on Friedman Test)	45
Table 5: Selections for Most Difficult Grammar Task.....	48
Table 6: Selections for Most Difficult Writing Task.....	51
Table 7: Selections for Most Difficult Speaking Task.....	53
Table 8: Selections for Most Difficult Listening Task.....	55
Table 9: Selections for Most Difficult Reading Task.....	58
Table 10: Selections for Most Difficult University Skill.....	60
Table 11: Top Themes Regarding Preparedness in Survey Write-In Answers.....	62
Table 12: Rankings of Themes in Survey Write-In Answers Regarding Preparedness...	63
Table 13: Top Themes About Unpreparedness in Survey Write-In Answers.....	66
Table 14: Rankings of Themes in Survey Write-In Answers About Unpreparedness...	67
Table 15: Reported Differences Between the IELP and PSU	68
Table 16: Most Common Themes Found in Interviews.....	72
Table 17: Rankings of Themes in Interviews.....	73
Table 18: Sample of former Student Quotes Aligned with Common Themes.....	74
Table 19: Summary of Consensus Found Among All Stakeholder Groups.....	81

List of Figures

Figure 1: Comparison of student populations by most frequent countries of origin.....	35
Figure 2: Former IELP students' perceptions of their preparedness for broad skills.....	41
Figure 3: Current students' perceptions on preparedness for broad skills.....	43
Figure 4: Difficult grammar tasks according to each stakeholder group.....	48
Figure 5: Difficult writing tasks according to each stakeholder group.....	51
Figure 6: Difficult speaking tasks according to each stakeholder group.....	53
Figure 7: Difficult listening tasks according to each stakeholder group.....	55
Figure 8: Difficult reading tasks according to each stakeholder group.....	58
Figure 9: Difficult university skills tasks according to each stakeholder group.....	60

Chapter 1: Introduction

Curriculum revision is an important part of program evaluation (Murray and Christison, 2010; Norris, 2009) and includes gathering information from many sources, one being the students themselves (Kiely, 2009). Specifically, program graduates can provide unique perspectives, yet Portland State University's (PSU) Intensive English Language Program (IELP) currently has no exit survey. Furthermore, little published research is based on alumni voices, so this study was designed to partially fill that gap by using surveys and interviews to gather quantitative and qualitative perception data from former IELP students and others regarding former IELP student preparedness for PSU.

Although former-student perspectives were emphasized, I used data triangulation to compare the perspectives of four groups of IELP stakeholders—1) Former IELP students currently enrolled in regular PSU undergraduate classes; 2) Current IELP students; 3) IELP faculty; and 4) PSU faculty who often teach former IELP students.

Research Questions

1. To what extent are former IELP students perceived to have achieved the outcomes listed in the highest level of the IELP curriculum (level-5)?
2. Are former IELP students perceived as prepared for their undergraduate programs of study? Why or why not? Was anything seen as missing from the IELP that students needed to feel prepared for regular undergraduate coursework?
3. In what ways do the stakeholders think that former IELP students are prepared or not for their undergraduate programs of study?

Context

The IELP, established in 1964, is one of Oregon's largest university-based ESL programs. This six-level intensive English program's (IEP) student body size has recently fluctuated, growing from about 500 students to more than 600 from 2012 to 2014 (N. Horikawa, personal communication, November 15, 2012; M. Mulder, personal communication, September 30, 2013; K. Kang, personal communication, March 11, 2015), and then falling in 2015 to about 430 (K. Kang, personal communication, March 11, 2015). At times, the majority of the program's students have been Saudi. However, once the Saudi student population became the majority in Oregon, the Saudi Arabian Cultural Mission (SACM) began sending students elsewhere (K. Kang, personal communication, March 11, 2015). Students also come from other countries like China, Japan, Kuwait, Vietnam, Brazil, and South Korea (N. Horikawa, personal communication, November 15, 2012).

The program has two tracks—academic and communication/culture. The academic track is for those who wish to enroll in a U.S. university. Others who prefer to improve their general communication skills and U.S. cultural knowledge can enroll in the newer and smaller communication/culture track. This study will focus on the academic track.

The curriculum in each track is organized by level, and each level is broken down by skill. Students who finish the highest level in all skill areas and faculty recommendation, may advance to PSU's undergraduate classes, even without taking the TOEFL or IELTS test, provided they have a minimum G.P.A. of 2.7. Then, upon leaving, the program offers support services to aid these transitional students (PSU, 2007).

Chapter 2: Literature Review

I began with an interest in curriculum design, and found myself attracted to program evaluation, which is one step in the curriculum design process (Nation and Macalister, 2010). Program evaluation is defined as, “the systematic assessment of the processes and/or outcomes of a program with the intent of furthering its development and improvement” (OEA, 2005), and it can be vital for ESL programs (Murray and Christison, 2010; Norris, 2009)—potentially contributing positively to accreditation, retention, and recruitment (Davidson-Shivers, Inpornjivit, & Sellers, 2004).

Despite the importance of program evaluation, it is, unfortunately, also notoriously difficult (Elisha-Primo et al., 2010; Norris, 2009); it’s “no small task” (Murray and Christison, 2010, p. 216). One source of difficulty is the large and growing scope of program evaluations in the field of Applied Linguistics (Murray and Christison, 2010). Modern descriptions of program evaluation include a wide range of responsibilities; according to Kiely (2009), “the task is...a broad, holistic one, incorporating all aspects of the programme and informed by all stakeholders” (p. 99). Due to the magnitude of the undertaking that is program evaluation today, I could not feasibly conduct a full-scale evaluation and had to instead considerably narrow my focus, so I chose to hone in on perceptions regarding former IELP students—specifically, perceptions of their preparedness for regular university coursework. Briefly I will discuss how I came to that conclusion, and Table 1 below outlines the various possibilities for the study, along with the choices that were ultimately made, and why.

Myriad decisions must be made during the design phase of a program evaluation (Murray and Christison, 2010). Will the focus of the evaluation be determined internally (called program-motivated evaluation) or externally by an accrediting body (called program evaluation for accreditation)? What is the purpose of the evaluation? According to Murray and Christison (2010), there are four possible purposes: Progress-oriented (to determine progress toward goals set by either the program itself, its funders, or its accrediting agencies), decision-oriented (to help make a future choice), research-oriented (to explain effects in order to determine program success), and standards-oriented (to demonstrate that a set of standards has been met with the goal of attaining accreditation). Other choices to be made include the research questions, as well as whether a quantitative, qualitative, or mixed methods model will be used (Murray & Christison, 2010)?

According to the common practices in the field, there were three main options for my evaluation: 1) To use Applied Linguistics theory-based criteria; 2) To use policy-based criteria such as benchmarks or the requirements of accrediting bodies; or 3) To take a constructivist or ethnographic approach that measured the program against the IELP's internal value system (Kiely and Rea-Dickins, 2005). As will be discussed, my personal preference, gaps in the research, trends in the field, and encouragement from IELP faculty all led me to move forward with the third option.

In the early twentieth century, researchers tended to believe that there was only one truth, and their goal was to uncover it (Croker, 2009). These *positivists* thought that it was possible to uncover reality (Croker, 2009). Constructivist postmodernists, on the

other hand, do not believe in a single reality, but rather multiple interpretations of the world (Croker, 2009). This paradigm grew out of the increasingly frequent critiques of positivism; more and more, people argued that everything is subjective and never value-free (Croker, 2009). As a result, very few modern studies are conducted within a completely positivistic framework (Croker, 2009), and this study is no exception. I endeavored to provide a rich, descriptive, and complex picture by investigating what different groups of stakeholders consider to be true regarding former IELP students' readiness for regular college coursework.

Of course, perception is only a fraction of what could have been examined, but perceptions are important because they influence behavior; actions are not necessarily dependent on objective truth, but rather dependent on what people think to be true—higher student satisfaction, for instance, increases the likelihood of student retention in a program (Kiely, 2009). Additionally, former-student beliefs can be of use to accreditors. In fact, according to Davidson-Shivers, Inpornjivit, & Sellers (2004):

Most accreditation bodies of higher education institutions and programs require that programs assess their effectiveness. These accreditation processes often require self-study of individual programs as well as the institution in and of itself. Part of this self-assessment is based on information about the students and those who have graduated from the program. (p. 511)

Table 1

Decisions in the Study Design Process

Decision Area	Options	Decision Made	Rationale
Type	Program-motivated evaluation Program evaluation for accreditation & Formative Summative	Summative program-motivated evaluation	Researcher's pre-existing familiarity with and access to IELP curriculum.
Purpose	Progress-oriented Decision-oriented Research-oriented	Progress-oriented	Natural choice after deciding to pursue program-motivated evaluation
Criteria	Standards-oriented Applied Linguistics theory-based Policy-based Constructivist or ethnographic-based	Constructivist-based	Increasingly acceptance of postmodernism in Applied Linguistics (Croker, 2009) Gap in research: No IELP exit survey Accrediting bodies regularly want information on program graduates. Researcher's personal interest in rich, descriptive data
Method	Quantitative Qualitative Mixed	Mixed	Researcher's personal interest in rich, descriptive, complex data Collecting both types of data has become increasingly popular in the social sciences.
Approach	Product-oriented Process-oriented	Both product and process oriented	Modern evaluations are often holistic like this.

Trend Evolution and Expansion in the Program Evaluation Field

The descriptions above of program evaluation from Kiely (2009) and Murray and Christison (2010) that explained the broad nature of such studies are modern portrayals—evaluation studies are far more expansive in scope than was previously the case, and the options and decisions that must be made are yet greater nowadays (Murray and Christison, 2010). Thus, briefly I would like to discuss how Applied Linguistic program evaluations evolved and came to encompass so much. This summary of the trends over time will include a brief discussion of older approaches, but due to its relevance to the current study, the primary focus will be on recent research that has given more substantial weight to student viewpoints than was previously the case.

Historically, measurements—especially test scores—were relied on exclusively (Guba and Lincoln, 1989). Early program evaluation literature focused narrowly on product (Brown, 1989; Kiely and Rea-Dickins, 2005), meaning that it considered whether programs were actually accomplishing their stated goals. This product-focused approach, particularly the measurement of outcomes, was not only typical of language education program evaluation, but of most social program evaluation in the U.S. and the U.K. (Kiely and Rea-Dickins, 2005).

Later, it became clear that test results alone were not sufficient to guide curricular change, because they only showed whether or not students were succeeding but gave no indication of why or why not (Guba and Lincoln, 1989). As a result, evaluations became more descriptive, providing analysis of student strengths and weaknesses and the extent of their achievement (Guba and Lincoln, 1989). During the Cold War, American

authorities wanted to be more academically competitive with Russia, which led to what Guba and Lincoln (1989) called the *third generation* of evaluation that was characterized by judgment. Judgment meant that evaluators needed to do more than describe and measure; they also needed to use standards and benchmarks—objectives by which to judge performance (Guba and Lincoln, 1989).

These first three *generations* were problematic for many, including Guba and Lincoln (1989), in part because too few voices were included, and too few studies questioned the worth of program goals. Therefore, they outlined their issues with the then current status quo and called for a more constructivist *Fourth Generation* approach to evaluation that was founded on the belief that there was no objective truth (Guba and Lincoln, 1989). Since that time, in response to such calls for change, the demands on program evaluation research have increased and studies have become more sophisticated (Norris, 2009). ESL and other social science research—once narrowly focused on whether stated program objectives were being accomplished (Brown, 1989; Guba and Lincoln, 1989)—have turned, over the years, into a more descriptive undertaking with far more possibilities and subsequent difficulties (Guba and Lincoln, 1989; Kiely and Rea-Dickins, 2005; Norris, 2009). Like Guba and Lincoln (1989), Brown (1989) and Long (1984) each explained that it was no longer enough to merely consider whether the outcomes of a program matched its stated goals (known as a product-oriented approach), but additionally, evaluation should employ more process-oriented approaches. Process-oriented approaches go beyond examining the intended outcomes of a program; a process-oriented approach may, for example, include tasks like evaluating the very *worth*

of the program goals themselves, regardless of whether or not the goals are being met (Brown, 1989).

Product vs. process represents only one important axis of program evaluation approaches that have traditionally been used—some others being formative vs. summative and quantitative vs. qualitative (Brown, 1989). While quantitative and qualitative are common terms, formative and summative may not be as well known. According to Brown (1989):

Typically, *formative evaluation* is defined as taking place during the development of a program...The types of decisions that will result from such evaluation will be relatively small scale and numerous...Summative evaluation, on the other hand, is often thought of as occurring at the end when a program has been completed. The purpose...is to determine whether the program was successful. (p. 229)

Unlike in the past, practitioners now consider both internal and external interests, formative and summative purposes, benchmarks and outcomes, and they frequently employ multiple methodologies, also known as mixed methods research (Ivankova and Creswell, 2009; Norris, 2009). "Over the last two decades, the practice of collecting and analyzing both quantitative and qualitative data within one study has become relatively popular in the social sciences" (Ivankova and Creswell, 2009, p. 136). However, this approach is somewhat new to Applied Linguistics but is increasingly being used because the world is becoming increasingly complex, and this approach enhances accuracy (Ivankova and Creswell, 2009).

While Brown (1989) and Murray and Christison (2010) explained that there are different ways to think about approaching evaluation (such as product vs. process and summative vs. formative), further expansion in the field occurred when Stoller (1999) and others began calling for programs to teach students more than linguistic skills. Language skills, they argued, are not enough to help English for Academic Purposes (EAP) students succeed due to the demands of mainstream classes for academic and acculturation skills as well. Stoller (1999) wrote that the “discrete skills”, like speaking, listening, reading and writing, which became popular in the 1970s, are still popular in EAP classes, yet the acquisition of those skills is not sufficient to prepare students for the demands of regular university courses. This claim was based on the fact that students also need to be able to take notes, use library resources for research, think critically, learn test-taking skills and navigate the expectations of the institution, and this idea is represented in my survey questions by asking for feedback regarding former IELP student readiness to navigate academic culture beyond the classroom.

Of all the trends, most important to this study is the inclusion of student voices in data collection. Until the 1990s, the students themselves were often not a common source of data (Kanno and Applebaum, 1995), but now, consulting students directly has become more popular, and in this study, their input is of particular importance.

Nunan (1989) advocated listening to many voices. He helped to further expand the breadth of the field by supporting what he called a “collaborative approach” to curriculum design, by which he meant that researchers should not consult only one or a limited number of groups, but that rather the perspectives of many diverse groups need to

be taken into account when evaluating a program—those of researchers, specialists in the field, the institutions that provide the funding, teachers, and finally, the learners. “Each individual’s experience, and the way each interprets and makes sense of that experience, are different, and the task of evaluation is to understand these experiences and interpretations without seeking a single, universal, objective truth” (Kiely and Rea-Dickins, 2005, p. 40). This constructivist approach, again known as *Fourth Generation* evaluation (Guba and Lincoln, 1989; Kiely and Rea-Dickins, 2005) has been increasingly common since the early 1990s (Early, 1992; Kanno and Applebaum, 1995; Harklau, 2000; Elisha-Primo et al., 2010).

Student Voices in Program Evaluation Literature

Considering that the perceptions of the former students themselves are such an integral part of this study, I wanted to dedicate additional space to further justifying that decision and fleshing out the well-established modern practice of collecting data directly from the students. This particular type of data, as will be explained below, is so interesting to me because it can provide insights not found elsewhere and reveal mismatches in stakeholder perception. Such information can be used to guide important decisions, satisfy accrediting institutions, make curricular improvements, and increase retention rates, among other purposes.

Based on a synthesis of literature, Kiely (2009) explored the role of learning in EAP program evaluation by focusing on three areas that have not always been considered in the evaluation field, one of which was the quality of the students’ learning experiences. In the past, program evaluation research, according to Kiely (2009), was based more on

theories and measurable outcomes, as was discussed early in this chapter, whereas now researchers must take a more “holistic” approach (p. 107). In other words, researchers must still consider the more traditional factors, but now there are additional considerations that have become accepted in the field, including student satisfaction according to the students themselves. In regards to learning experience, Kiely (2009) explained that studies have indicated that programs that are satisfying to students increase student motivation and play a role in the achievement of their goals. Additionally, through questionnaires and interviews regarding student satisfaction, researchers can potentially help improve program outcomes while also satisfying the requirements of institutions and accrediting bodies (Kiely, 2009). The section that follows will further discuss the importance of student voices to the ESL field and its literature.

An early study that focused on student voices was Kanno and Applebaum (1995). Within their study of three Japanese senior high-school students in Toronto, they acknowledged that they were among only a handful of researchers then (including Early and Harklau) spending a significant amount of time discussing student experience based on first-hand accounts. Collecting data from students was an aberration from the past when student empowerment was discussed, but student perspectives were not typical sources of information. Their “in-depth free-conversation-style interviews” (p. 35) conducted in Japanese revealed the urgency the students felt to find peer groups upon arrival and a mismatch between their ESL classes and the target regular classes. It also uncovered mismatches between what teachers and students felt were the most important educational goals. For example, one student said, “What you do in ESL isn't really useful

in the regular class ... I don't think that they [teachers] even mean it to be preparation for the regular class" (p. 39). This ability of student data to illuminate previously unknown information inspired my decision to go directly to former students for feedback.

A later example of a study that used student voices as a primary data source is Elisha-Primo, Sandler, Goldfrad, Ferenz, and Perpignan (2010), which surveyed 469 graduate EFL students in Israel. Due to the increasing necessity and importance of learning English for foreign students who intend to conduct research, the authors of the study felt compelled to re-evaluate the current program at Bar-Ilan University.

They first began with a needs assessment, a notoriously difficult task (Elisha-Primo, et. al., 2010). In fact, "few programs are actually based on clearly identified and evaluated needs" (p. 458). The results of their study lead them to believe that the curriculum at the university should be changed in order to provide more English related to professional needs and that the curriculum at each level should be more distinct. Furthermore, students ranked vocabulary and speaking skills as the most important English-language areas to learn, yet the program's then current curriculum gave priority to reading and writing, which prompted a discussion and re-evaluation of where curricular priorities should lie. The authors were also led to believe that their program needed to implement different tracks for different needs. Moreover, they felt it was important to bring these viewpoints to the attention of the teachers.

Clearly, in this case also, eliciting data from students directly revealed information that was not previously known. The authors discovered a mismatch between the realities of the program and the desires of the students, which led to curricular change

and enhanced overall staff awareness. This potential to improve curriculum and bring about greater understanding is also at the heart of my motivation to pursue the current study. Along the same vein, the primary aim of a relatively recent study from Kanno and Varghese (2010) was also to find out about the viewpoints of ESL students in order to understand the barriers between those learners and their goals. In their qualitative study at a major public U.S. research university, they interviewed 33 first-generation immigrant students in the U.S. English was not their first language, and their English language ability was considered insufficient to pursue undergraduate work. They also interviewed seven employees of the college who had experience with these students.

Along with linguistic challenges, their interviews found that students reported difficulty dealing with the structure and bureaucracy of the institution. Many of the students reported frustration that they must take language classes that cost them substantial amounts of money, but that they received no credit for them. Based on these results, like Stoller (1999), they concluded that linguistic considerations should not be the only considerations in regards to success in ESL programs. They argued that more research should additionally investigate indicators like access to college. Following these examples, in my surveys, I included questions about former IELP student preparedness for skills related to navigating university culture, including registering for classes, asking questions, finding help, taking notes, and using the library.

Lack of Research & Internal Studies

The studies detailed above were influential forces, but there is simply too little research that has much in common with this study; even similar studies were focused on different populations and questions. This lack of research may be partially explained by the fact that so many program evaluation studies go unpublished because they are conducted internally (Norris, 2009). Furthermore, even if more studies were published, they would not be generalizable to the IELP because research of this kind is so specific to the individual environments where it is conducted. Due to the difficulty of finding relevant, applicable studies, the next natural step in my review of the literature was to consult internal PSU and IELP studies. Two unpublished PSU master's theses have been conducted on the IELP in the last 10 years – one about learning styles and one about student goals.

In the first study, using the results of questionnaires and satisfaction surveys from 56 then-current IELP students in levels 3-5, Heslin (2003) found that students who preferred a certain type of learning style were most likely to be satisfied with the program. Students at lower levels were not included due to probable linguistic difficulties and lack of experience with the program. The participants hailed from many nations, but the largest group of participants came from Japan and Korea, which does not reflect the current make-up of the IELP student population, suggesting the need for more current studies. The data included in this study were both qualitative and quantitative.

The second, Vaught (2009), analyzed the results of 40 student and eight faculty questionnaires about student goals before using the themes from those questionnaires in

semi-structured interviews with a subsection of each of the original groups. This process uncovered perceptual mismatches between student goals for themselves and faculty goals for students. In regards to academic goals, some students reported feeling that the IELP was not helping them to meet their goals.

Conclusion

As summarized in Table 1 on page 6, the current study is *summative* in that it is not examining a program in progress, but rather one that the students have completed (Brown, 1989; Norris, 2009). Like many older studies, this one is *product-oriented* (Brown, 1989) because it seeks to determine whether stakeholders perceive that the IELP is accomplishing its stated goals (Murray and Christison, 2010), but like newer approaches, it is also *process-oriented* because it also asks whether anything was missing from their IELP education, which could potentially indicate gaps in the program's stated goals. This study is also aligned with newer more *postmodernist, constructivist program-evaluation research* that more often includes student voices and includes both quantitative (surveys) and qualitative (surveys and interviews) data collection, or "mixed methods" (Ivankova and Creswell, 2009; Kiely and Rea-Dickins, 2005; Murray and Christison, 2010; Norris, 2009).

Upon reviewing the literature, I have become even more confident in the worth of this study for a variety of reasons. Because determining student needs is such an overwhelming task (Norris, 2009; Elisha-Primo et. al., 2010; Murray and Christison, 2010), it seems that any contribution to that endeavor should be helpful. Moreover, alumni voices are still underrepresented despite the trend of taking student voices into

account in more recent program evaluations (Early, 1992; Kanno and Applebaum, 1995; Harklau, 2000; Elisha-Primo et al., 2010; Kiely, 2009). Also, it was a struggle to find many studies that were similar to the current study (Norris, 2009), and those that were similar had different research questions and took place in different contexts with different populations, so they cannot be generalized to the IELP. For example, Kanno & Applebaum (1995) took place in an ESL setting but in Canada rather than in the U.S., and their subjects were high-school rather than college aged. Elisha-Primo (2010) focused on graduate EFL students rather than undergraduate ESL students. Kanno and Varghese (2010), like my study, concerned themselves with ESL students at a U.S. public university, but they concentrated on current students rather than the former students. This was also the case for the internal IELP studies. Therefore, the current study has the potential to provide a clearer picture of what IELP students need; by focusing on former students and asking different questions, this study is helping to build existing knowledge about the IELP in a meaningful way.

Although I could not predict the outcomes of this study, my inspiration to conduct this research came from the thought that I could potentially play a part in the improvement of a program that I think is already doing a fantastic job. Through tutoring at the IELP, I connected with many of the students, instructors, staff, and administrators in the program, so I have a personal interest in its success. Perhaps through this work, novel information can be discovered and the administration can use the results to make decisions or to help meet accreditation requirements.

Chapter 3: Methodology

For various reasons, program evaluation studies need to be especially carefully designed. This is due to their potentially sensitive nature, the diverse needs of stakeholders, and the complex and sophisticated practices that have come to be expected in this field over time. This section will describe how the study was designed and the justification for each step of that process.

On Resistance

Program evaluation is a sensitive matter (Taut and Brauns, 2003). In fact, “evaluators frequently encounter resistance from individuals affected by evaluation” (Taut and Brauns, 2003, p. 247). Of particular interest to this study is that “summative evaluation often poses a greater threat than formative approaches” (Taut and Brauns, 2003, p. 259). Taut and Brauns (2003) outline various psychological reasons for this phenomenon, including that many program stakeholders—especially staff—can feel very personally involved in the program, and program evaluations have the potential to feel like personal judgment or a loss of power or control. Additionally, it is possible for those involved with the program to have had prior negative evaluation experiences that may influence their opinion of evaluations in general (Taut and Brauns, 2003), or resistance can result when various stakeholders have competing interests and goals. Although I did not know what would be found in the course of this research, I knew that it was possible that indications of not only program strength, but also program weakness could be revealed (Nation and Macalister, 2010). With weakness naturally comes the idea that there is a cause, which means that blame can be attributed to someone or something—a

situation that can potentially feel threatening in regards to reputation or job security (Nation and Macalister, 2010).

Regardless of the reasons for resistance, care needs to be taken in the design phase of such studies to limit resistance if the research is to proceed smoothly (Kiely and Rea-Dickins, 2005). Steps must be taken to ensure that the data will be valid, reliable, and honest (Nation and Macalister, 2010). Also, Taut and Brauns (2003) explore strategies for addressing resistance: Researchers, they wrote, should strive to continuously and effectively communicate with the stakeholders and seek their cooperation when possible (Kiely and Rea-Dickins, 2005; Taut and Brauns, 2003). “Actively involving a wide range of stakeholders can result in a better informed evaluation as well as a protective sharing of responsibility (working with others means you don’t have to take all the blame yourself!)” (Nation and Macalister, 2010, p. 128).

Keeping in mind the usefulness of stakeholder involvement, I informally interviewed a number of IELP instructors before I officially chose my thesis topic. It was helpful to bounce my ideas off them as they provided me with IELP history and context that I had not been aware of, and they pointed me in the direction of other helpful resources. Additionally, I worked closely with my thesis advisor, and one of my thesis committee members, who is on the IELP’s Program Review Committee (PRC), helped me to narrow the focus of my study and to guide my survey questions so that they would be better aligned with the PRC’s goals. Furthermore, I met with the IELP’s Director and Academic Director to discuss my intended research, and they provided further guidance.

Participants

Like much modern research, this study took a constructivist approach, meaning that many different perspectives, or different views of reality, were taken into account (Kiely and Rea-Dickins, 2005). Certainly constructivism has its limitations, and many have offered critiques of this approach, especially in regard to its subjectivity (Kiely and Rea-Dickins, 2005). Therefore, it is important in such studies to use data triangulation in order to balance and compare the varying accounts of reality (Kiely and Rea-Dickins, 2005).

I was most interested in former IELP students who are now enrolled in regular PSU undergraduate classes, and, within this group, I was specifically interested only in those who left the IELP in the two years preceding my collection of data because there had been changes to the curriculum during that time, and the goal was to focus on those students who experienced the curriculum in its most recent incarnation. Though I was most interested in former students, for the sake of accuracy, I chose to use triangulation to compare various views on the matter. Thus, data was collected not only from the former students, but also from other stakeholders, including current IELP students, IELP faculty, and PSU faculty who frequently teach former IELP students. In addition to looking for signs of agreement among different stakeholder groups, another reliability check was to look for consistency within stakeholder groups.

The current students in the study were those in the upper levels of the IELP because they were likely to have observed regular PSU classes, as that is a required assignment in level 4 of the program. Furthermore, students in levels 4 and 5 may enroll

in a limited number of regular courses while they are still in the IELP, so many in the sample should have had at least some limited exposure to undergraduate classrooms at PSU. Many of the current students also have friends and relatives who have moved on from the IELP to PSU, so I thought that they would also be likely to have heard about others' experiences.

Mixed Methods Research

Initially, I was interested in conducting a study that exclusively used qualitative data with open-ended questions but ultimately decided that that would require more time than the scope of this study would allow. On the other hand, I still wanted qualitative data to play a role because I was interested in understanding the participants' experiences in a way that quantitative data alone might not allow (Ivankova and Creswell, 2009).

This led me to mixed methods research, which has been increasing in popularity due to its sophistication—its ability to more accurately describe various dimensions of the results (Ivankova and Creswell, 2009). This approach is a way of exploring complex systems (Ivankova and Creswell, 2009). There are many facets to research questions, and mixed methods helps tackle that obstacle by allowing researchers to more fully explore those various angles, which leads to deeper, clearer, richer, more contextualized and insightful, therefore better, answers to research questions (Ivankova and Creswell, 2009).

After choosing a mixed-methods approach, the next step was to decide on a particular design. Four basic, frequently used designs include Explanatory, Exploratory, Triangulation, and Embedded (Ivankova and Creswell, 2009). Although triangulation was used to compare the perspectives of various stakeholders, this study's mixed-methods

approach would not be deemed Triangulation, but rather Explanatory, which is when "qualitative findings are used to explain, refine, clarify, or extend quantitative results" (Ivankova and Creswell, 2009, p. 139). This type of design is common for applied linguistics research (Ivankova and Creswell, 2009). However, it must be noted that although the questionnaires were almost entirely quantitative, the inclusion of a small number of qualitative questions were embedded as well.

Materials & Instruments

Given the constraints of this research, like most other social science research, the largest data source was questionnaires due to their efficient and inexpensive nature (Dörnyei, 2010). The goal was to collect a minimum of 50 surveys from former IELP students and 20 surveys from each group of other stakeholders. The questionnaires were comprised of mostly closed-ended questions, with a limited number of open-ended ones so that I could quantify most of the information and keep the analysis process feasible. All questionnaires were filled out online, due to the comparative ease of submitting something online versus either mailing or hand-delivering hardcopy surveys. The hope was that this would increase the response rate.

In spite of their advantages, questionnaires lack depth (Ivankova and Creswell, 2009), yet my goal was to *thoroughly* investigate perceptions. Since "gathering information in different forms from different sources almost always improves the quality of qualitative studies" (Hatch, 2002, p. 97), and interviews help to paint a more detailed picture of the situation and "allow insight into participant perspectives" (Hatch, 2002, p. 97), I decided to not only consult various stakeholder groups, but to also conduct

interviews to expand on and interpret the survey results. My exact goal was to complete 10 interviews with former IELP students, and three individual interviews with each group of other stakeholders.

The survey design process.

Each stakeholder group had a different survey but with questions that were similar so that the answers could easily be compared across all groups. The questions for the surveys were designed based on the learning outcomes listed in the IELP's level-5 curricula and the standards laid out in Dörnyei (2010) with the intent of increasing their reliability and validity. Per Dörnyei (2010), both of the student surveys requested: factual information regarding their respective countries of origin, behavioral input about how well the former students are able to perform the outcomes in regular PSU classes upon leaving the program, and attitudinal data about whether the IELP prepares students for undergraduate classes. The faculty surveys were similar, but their factual questions were related to subjects like what courses they have taught, for example.

The first steps.

The process of writing the survey questions began with the then-most-up-to-date copies of the individual level 5 curricula for each skill taught in the IELP: Grammar (updated June 6, 2011), Writing (updated on July 25, 2011), Listening and Speaking (last updated on July 27, 2011), and Reading (last updated on August 1, 2011). For each document, I highlighted each learning outcome listed. Within these four documents, I came up with a list of more than 100 outcomes (See Appendix A for full list). Clearly, my survey could not feasibly have 100 or more questions. Considering the constraints of

this study (including limited time and participants with varying degrees of English-language ability), I had to figure out a way to reduce and condense this list.

In order to decrease the size of this list, I sought patterns and common themes, which helped me to combine multiple, similar outcomes into single survey questions. Furthermore, because writing and speaking are both production skills, these outcomes were often combined into single survey questions. Likewise, receptive skills like reading and listening were sometimes combined also. Additionally, items listed in the curriculum outcomes that were emphasized and repeated less often were not included in the survey questions due to their apparent lack of emphasis in the curriculum (See Appendix B for list of which outcomes in Appendix A are represented by which of my original survey questions. Also, the first drafts of the surveys are attached as Appendices C-G.)

Survey evolution.

After this initial process of designing questions that reflected the curriculum, my surveys were subjected to five more rounds of changes: 1) In response to recommendations from my thesis advisor; 2) Per advice from my committee following the proposal meeting; 3) Again after piloting the surveys; 4) After feedback from the IRB; 5) And finally, after proofreading and self-editing to make language more precise. Below I will briefly describe the nature of and justification for the most important of those changes.

Before my proposal meeting, my advisor recommended some survey changes that would increase the accuracy and precision of my questions and better elicit the desired responses. For example, she recommended that I change a couple of my open-ended

text-entry questions to multiple choice questions so that answers would be more clear, thus allowing me to better compare the various responses. In other cases, she advised me to split some of my open-ended questions into multiple questions. Breaking down these questions into smaller parts helped to ensure that participants addressed all parts of those original questions, and later data would be easier to analyze. Furthermore, before my final surveys were distributed, I increased the size of the text boxes of the open-ended, text-entry questions with the intention of encouraging longer responses from participants.

My original surveys (Appendices C-G) asked participants to rate how prepared they thought former IELP students were to handle a great number of skills, and each skill addressed had its own question in the survey. For example, there was a question asking participants to rate former IELP student ability to use proper tenses. A separate question asked stakeholders to rate former IELP student ability to use proper sentence structure. However, after meeting with my committee, the decision was made to ask participants to rate former IELP students' grammar ability overall, and then that question was followed by a question asking participants to select from a drop-down list what they thought to be the most significant challenges to former students in regards to grammar. This drop-down list included all of the individual skills that previously had been listed as individual questions. This change reduced the number of questions on the surveys, thus lowering the burden on participants and making for a cleaner, less verbose survey. Additionally, my committee agreed that some participants might simply not have a feel for students' abilities to handle each and every one of those skills, so by making this change, they would not be asked to comment on a subject they lack knowledge of.

A built-in advantage of this study was the fact that it was conducted in a higher-education setting, and the majority of the participants had either achieved high-levels of English proficiency or were native English speakers, so for the most part, I did not have to worry about a lack of literacy. On the other hand, I was cognizant of the potential language barriers for participants for whom English was their second language, especially considering that some participants were still in the IELP. Therefore, care had to be taken to ensure that questions were clear and straightforward, so the surveys were designed to take less than 15 minutes to complete. Also, emoticon graphics were included in the student surveys to further clarify meaning, and the use of drop-down menus gave the survey a clean appearance by creating plenty of white space so as not to overwhelm participants with the number of words on the page.

The process of piloting the survey also helped ensure that the questions were worded properly, particularly for the student populations, so that they would be understood and elicit the data I sought. In order to prevent survey fatigue in the target population, I did not pilot the surveys with all groups of stakeholders, but rather only with a population similar to the two student groups of stakeholders, as they were most likely to misunderstand the questions, on account of their being non-native speakers whose English skills either currently or recently were less than sufficient for university-level coursework. Of course, it was also a concern that the student groups would experience survey fatigue as well, so I piloted the survey with a very small group: Six current IELP students taking both regular and IELP classes. Three of the six completed the survey. Attached as Appendix G is the list of questions used in the pilot surveys.

Piloting the surveys led to important changes: The expected time needed to take the surveys, the possible answers to multiple-choice questions, and some question types were modified. In the piloting process, I also found and corrected errors. It is easiest to see these changes by comparing the early survey drafts (Appendices C-G) to the final surveys (Appendices H-K), but to briefly highlight a few specific areas: Originally, the consent forms described the surveys as taking 30 minutes, whereas those who participated in the pilot took fewer than five minutes each. Also, I found that in *Qualtrics*, the survey software I used, I needed to manually enter the question number for each survey question if I wanted the participants to see it. The result of these changes were the final surveys (Appendices H-K), and these final surveys were reported to and approved by PSU's Institutional Review Board (IRB).

Qualtrics itself helped to further ensure validity, especially by allowing for certain rules to be applied in the settings menu. Using these options, I made sure that participants could go back and change their responses to the questions they had already answered, in case they thought of additional information or in case they wanted to improve their answers. Additionally, I made sure that they were not required to finish the survey in one sitting by making it possible to save answers and continue the survey at a later time.

In order to prevent hazards to the best of my ability, surveys and interviews were designed to last less than 15 minutes each. Participants were informed that the researcher was not in a position of power at the IELP or PSU, that the survey data would be shared anonymously as group data, the interview data would be shared confidentially with

personal information coded, and responses would not affect grades or relationships. Moreover, they could stop any time or skip any question for any reason. Not only was this language already written into the consent forms, but also the researcher also verbally expressed this information verbally before the interviews.

The interview design process.

A formal, semi-structured, in-depth design was chosen for interviews, meaning that the interviews allowed subjects to elaborate on their survey answers, were arranged at set times and recorded (Hatch, 2002). Semi-structured meant that, for the sake of comparison, I came prepared with set interview topics to explore with all participants. However, the conversation was allowed to develop somewhat organically because the flexibility to follow the lead of the interviewees is common in constructivist designs; it allows both researcher and interviewee to take responsibility for the direction of the conversation (Hatch, 2002). Considering my initial desire for a more open-ended study that would allow subjects to bring up the topics that weighed most heavily on their minds, this flexibility was particularly appealing. Yet, the flexibility is balanced by the structure of formal interviews, in which both the researcher and interviewee understand that they are there for data collection, as opposed to informal interviews, which are unplanned events, happening incidentally at a time when something else is going on (Hatch, 2002).

The purpose of the interviews was to collect fuller, richer data than the surveys were able to elicit, so I asked participants for elaborations and explanations of their survey answers. The questions I used to introduce the topics were open-ended, so I avoided both yes/no questions and questions with choices provided. Additionally, I took

the surveys' closed-ended questions and asked participants how they would have responded had those questions been open-ended. By the time of the interviews, the survey data had been analyzed, so I also shared some of the major findings of the surveys and asked participants for their perspectives on those findings, including possible indications.

Data Collection Procedures

Subject recruitment.

The Office of Institutional Research and Planning (OIRP) at PSU was able to determine which international undergraduate students were previously enrolled in the IELP. After approval from PSU's Institutional Review Board for a revision, the OIRP sent me a list of 606 currently-enrolled international students who were previously enrolled in the IELP, and then surveys were distributed to that group directly using *Qualtrics*, the survey software available to PSU students and faculty. Of those 606 students, more than 100 completed the survey, but some ultimately were disqualified for a few different reasons. A few emailed me to say that they had never taken IELP classes, so perhaps they ended up on that list because they enrolled in the IELP but never actually attended. Others were deemed not part of the target population because their survey responses indicated that they left the IELP prior to the Winter 2012 term. Another small set of responses was excluded because the participants reported that, although they were done with the IELP and enrolled as undergraduates at PSU, they had not yet begun their PSU coursework. Others were moved to the current-IELP student group because it turned out that although they were on the OIRP list, they were still taking one or more

IELP classes. Ultimately, after all of these cuts, there were 63 former-IELP student survey responses.

As for the other groups of stakeholders, I contacted them directly via email. Both IELP and PSU faculty contact information was available on the university and program websites, and in order to determine which PSU faculty members teach the courses that are most frequently taken by former IELP students, I asked my committee for their expertise. They indicated that PSU students are required to take Freshman Inquiry and Sophomore Inquiry (FRINQ and SINQ) courses, so former IELP students often take FRINQ courses soon after leaving the IELP. I was able to locate those instructors online at <http://www.pdx.edu/unst/frinq-faculty>.

In order to find participants for the interviews that followed the questionnaires, the survey's last question asked whether the informants would be open to further discussing their experience, and if so they could enter their contact information voluntarily at that time. When scheduling the interviews, I attempted, when possible, to select an equal number of those with positive and negative outlooks, based on their response to one of the yes/no questions about student preparedness in the surveys. Specifically: Questions 6 and 22 in the former IELP student surveys; questions 5 and 21 in the current IELP student surveys; questions 3 and 19 in both the IELP faculty and PSU faculty surveys. However, to some extent my interview volunteers were a convenience sample, because I had to accept those who were available to be interviewed, and as a result, the number of positive versus negative survey participants was not completely even; in the former IELP student and IELP faculty group, there were more positive

participants, and in the current student and PSU faculty groups, there were more negative participants.

There were two primary potential benefits of taking part in this study: Input from any one of these groups of stakeholders could potentially lead to positive change in the IELP, and I thought that some stakeholders might have a desire to find a safe and constructive outlet for expressing their opinions. That intuition turned out to be true, as many expressed at the end of their interviews that they were grateful for the chance to talk about this matter, saying, “I like to talk about these things,” and, “Thanks for the option to complain.”

Interviews.

In order to protect identities, all interviews were conducted one-on-one, and interviews were not videotaped. However, they were audio recorded, which allowed me to focus on interviewing instead of taking excessive notes, as well as to review the recordings as many times as was necessary to ensure the accuracy of the reported findings. Participants were instructed not to say their names, and they were informed both verbally and in writing (via the consent forms that they signed) that they were being recorded and why. I also started the interviews with brief friendly chats with the participants in an attempt to make them comfortable (Hatch, 2002). More specific details about how participants were protected during the interviews are available in my approved IRB application.

Data Analysis

I started the data analysis process with the quantitative survey items by calculating some descriptive statistics, including the number of participants from each stakeholder group and the student participants' countries of origin. I also obtained a list that broke down the actual 2014 spring term IELP population by country of origin so that I could compare my participants with the then-current population in order to partially determine the representativeness of my sample.

Both during the period of study and afterwards, even in my notes to myself, subjects were given code names and numbers, and all information was reported as group data. Because I used some open-ended questions and interviews, I went through an iterative process of coding the data for themes, with the guidance of my adviser, as well as Hatch's 2002 book on qualitative research in educational settings, which includes step-by-step guides to ensure systematicity.

Per Hatch (2002), I informally began the process of analyzing the data soon after my first results came in by taking field notes about my initial "impressions, reactions, reflections, and tentative interpretations" (Hatch, 2002, p. 149). Those original results were from the IELP faculty participants, and one theme that seemed to stand out was the mismatch between student expectations and reality when it came to starting regular university coursework—that students were surprised by the volume of homework, for example. I noticed that this sentiment was echoed by the former IELP students when their responses began to come in. They also frequently discussed fundamental differences between regular classes and IELP classes, and many of them expressed

wanting the option to learn vocabulary specific to their majors, and they wish it were easier for them to ask questions in class and to work with native speakers.

Since the main focus of this study is the former IELP students, I collected more surveys from that group of stakeholders than any other, and logically that seemed to be the best place to start my more formal analysis of the surveys. Hatch (2002) recommended that researchers also begin formal data analysis early in the data collection process. The first step in understanding the data was to decide on "frames of analysis" (Hatch, 2002, p. 163), or specific categorical units to be analyzed. These frames of analysis, according to the Hatch guidelines, were permitted to change as the research proceeded, but some initial categories had to be selected before I could start to find meaning in the data. Within the parameters of the frames are smaller units, referred to as "domains" (Hatch, 2002, p. 164).

After reading through the open-ended question data for my initial broad impressions, I changed direction and took the opposite approach, meaning that I then tried to code everything. Completing each of these processes helped me to familiarize myself with the data, which illuminated patterns and gave me an idea of which items were not consistently present. For example, if only a single participant brought up a topic or type of topic, it was eventually dropped. Using this information I determined domains, which Hatch (2002) defined as sharing semantic meaning. These domains are easily expressed and understood when displayed in tables that show their semantic connections to various themes, so below in Table 2 are examples from this study that are displayed in this way.

Table 2

Examples of Semantic Connections Between Final Themes and Domains

Themes	Semantic Connection	Domains
Reading Writing Grammar Speaking Listening Vocabulary Spelling	Are all:	Discrete language skills
Lectures Note-taking Discussions Group work	Are all:	Classroom activities
Level of challenge Types of content Supportiveness of faculty Class size Types of assignments Native to non-native speaker ratio	Are all:	Areas cited as being different in the IELP versus at PSU

Once I finished my process of determining the frames, domains, and themes, my advisor validated them by comparing them to a portion of the survey data that had been gathered from the open-ended questions. The full, final list of frames, domains, and themes are listed in Appendix J.

Chapter 4: Results

Quantitative Results

Ultimately, 152 people participated in the study: 63 former IELP students, 33 current IELP students, 27 IELP faculty members, and 29 PSU faculty members took part in the online surveys, and 19 of the total 152 were interviewed.

Participants in the former IELP student sample population came from 11 different countries—Saudi Arabia, China, Kuwait, Vietnam, South Korea, United Arab Emirates, Thailand, Venezuela, India, Russia, and Iraq—and 10 countries of origin were present in the current IELP students surveyed: China, Saudi Arabia, Vietnam, Kuwait, Qatar, Japan, Bulgaria, Iran, Iraq, and Libya. Thus, in each student group, there was representation from about one-third of the 32 countries present in the 2013-14 IELP population (not including summer term) (K. Kang, personal communication, June 23, 2014).

Figure 1: Comparison of student populations by most frequent countries of origin. This figure shows the percentages of students from various countries in each population. Only countries with at least 5% representation in one or more of the populations were included.

As illustrated in Figure 1, there were many similarities between the sample and target populations: Just as the largest numbers of IELP students came from Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and China in the 2013-14 school year (K. Kang, personal communication, June 23, 2014), so too did the largest numbers of former IELP student participants in this study. In fact, there is an exact match in terms of the percentage of Saudi participants (37% of both the former IELP student sample and the 2013-14 IELP population (K. Kang, personal communication, June 23, 2014)).

Though, admittedly, there are some key differences in the two populations. In comparison to the population of the IELP during the regular 2013-14 school year, there was an overrepresentation of Chinese students in my study (30% of the former IELP student sample population and 33% of the current IELP student population, compared to the 11% of the 2013-14 school year IELP population that called China home (K. Kang, personal communication, June 23, 2014).) Furthermore, there was an underrepresentation of the Kuwaiti students who made up 26% of the regular 2013-14 school year IELP population (K. Kang, personal communication, June 23, 2014) but only a respective 11% and 6% of the former and current IELP student survey participants. It is also unfortunate that I had no Brazilian participants in my study since nearly 6% of the 2013-14 IELP students were from Brazil (K. Kang, personal communication, June 23, 2014).

Research questions.

Are former IELP students prepared for their undergraduate programs of study?

Why or why not?

Overall, responses to the surveys were positive, in that participants tended to speak very highly of the program, generally indicating that former IELP students were satisfactorily able to perform the outcomes in the curriculum and were prepared for their undergraduate classes. In response to a yes/no question, 100% of IELP faculty participants, 94% of the former-IELP student participants, and 87% of the current IELP students reported that they think the IELP prepares students for undergraduate coursework. PSU faculty members were less positive, with 52% of that group reporting that students were prepared. However, it is important to note that PSU faculty members were asked to refer to *all* international undergraduate students on account of the difficulty of knowing who came through the IELP and who did not.

When given more degrees to choose from (*Very*, *Satisfactorily*, *Not Quite*, and *Not*), a calculation of the medians (See Table 3) indicates that the average student respondent, whether a former IELP student or current one, felt that students who leave the IELP and successfully enroll in PSU undergraduate classes are *Satisfactorily* prepared, and *Satisfactorily* was also the most frequently selected option in both of those student populations. For each of the student groups, the interquartile range of their answers to this question came to one, and lower interquartile ranges are indicators of consensus.

Table 3

Assessment of Students' Overall Preparedness for Undergraduate Work

		How well did/does the IELP prepare you/students for undergraduate classes?			Overall, how many IELP/international students do you think are prepared to handle their undergraduate classes?
		<i>Very</i> = 1 <i>Satisfactorily</i> = 2 <i>Not Quite</i> = 3 <i>Not</i> = 4			<i>All</i> = 1 <i>Most</i> = 2 <i>Many</i> = 3 <i>Some</i> = 4 <i>Few</i> = 5 <i>None</i> = 6
		Median Mode			Median Mode
Former IELP students		2 2	IELP faculty		2.5 2
Current IELP students		2 2	PSU faculty		4 4

As detailed in Table 3, a calculation of the median of the IELP faculty responses fell directly between *Most* and *Many*, and the most common response for this group was that *Most* students who leave the IELP are prepared for their PSU undergraduate classes. As with the student groups, the IELP faculty responses to this question had an interquartile range of one. Again, the PSU faculty responses were less positive, but they were referring to a population that included international students who did not go through the IELP. They said that *Few* of the international students in their classes (as indicated by both the median and mode) were prepared for undergraduate work, and the interquartile range for that group was zero, meaning that there was even more consensus within this group.

When asked if anything was missing from the program, half of the student respondents reported that nothing at all was missing (22 of the 50 former IELP students who answered that question, and 13 of the 20 current IELP students who answered that question.). Twenty-nine percent of IELP faculty reported that nothing came to mind when asked if anything was missing, and the PSU faculty participants were not asked this question since they were to focus on all international students and not specifically those who came through the IELP.

Research questions part two.

In what ways are former IELP students prepared or not?

Preparedness for broad skills.

In addition to *overall* preparedness, participants from each stakeholder group also rated how ready former IELP students are to handle specific skills, including language skills (reading, writing, speaking, listening, and grammar) and university skills, such as registering for classes. Isolating each of these skills allowed for a comparison of the responses for each skill to determine whether participants in each group felt better about some skills than others.

Former IELP students.

The student survey respondents were again asked to choose from *Very*, *Satisfactorily*, *Not Quite*, and *Not* for the questions regarding how prepared former IELP students are to handle specific skills in their undergraduate work. After assigning each degree a number (one to four with one being *Very* and four being *Not*, so the lower the number, the more prepared), I calculated measures of central tendency. All calculations

of mode and median for the former IELP student survey answers to the questions about discrete skills came to 2 (*Satisfactorily*), so according to those measures, they perceived their level of preparedness for each of those individual skills as the same.

Those calculations seemed to indicate that former students did not appear to feel more prepared for some skills than for others, which surprised me, so I decided to run additional tests. Because I was looking for differences between more than three groups (the six various skills) within a single population (the former IELP students) and using ordinal (Likert-type) data that is not assumed to be normally distributed, I needed a non-parametric procedure for a repeated measure that would result in a ranking score, which led me to the Friedman test. Running the Friedman test on the former IELP student data resulted in a p value greater than .05, $\chi^2(5) = 5.75$, $p = .33$, so none of the differences between the former IELP students' views of their preparedness for these various skills was statistically significant. Despite the possibility that the differences among the skills were simply due to chance, I still took note of the resulting Friedman ranking scores (See Table 4 for specific numbers), which indicated that in the former IELP student sample, the participants seemed to feel most prepared for their undergraduate listening, and least prepared for their undergraduate reading, but those differences are too small to generalize to a larger population.

Another way to compare these perceptions of the discrete skills that shows slight differences between them is to plot out the frequencies visually on a histogram (*Figure 2*). By looking at this graph, it is possible to see where the small differences in the Friedman scores come from. For former IELP students, in all skill categories,

Satisfactorily prepared was the most popular response, and in most categories, *Very* prepared was selected more often than *Not Quite* prepared, but this was not true for reading. Unlike the other skills, reading had a more normal, bell-curve distribution, with the largest number of *Satisfactorily* prepared answers, the fewest *Very* prepared responses, and a smaller *Very* to *Not Quite* ratio, indicating more negative feelings about reading compared to the other skills. Moreover, I noticed that university skills and speaking received the highest numbers of *Not Quite* votes, and each of those categories also received a vote for *Not*, so it is unsurprising that the Friedman calculations ranked university skills and speaking as the most difficult skills after reading.

Figure 2: Former IELP students' perceptions of their preparedness for broad skills. This figure shows the distribution frequency of the former IELP student participant responses to the closed-ended survey question, "After leaving the IELP, how prepared were you to handle (insert skill) in undergraduate classes?" Uni Skills = *University Skills*.

Current IELP students.

Like the former IELP students, neither the medians and modes, nor the results of the Friedman test indicated the presence of significant differences in the current students' perceptions of former IELP student preparedness for discrete skills, $\chi^2(5) = 7.03$, $p = .22$. Each median and mode for the discrete skills in this group came to 2, which corresponded to *Satisfactorily* prepared. Again, though any differences in the groups were statistically shown to be possibly due to chance, I still examined the Friedman results for the ranking scores of the skills (See Table 4) and found that current IELP students' opinions regarding the difficulty of these skills differed from the former IELP students', especially in regards to reading, which was ranked most difficult for the former IELP students, yet for the current students, it is not even one of the three most difficult according to this calculation.

As with the former IELP student responses, it can again be helpful to see the frequency distributions for the current IELP student responses plotted out in a histogram (*Figure 3*). Because the current IELP students selected *Very* prepared for grammar and writing more often than they did for the other skills, and because none of them reported that the former IELP students were *Not* prepared for grammar or writing, it was expected that those tasks would be ranked as the least difficult by the Friedman test calculations, and that was, in fact, the case. However, it was less apparent which skills they considered the most difficult. On the one hand, for example, speaking had the largest number of *Not Quite* responses, but it did not have the fewest number of *Very* votes. Likewise, university skills had the largest number of *Not* votes, but only by a small margin, and listening tied for the fewest selections for *Very* and had more *Not Quite* votes

than university skills, so it was not clear until after the calculations that speaking would be ranked as the most difficult and university skills as the second most difficult.

Figure 3: Current IELP students' perceptions of former IELP students' preparedness for broad skills. This figure shows the distribution frequency of the current IELP student participants' responses to the closed-ended survey question, "How well do you think the IELP prepares students to handle (insert skill) in undergraduate classes?" Uni Skills = *University Skills*.

IELP faculty.

The faculty participant scales were different from those used for the students.

Rather than selecting the extent of student preparedness, they were to choose *how many* former IELP students were prepared for each skill in their undergraduate coursework.

The options were *All, Most, Many, Some, Few, and None*. As with the student responses, the options were automatically assigned numbers by the survey software, in this case, 1-6 (with 1 being *All* and 6 being *None*, so the lower the number, the more students they expected were prepared.)

Unlike in the student groups, the medians and modes for the individual skills in the IELP faculty group were actually different in some cases. According to those calculations, it seems that the IELP faculty tend to think that the largest numbers of former IELP students are ready to take on undergraduate speaking and university skills (tied at 2 for both their medians and modes, indicating *Most*), followed by writing with a median of 2.5 (between *Most* and *Many*) and a mode of 2 (*Most*). The medians and modes indicate that IELP faculty believe that the fewest number of former IELP students in undergraduate PSU classes are ready for the required reading, which had a median of 3.5 (between *Many* and *Some*) and a mode of 4 (*Some*). The IELP faculty's ratings of grammar and listening were tied in the middle, both with medians and modes of 3 (*Many*). When I ran the Friedman test on this data set (See Table 2), the resulting p value was less than .05, $\chi^2(5) = 30.73$, $p = .00$, meaning that one or more statistically significant difference was detected, though this test does not indicate where. It seems clear from a glance that surely there is a significant difference between reading (ranked in this group as the skill students are least prepared for) and university skills (ranked in this group as the skill students are most prepared for), but there could be additional significant differences, so the Wilcoxon rank-sum test could be used to determine whether that is the case.

PSU faculty.

The medians and modes for the PSU faculty's perceptions of the discrete skills all came to 4 (meaning that the average PSU faculty participant thought that *Some* international students are prepared), with the exception of listening, whose median and

mode both came to 3 (meaning *Many*) in this group. As with the IELP faculty, the resulting p value of the Friedman test was less than .05, $\chi^2(5) = 30.73$, $p = .00$, indicating that at least one statistically significant difference is present in the PSU faculty's responses regarding the broad skills, but again, this test does not pinpoint the location(s) of difference. There must be a significant difference between grammar (ranked in this group as the skill students are least prepared for) and listening (ranked in this group as the skill students are most prepared for), but there could be other significant differences, so again the Wilcoxon rank-sum test could be used to determine whether that is the case. After listening, the ranking scores for this group (See Table 4) point to university skills as the area where international students are next most prepared, followed by speaking, writing, reading, and finally grammar.

Table 4

Difficulty Rankings of Broad Skills (Based on Friedman Test) by Stakeholder Group

Skill	Former IELP Students	Current IELP Students	IELP Faculty	PSU Faculty	Sum of ranks
Listening	1 (3.29)	4 (3.65)	4 (3.67)	1 (2.61)	10
Writing	3 (3.40)	2 (3.15)	3 (3.42)	4 (4.11)	12
Uni. skills	5 (3.58)	5 (3.77)	1 (2.38)	2 (2.82)	13
Grammar	2 (3.35)	1 (3.12)	5 (4.00)	6 (4.29)	14
Speaking	4 (3.55)	6 (3.90)	2 (2.88)	3 (3.00)	15
Reading	6 (3.83)	3 (3.40)	6 (4.65)	5 (4.18)	20

Note. Friedman results are in parentheses next to the rankings. For each group of stakeholders, each respondent's answer to the question regarding the former students' preparedness in their PSU classes for each skill was fed into the Friedman test. 1 = Perceived as least difficult, and 6 = Perceived as the most difficult. Uni = University.

As illustrated in Table 4, using the Friedman rankings for each group, I triangulated the four groups' perceptions of the discrete skills by assigning the numbers 1 (for the least difficult) through 6 (for most difficult) to the ranks, and the other skills were respectively labeled 2, 3, 4 and 5. Once I assigned these numbers to each of the skills in each of the stakeholder groups, I added those numbers together for each skill to get a quick sense for, overall, how difficult that skill was perceived. According to this calculation, reading was seen as the most difficult, followed by speaking, and then grammar.

What is encompassed and meant by these broad skills could be somewhat ambiguous because each participant could be thinking about different tasks when they think about the skill. For instance, when asked about speaking, some survey takers could have based their answers on casual conversations with native speakers while others perhaps had formal presentations in mind because both are speaking-intensive tasks. Therefore, the surveys also included questions about specific tasks within each of the broader skills, including, *Which of these listening tasks do you think is the most difficult for former IELP students in their undergraduate classes?* and *Which of these writing tasks do you imagine is likely the most difficult for former IELP students in undergraduate classes?* In analyzing the data that resulted from asking about these specific language tasks, I found that the former IELP students overwhelmingly focused on vocabulary, in that they rated it to be the number one most difficult task in all skill areas in which it was an option.

Research questions part three.

To what extent have former IELP students achieved the outcomes listed in the level-5 IELP curriculum?

The questions in the surveys that addressed this research question were those pertaining to the specific skills within each broad language area, as those were the questions that were designed by pulling language and outcomes directly from the level-5 IELP curriculum. Again, see Appendices A and B for the full list of outcomes and which survey questions contained which outcomes.

Specific Grammar Tasks.

All stakeholder groups most frequently chose either *Using the right articles, prepositions, and word combinations* or *Using a variety of sentence structures* as the most difficult grammar task. As illustrated in both Table 5 and Figure 2, most groups chose the former option most frequently. However, the former IELP students' top choice was *Using a variety of sentence structures*, which was surprising considering that fewer than half as many participants in each of the other stakeholder groups chose that option.

In spite of that difference, the overlap among the stakeholder groups in this category was substantial, in that they all had the same top two answers, and not one of the groups selected *Using the right verb tenses* or *Using active and passive voices correctly* as one of their top answers. In fact, not even one PSU faculty member chose one of those alternatives, and each of those choices each respectively got only one vote from IELP faculty.

Table 5

Selections for Most Difficult Grammar Task as Percentage of Each Stakeholder Sample

Task	Former IELP Students (n = 54)	Current IELP Students (n = 28)	IELP Faculty (n = 22)	PSU Faculty (n = 20)	Sum of Percentages
Articles, prepositions...	26%	50%	77%	90%	243
Sentence variety	43%	21%	14%	10%	88
Active/Passive	20%	11%	5%	0%	36
Verb tenses	11%	18%	5%	0%	34

Note. Percentages are, specifically, percentage of participants who answered the question (not percentage of all participants in that stakeholder group.) Percentages rounded to the nearest whole number. Articles, prepositions = *Using the right articles, prepositions, and word combinations*; Sentence variety = *Using a variety of sentence structures*; Active/Passive = *Using active and passive voices correctly*; Verb tenses = *Using the right verb tenses*.

Figure 4: Difficult grammar tasks according to each stakeholder group. This figure shows how many respondents in each group surveyed chose each option as the most difficult grammar task listed for former IELP students. Respondents were only permitted to select one.

Specific Writing Tasks.

When it came to writing, the data were more complex, in part, because there were more options to choose from. Specifically, there were nine possible answers, and responses varied widely, but patterns were found (See Table 6 for summary of each group's selections for difficult writing tasks). In terms of raw data for all four stakeholder groups combined, more participants overall chose *Using a variety of academic vocabulary* and *Editing (Their own writing and the writing of others)* as the most difficult writing skills listed in the surveys, while *Writing effective thesis statements* and *Using transitions and other cohesive devices* were selected least often. In all groups, *Collecting information from good sources* was among the top four most frequently selected choices for most difficult task, but it was never the most common choice. Additionally, *Making strong arguments* was among the top four choices in each group for the most difficult task, but it was only the most common choice in the current IELP student stakeholder group (tied for first with *Using a variety of academic vocabulary*).

In both student groups, large percentages of the participants chose *Using a variety of academic vocabulary*. In the current IELP student group, there was a tie for the most common response to this question, so just as many participants in that group also chose *Making strong arguments*, which was the fourth most common response in the former IELP student group out of the nine options, so it was in the upper half of their most frequent responses as well. Another popular answer—though to a lesser extent—was *Collecting information from good sources*. The former IELP students chose *Using citations and reference lists* as one of their top answers, while only one current IELP

student selected that response. In both student groups, *Choosing and developing topics*, was among the least popular choices.

Unlike the students, both faculty groups chose *Editing (Their own writing and the writing of others)* more often than any other option as the hardest task for former IELP students. Additionally, in both faculty groups, one of the most popular answers was *Making strong arguments*. However, the faculty groups did not entirely agree because *Choosing and developing topics* was the second most frequent IELP faculty answer, yet none of the PSU faculty participants chose that option. *Collecting information from good sources* was also a top IELP faculty response to this question. On the other hand, none of them chose *Using transitions and other cohesive devices*, and only one IELP faculty member selected *Using a variety of academic vocabulary*. In both faculty groups, among the least popular answers were *Writing effective thesis statements*, *Using citations and reference lists*, and *Creating good visual aids in papers*.

The IELP faculty were the only group to select *Choosing and developing topics* as one of their top choices. Likewise, the only group to select *Writing effective thesis statements or creating good visual aids* as one of their top answers was the current IELP students, and the former IELP students group was the only one with *Using citations and reference lists* as popular response.

Table 6
Selections for Most Difficult Writing Task as a Percentage of Each Stakeholder Sample

Task	Former IELP Students (n = 55)	Current IELP Students (n = 26)	IELP Faculty (n = 22)	PSU Faculty (n = 20)	Sum of percentages
Editing	7%	8%	50%	40%	105
Academic vocab	40%	27%	5%	10%	82
Strong arguments	9%	27%	14%	30%	80
Collecting info	15%	12%	9%	10%	46
Topics	5%	0%	23%	0%	28
Cohesive devices	0%	8%	0%	10%	18
Citations	13%	4%	0%	0%	17
Visual aids	7%	8%	0%	0%	15
Thesis statements	4%	8%	0%	0%	12

Note. Percentages are, specifically, percentage of participants who answered the question (not percentage of all participants in that stakeholder group.) Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number. Editing = *Editing (Their own writing and the writing of others)*; Academic vocab = *Using a variety of academic vocabulary*; Strong arguments = *Making strong arguments*; Collecting info = *Collecting information from good sources*; Topics = *Choosing and developing topics*; Cohesive devices = *Using transitions and other cohesive devices*; Citations = *Using citations and reference lists*; Visual aids = *Creating good visual aids in papers*; Thesis statements = *Writing effective thesis statements*.

Figure 5: Difficult writing tasks according to each stakeholder group. This figure shows how many respondents in each group surveyed chose each option as the most difficult writing task for former IELP students. Respondents were only permitted to select one from the list of options.

Specific Speaking Tasks.

I was especially interested in which speaking tasks were considered difficult since speaking was determined to be one of the more difficult tasks (after reading) in my analysis of the broad skills. Overall, the most difficult speaking task was perceived as *Using a variety of academic vocabulary*, with three of the four stakeholder groups choosing that option most frequently. The next most common response was *Managing time and anxiety during speeches*, and there was a consensus among all stakeholder groups that former IELP students do not have trouble creating visual aids for their presentations, as it was the least most common response. In fact, only 2 of the 152 total participants (1.3%) chose it as the most difficult speaking option, and not a single faculty member – in the IELP or PSU – selected it.

Table 7

Selections for Most Difficult Speaking Task as a Percentage of Each Stakeholder Sample

Task	Former IELP Students (n = 51)	Current IELP Students (n = 26)	IELP Faculty (n = 22)	PSU Faculty (n = 19)	Sum of percentages
Academic vocab	37%	36%	27%	16%	116
Time and anxiety	29%	18%	18%	37%	102
Strong arguments	8%	7%	23%	26%	64
Non-verbals	14%	18%	14%	16%	62
Topics	10%	18%	18%	5%	51
Visual aids	2%	4%	0%	0%	6

Note. Percentages are, specifically, percentage of participants who answered the question (not percentage of all participants in that stakeholder group.) Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number. Academic vocab = *Using a variety of academic vocabulary*; Time and anxiety = *Managing time and anxiety during speeches*; Strong arguments = *Making strong arguments*; Non-verbals = *Using proper and effective body language and other non-verbals*; Topics = *Choosing and developing topics*; Visual aids = *Creating visual aids*.

Figure 6: Difficult speaking tasks according to each stakeholder group. This figure shows how many respondents in each group surveyed chose each option as the most difficult speaking task for former IELP students. Respondents were only permitted to select one from the list of options.

The former IELP students' most and least frequent selections for difficult speaking tasks matched the overall results, in that their most common choice was *Using a variety of academic vocabulary*, the second most popular response in that group was *Managing time and anxiety during speeches*, and the fewest number of responses were for *Creating visual aids*. *Using a variety of academic vocabulary* was also the current IELP students' top response. Just like the two student groups, IELP faculty chose *Using a variety of academic vocabulary* more often than any other option, while the PSU faculty's view of speaking tasks was different from the other groups: Although *Managing time and anxiety during speeches* was a top selection for this group just as it was for the other stakeholder groups, *Making strong arguments* was the second most popular response. Thus, not only was *Using a variety of academic vocabulary* not the most popular response in this group like it was in the others, but also not even the second most common.

Specific Listening Tasks.

Because my analysis of the broad skills resulted in listening as being ranked the least difficult task for former IELP students, I thought it might be interesting to start by taking note of which specific listening task was considered by the fewest to be the most difficult skill, as it may indicate an area of particular strength in the program.

Understanding lecture vocabulary was overall considered the most difficult listening task, while *Finding a lecture's main ideas* appeared to be considered the least difficult of the options.

Table 8

Selections for Most Difficult Listening Task as a Percentage of Each Stakeholder Sample

Task	Former IELP Students (n = 52)	Current IELP Students (n = 26)	IELP Faculty (n = 21)	PSU Faculty (n = 17)	Sum of percentages
Lecture vocabulary	37%	19%	29%	35%	120
Understanding ideas	6%	23%	24%	41%	94
Taking notes	12%	35%	29%	6%	82
Non-verbal cues	13%	12%	10%	6%	41
Retaining lectures	29%	8%	0%	0%	37
Finding main ideas	4%	4%	10%	12%	30

Note. Percentages are, specifically, percentage of participants who answered the question (not percentage of all participants in that stakeholder group.) Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number. Lecture vocabulary = *Understanding lecture vocabulary*; Understanding ideas = *Understanding the information and ideas*; Non-verbal cues = *Understanding non-verbal cues in lectures*; Finding main ideas = *Finding a lecture's main ideas*; Retaining lectures = *Remembering lectures later*; Taking notes = *Taking lecture notes that are helpful later*.

Figure 7: Difficult listening tasks according to each stakeholder group. This figure shows how many respondents in each group surveyed chose each option as the most difficult listening task for former IELP students. Respondents were only permitted to select one from the list of options.

Just as using academic vocabulary came up as a most difficult speaking task, *Understanding lecture vocabulary* was again selected most frequently by the former IELP student participants as the most difficult task in the listening category. Oddly, a large percentage also chose *Remembering lectures later*, whereas none of the faculty participants chose this response, and only 2 current IELP student participants selected that option. The fewest number of students selected *Finding a lecture's main ideas*, which is consistent with the overall results.

The largest percentage of the current IELP student participants chose *Taking lecture notes that are helpful to them later*, which was not even in the top three former-student answers. Many others chose *Understanding the information and ideas in lectures*. Unlike former IELP students, the current IELP students did not most frequently choose *Understanding lecture vocabulary*, but it was still one of the top three most popular answers, which means it was within the top half of the most frequent responses. As with the former IELP students, the current ones appear to have regarded *Finding a lecture's main ideas* as the least difficult task on the list.

Like the former students, many IELP faculty chose *Understanding lecture vocabulary* as one of the most difficult tasks, equally as many selected *Taking lecture notes that are helpful later*, and close behind was *Understanding the information and ideas*. On the other hand, based on this survey, IELP faculty did not find *Remembering lectures later* to be a prominent difficulty, as none of them selected that option.

The top response from the PSU faculty was *Understanding the information and ideas in lectures*, followed by *Understanding lecture vocabulary* and *Finding a lectures*

main ideas. As with the IELP faculty, not one PSU faculty participant chose *Remembering lectures later* either.

Specific Reading Tasks.

Of all of the broad skill categories, I was most interested in which Reading tasks were viewed as the hardest because Reading was at the top of the most difficult list after triangulating the closed-ended survey responses related to the broad skills (See Table 4). Vocabulary was overwhelmingly seen as the major reading difficulty, just as it was in the previously discussed broad language areas: Grammar, writing, speaking, and listening. In fact, three of the four stakeholder groups—so all participant groups with the exception of the PSU faculty participants—most frequently choose *Understanding the vocabulary* as the most difficult reading skill.

However, there was less consensus regarding the former IELP students' ability to *summarize* their readings in their regular classes: While the former IELP students and PSU faculty members least frequently selected *Summarizing* as the most difficult task, the current IELP students and IELP faculty chose *Summarizing* second most often, after *Understanding the vocabulary*.

Table 9

Selections for Most Difficult Reading Task as a Percentage of Each Stakeholder Sample

Task	Former IELP Students (n = 53)	Current IELP Students (n = 26)	IELP Faculty (n = 21)	PSU Faculty (n = 20)	Sum of percentages
Vocabulary	47%	35%	52%	20%	154
Understanding ideas	23%	23%	14%	40%	100
Summarizing	13%	31%	29%	15%	88
Finding the main ideas	17%	12%	5%	25%	59

Note. Percentages are, specifically, percentage of participants who answered the question (not percentage of all participants in that stakeholder group.) Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number. Vocabulary = *Understanding the vocabulary*; Understanding ideas = *Understanding the information and ideas*.

Figure 8: Difficult reading tasks according to each stakeholder group. This figure shows how many respondents in each group surveyed chose each option as the most difficult reading task listed for former IELP students. Respondents were only permitted to select one.

Specific University Skills.

Three of the four stakeholder groups most frequently selected *Asking questions in class* as the most difficult university skill with a full 70% of PSU faculty and 50% of former IELP students choosing that option. *Working in groups* and *Finding help when they need it* were generally considered the next most difficult university skills, so the most common responses were all related to speaking to and in front of native speakers. On the other hand *Using the library* and *Registering for classes* were overall considered the least difficult.

Table 10

Selections for Most Difficult University Skill as Percentage of Each Stakeholder Sample

Task	Former IELP Students (n = 50)	Current IELP Students (n = 26)	IELP Faculty (n = 20)	PSU Faculty (n = 20)	Sum of percentages
Asking questions	30%	19%	50%	70%	173
Working in groups	22%	31%	10%	0%	59
Finding help	10%	12%	20%	15%	59
Note-taking	20%	12%	10%	10%	49
Organization	6%	8%	10%	0%	25
Using the library	4%	8%	0%	5%	18
Registering	8%	12%	0%	0%	17

Note. Percentages are, specifically, percentage of participants who answered the question (not percentage of all participants in that stakeholder group.) Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number. Asking questions = *Asking questions in class*; Finding help = *Finding help when they/you need it*; Organization = *Organizational skills (like using calendars, folders, and binders)*; Registering = *Registering for classes*.

Figure 9: Difficult university skills tasks according to each stakeholder group. This figure shows how many respondents in each group surveyed chose each option as the most difficult university skills task for former IELP students. Respondents were only permitted to select one from the list of options.

Qualitative Results

Because I initially envisioned an entirely qualitative research design, I particularly enjoyed analyzing the surveys' open-ended questions and interview data. I was anxious to see what the participants emphasized and where their discussions led when they had free reign to express anything they liked. What I found was that, the qualitative data were consistent with the quantitative data: Many spoke highly of the former IELP students' sound preparation in writing, even though writing is still a difficulty, whereas reading and speaking to native speakers of English were the most commonly cited areas of unpreparedness. Naturally, the qualitative data provided a richer account of the former IELP students' experiences, and I additionally found that many think they need more exposure to discipline-specific vocabulary and content prior to their undergraduate coursework, as well as more challenge in the IELP.

Regarding preparedness.

Table 11

Top Themes Regarding Preparedness in Survey Write-In Answers by Stakeholder Group

Former IELP Students	Current IELP Students	IELP Faculty	PSU Faculty
1. Writing	1. Writing	1. Writing	1. Good Students
2. (Tie) Reading; Research Papers	2. U.S. University Culture	2. U.S. University Culture	2. Positive Comparison to Native Students
3. Listening	3. Reading	3. Reading	3. Writing
4. Note Taking	4. Confidence	4. (Tie) Note Taking; Research Papers	4. (Tie) Speaking; Study Skills
5. Speaking	5. (3-Way Tie) Speaking, Presentations, Research Papers	5. Level of Challenge	5. (3-Way Tie) Discussions, Asking for Help, Comprehension
6. Confidence	6. (8-Way Tie) Grammar; Listening; Academic Vocabulary; Note Taking; Discussions; Homework; Sufficiency for Goals; Students Responsible for Learning	6. Lectures	6. (5-Way Tie) Grammar, Communication with Teachers, Homework, Sufficiency for Goals, Level of Challenge

Table 12

Rankings of Themes Present in Survey Write-In Answers Regarding Preparedness, Arranged by Stakeholder Group and based on Frequency

Theme	Former IELP Students	Current IELP Students	IELP Faculty	PSU Faculty	Sum of Ranks
Writing	1	1	1	3	6
Reading	2	3	3	X	--
Research Papers	2	5	4	X	--
Speaking	5	5	8	4	22
Note Taking	4	6	4	X	--
U.S. university culture	11	2	2	X	--
Listening	3	6	7	X	--
Confidence	6	4	X	X	--

Note. A ranking of one means that the theme was present in more participant answers in that stakeholder group than any other theme. X = Theme not present in any of this stakeholder group's answers to open-ended questions.

-- denotes that number cannot be computed because theme was not present in some groups.

Tables 11 and 12 above summarize the skills that former IELP students *are* perceived as being prepared to handle in their regular PSU courses, as expressed in their open-ended survey responses.

Preparedness according to former IELP student open-ended survey responses.

When asked to write in survey answers regarding the ways they felt prepared, former IELP students often focused on language skills and reported feeling especially prepared for undergraduate writing more than any other skill, especially in regards to writing research papers. Of the 58 former IELP student participants who wrote in answers about the ways they felt prepared for undergraduate classes, nearly 35% of them brought up the topic of writing, and about 10% of those who responded to the question expressed feeling prepared for writing research papers. The next most frequent discrete language skills represented in former student answers, after writing, were reading, listening, and then speaking. On the other hand, the topics of vocabulary, grammar, and spelling were least often present in answers.

Preparedness according to current IELP student open-ended survey responses.

In many ways, the themes in the current IELP student survey write-in responses were similar to those in the former IELP student answers. Like the former IELP students, the current IELP students were focused on language skills, most often including their belief that the IELP does an especially good job of preparing students for university writing, particularly for research papers. The two student groups also agreed to some degree that former IELP students are well prepared to handle college reading and, to a lesser extent, speaking and listening. Additionally, both student groups expressed the belief here that students become more confident as a result of the IELP. On the other hand, the theme found second most frequently in the current IELP students' write-in survey answers was that the former IELP student were particularly prepared for U.S.

university culture, whereas this topic was not among the top themes for the former IELP students (it was only the 11st most common topic found in that group's responses.). Furthermore, the current IELP students were the only group to frequently express that former IELP students are especially well prepared for academic vocabulary.

Preparedness according to IELP faculty open-ended survey responses.

Yet again, as it was in the two student groups' answers, writing was the number one theme in the IELP faculty survey write-in responses when asked how students are prepared, so clearly writing is perceived as an area of real strength in the IELP. Like the current IELP students, IELP faculty also emphasized the ability of former IELP students to navigate U.S. university culture, and as in both of the student groups, one of the more frequent themes present was that of reading. As can be seen in Table 11, some of their other more common themes did not match those of the other stakeholder groups.

Preparedness according to PSU faculty open-ended survey responses.

Unsurprisingly, the themes found in the PSU faculty's write-in survey responses were a little different from those found in the other stakeholder groups, though there were some similarities. When the PSU faculty praised their international students, they were more focused on their work ethic, grit, and maturity, especially in comparison to their non-international students. Although it was not the most popular theme found, as it was in the other groups, writing was still a topic that PSU faculty members included when asked to describe how their international students were prepared for their undergraduate classes, and, as in the other participating groups, they too expressed to some degree that students were prepared for speaking.

Regarding unpreparedness.

Table 13

Top Themes About Unpreparedness in Survey Write-In Answers by Stakeholder Group

Former IELP Students	Current IELP Students	IELP Faculty	PSU Faculty
1. Major-specific vocabulary and content	1. Speaking	1. Reading	1. Writing
2. Vocabulary; High level of challenge	2. (Tie) Reading; Speaking to and in front of native speakers	2. (3-Way Tie) Writing; U.S. university culture; High level of challenge	2. Reading
3. (Tie) Reading; Speaking	3. (5-way tie) Major-specific vocabulary and content; Listening; Confidence; U.S. university culture; High level of challenge	3. Grammar	3. (Tie) U.S. university culture; High level of challenge
4. Writing	4. (9-Way Tie) Lack of support from PSU faculty; Real life application of skills; Discussions; Group work; Communicating with peers; Presentations; Assessment; Non-academic pursuits; American culture in general;	4. Vocabulary	4. Grammar
5. (4-Way Tie) Presentations; Non-academic pursuits; Limited PSU faculty support (vs. IELP); Speaking to and in front of native speakers		5. Lack of support from PSU faculty (in comparison to IELP faculty)	5. (Tie) Speaking; Comprehension
6. (5-Way Tie) Group work; American culture in general; Lack of confidence or comfort; U.S. university culture; Volume of reading		6. Speaking to and in front of native speakers 7. Group work	6. (3-Way Tie) Asking for help when they need it; American culture; Format (inc. proper citations) 7. Confidence

Table 14

Rankings of Themes Present in Survey Write-In Answers Regarding Unpreparedness, Arranged by Stakeholder Group and based on Frequency

Theme	Former IELP Students	Current IELP Students	IELP Faculty	PSU Faculty	Sum of Ranks
Reading	3	2	1	2	8
High level of challenge	2	3	2	3	10
Writing	4	X	2	1	--
U.S. university culture	6	3	2	3	14
Speaking	3	1	8	5	17
General and academic vocabulary (not major specific)	2	X	4	9	--
Lack of support from PSU faculty	5	4	5	8	22
Grammar	7	X	3	4	--
Major-specific vocabulary and content	1	3	9	X	--
Lack of confidence and comfort	6	3	8	7	24
Listening	7	3	8	9	27

Note. A ranking of one means that the theme was present in more participant answers in that stakeholder group than any other theme. X = Theme not present in any of this stakeholder group's answers to open-ended questions.

-- denotes that number cannot be computed because theme was not present in some groups.

According to the former IELP students.

When the former IELP students were asked in the surveys how they were unprepared for PSU undergraduate classes, the most common themes found in responses were vocabulary, the high level of challenge, reading, and speaking. Specifically, they referred to the difficulty of understanding field-specific words, the volume of reading, speaking with and in front of native speakers, and making presentations.

Within their open-ended answer responses about the ways they were not prepared for PSU, many of the former IELP students cited the sources of their difficulty, and what dominated these responses were the fundamental differences between the IELP and PSU, particularly the types of vocabulary in focus, the level of challenge, and the ratio of native speakers to non-native speakers. The chart below lists those differences as well as others mentioned throughout the study.

Table 15

Reported Differences Between the IELP and PSU

IELP	PSU
Students are surrounded by other non-native speakers	Students are surrounded by native speakers
Smaller class sizes	Larger class sizes
Faculty is more supportive, attentive, understanding	Faculty is less supportive, attentive, understanding
General academic vocabulary taught	Students need both general academic vocabulary and discipline-specific vocabulary
Students read fiction	Students read textbooks
Light on group projects	Heavy on group projects

According to current IELP students.

When asked in what ways they thought former IELP students were prepared for undergraduate coursework, most current IELP students surveyed discussed language skills. Like the former IELP students, current students reported in their survey responses that former IELP students are prepared for undergraduate writing. Of the 33 current students who took the survey, 23 responded to this open-ended question, and of those 23, more than half (12) brought up writing in their answers. The next most popular topic in the written answers to that question was *Reading*, followed by, *Academic/University Culture & Expectations*.

According to IELP faculty.

After coding both the former IELP students and the IELP faculty responses to the question that asked in what ways former IELP students may not be prepared for undergraduate work, substantial overlap was found. Both groups of respondents agreed that reading is a major area where students could use more preparation, particularly in regards to the *volume* of reading required in university classes. Another discussion that dominated both the former-student and IELP faculty responses to the question related to ways that students were unprepared for differences between the IELP and PSU.

As for mismatches, most notably, the former students focused heavily on their lack of preparation to confidently complete university speaking tasks. They said they struggled to collaborate and keep up with native speakers during class discussions and were afraid for native speakers to hear their accents. Additionally, the former students said they were especially unprepared for vocabulary related to their majors, yet

surprisingly, this topic of discipline-specific vocabulary was not present in any of the IELP faculty answers. The IELP faculty participants mentioned students' need for academic vocabulary but not major-specific terms.

According to PSU faculty.

Overall, the themes found in the PSU faculty's open-ended survey responses concerning international student unpreparedness were similar to those of the other groups'. Like in the other stakeholder groups, reading was one of the most popular topics among the PSU faculty members in their write-in answers about how their international students seem unprepared for their PSU coursework. An even more common theme in that group—their most common, in fact—was writing, but those interviewed were professors of writing-intensive courses, so their emphasis on writing may not be representative of how professors of other departments may feel.

Interviews.

With former IELP students.

In their interviews, many former IELP students elaborated on their positive feelings about the IELP—especially in regards to its curriculum and faculty. In particular, they expressed feeling prepared to write college research papers and to navigate both U.S. university culture and American culture in general. Although many in this group expressed that the IELP was helpful overall, they felt less prepared for speaking, vocabulary, and reading in their college coursework, in comparison to other language skills, and many of them spoke at length about struggling with emotional issues, speaking with and in front of native speakers, and what they perceived as a lack of PSU

faculty support. Many also pointed to changes they would like to see in the IELP, often stating that they thought the IELP could have been more challenging, particularly in level 3 of the program, and that, among other things, they wish they had had more opportunities to interact with native speakers before matriculating into PSU. Table 16 below shows the most common themes from the former IELP student interviews, and Table 17 lists quotes from the former IELP student interviews that were well aligned with some of these themes.

Table 16

Most Common Themes Found in Interviews, Arranged by Stakeholder Group

Former	Current	IELP	PSU
1. (3-way tie) Prepared for writing; Negative emotions; IELP faculty more supportive than PSU faculty	1. Negative emotions	1. (3-way tie) Overall positive feelings about the IELP; Less prepared for volume of reading;	1. (Tie) PSU want training on how to handle international students in classes; PSU has ethical obligation to better support international students.
2. (3-way tie) Overall positive feelings about the IELP; Less prepared for level of challenge; Less prepared for field-specific content vocabulary	2. (9-way tie) Prepared for writing; Prepared for research papers; Less prepared for speaking; Less prepared for vocabulary in general; Less prepared for group work; IELP and PSU fundamentally different; Less prepared for field-specific content vocabulary; Less prepared for new types of assignments at PSU; Ratio of native to non-native speakers at IELP vs. PSU	2. (7-way tie) Prepared for study skills; Prepared for note-taking; Prepared for U.S. university culture; Less prepared for group work; Less prepared for level of challenge; Less prepared for field-specific content vocabulary; IELP faculty more supportive than PSU faculty;	2. Prepared to work hard; Less prepared for reading; Less prepared for volume of reading; Less prepared for writing; Less prepared for U.S. university culture; Less prepared for American culture in general; Less prepared for level of challenge
3. (3-way tie) Less prepared for speaking; Less prepared for vocabulary in general;			
4. (7-way tie) Prepared for U.S. university culture; Prepared for research papers; Prepared for American culture in general; Positive about IELP level 5; Less prepared for reading; Less prepared for new types of assignments at PSU—unsure of expectations; Ratio of native to non-native speakers at IELP vs. PSU			

Note. Themes were not included in this table if only one person said them; so more topics were discussed than are represented here. Themes regarding former IELP students at PSU, unless otherwise noted.

Table 17

Rankings of Themes in Interviews, Arranged by Stakeholder Group and based on Frequency

Theme	Former	Current	IELP	PSU	Sum of Ranks
Negative emotions	1	1	3	3	8
Less prepared for volume of reading	5	3	1	2	11
Less prepared for group work	7	2	2	3	14
IELP faculty more supportive than PSU faculty	1	3	2	X	--
Overall positive feelings about the IELP	2	3	1	X	--
Less prepared for Level of challenge	2	X	2	2	--
Prepared for writing	1	2	X	X	--
Less prepared for discipline-specific content vocabulary	2	2	2	X	--
Less prepared for speaking	3	2	3	X	--
Ratio of native to non-native speakers at IELP vs. PSU	4	2	3	X	--
Prepared for research papers	4	2	3	X	--

Note. A ranking of 1 means that the theme was present in more participant answers in that stakeholder group than any other theme, except in the case of ties. X= Theme not present in any of this stakeholder group's interviews.

-- denotes that number cannot be computed because theme was not present in some groups.

Table 18

Sample of former IELP Student Quotes that Aligned Well with Some Common Themes

Theme	Interview quotes aligned with theme
Generally positive feelings about the IELP	<p><i>IELP is a very good place—very good place.</i></p> <p>(On a friend who wanted to rush through IELP and just start PSU): <i>But when you [start] going to PSU, you will know, “Oh! The IELP is a good one.”</i></p> <p><i>IELP Helps me to just be ready for my future...It was a great time for me to be in the IELP—the teachers—everyone was very friendly—very kind.”</i></p> <p>(On the IELP) <i>They’re doing a really good job.</i></p> <p><i>The IELP is like the best English program here, like comparing to the other English programs...most of the student, they come to these place [other English programs] because they are cheaper, and then when they get the scholarship, they transfer to the IELP.</i></p> <p><i>I feel very comfortable when I was in the IELP.</i></p>
Negative emotions	<p><i>A distressful thing is when I was in IELP, I feel very confident, but when I went to college, it, like, change me a lot, and all of my confidence going down.</i></p> <p><i>School...make me feel really bad about myself.</i></p> <p><i>I don’t want to, like, pay, like, three times tuition to make myself always, like, desperate, you know, like feel lonely, like, feel worthless in this country.</i></p> <p><i>In my math class, like, my first term in PSU, like, for, like for two months, I always go back and cry, like, “I can’t do it,” and I wanted to go back home.</i></p>
Supporting more challenge in the IELP	<p><i>In PSU you feel there is more pressure than being in the IELP...PSU is much harder than the IELP.</i></p> <p>(IELP) <i>It is easier than PSU.</i></p> <p>(On IELP) <i>I think more difficult might be better.</i></p> <p><i>IELP teachers...they should be more strict with us...They treat us like kids.</i></p> <p><i>Level three writing wasn’t that difficult, for me... I think, like, we, like, do two essays; if one of them was with a citation, it could be better.</i></p> <p><i>I wish they had more different types of paper...instead of working on same paper the whole term.</i></p>
Speaking with and in front of native English speakers	<p><i>When you take (IELP) classes, like, all of them is foreigners, so you will feel confident with that, but when you transfer to college, it’s different...most of them, they have, like, good, um, like, language, like, English, and they know how to, uh, discuss...and sometimes when they discuss, uh, the materials or something, I always keep quiet.</i></p> <p><i>I was talkative when I was in IELP, but in, like, uh, regular classes with, like, (??) most of Americans, so I’m really afraid, like, (??) when I speaking, like, does that make sense what I’m saying?</i></p> <p><i>I never speak in class...I don’t want to slow class down.</i></p> <p>(IELP Suggestion) <i>We have to meet with native speakers and speak with them.</i></p>

With current IELP students.

The most common themes in the current IELP student interviews were similar to those found in the former sample. Like the former IELP students, the current ones interviewed most frequently broached the topic of negative emotions felt by former IELP students who have gone on to PSU. They were also in agreement with the former IELP students regarding language skills, in that they expressed their feelings that the IELP does a good job of preparing students for college writing, particularly research papers. On the other hand, they expressed that former IELP students are perhaps less prepared to handle university vocabulary (especially field-specific content vocabulary), as well as speaking to and in front of native speakers, including during group work. Furthermore, the current IELP students reiterated a theme that was common in the survey open-ended responses: that PSU and the IELP are just fundamentally different in many ways—the ratio of native to non-native speakers, the types of assignments—and that is often the source of difficulty. One participant advised that the IELP should, “try to be like PSU.”

With IELP faculty.

On the whole, the themes found in the IELP faculty interviews were similar in many ways to those present in the interview with both student groups, so there is not much to report for this group. There are only slight differences, including that negative emotions did not dominate their discussions quite as much as they did in the student interviews, and they were also less focused on students’ preparedness for writing. But along with the student groups, the most remarkable differences were clear when comparing the PSU faculty interviewees to the other participant groups.

With PSU faculty.

Two themes came up in all three PSU faculty interviews—One being that PSU professors want formal training on how to deal with the influx of international students in their classrooms. Secondly, they reported believing that PSU has a moral and ethical obligation to better support international students because they actively recruit them from other countries, yet when they get here, they said, they are on their own. Thus, they did not necessarily believe that the burden should be on the IELP to improve the student experience, but that the funding and other forms of support needed to come from the university at large. Additionally, like the other groups, some of them discussed that they have known international students to encounter negative emotions and struggle with reading and group work to some extent. Hence, there was some overlap, but there were a number of topics discussed in the other stakeholder groups that did not come up in my discussions with the PSU faculty members.

Chapter 5: Discussion & Conclusion

In this study, I systematically assessed the outcomes of a program by collecting data via surveys and interviews from four different stakeholder groups. Specifically, the goal was to investigate the preparedness of former IELP students and international students for undergraduate coursework at PSU. Like so many modern program evaluation studies, the scope of the research was broad, even after narrowing the focus substantially. Because there were so many participants (152), three research questions, and multiple instruments with myriad items, the prospect of analyzing the results and keeping the big picture in sight was overwhelming. However, considering that a primary goal of this study was to triangulate the data and highlight where consensus could be found, it was a natural step to begin making sense of the results by looking for areas in which all four groups, to some extent, seemed to agree.

Overlap

So what topics were present in all sets of stakeholder data? Table 19 lists these areas, and, in short, recurring areas of agreement concerned the difficulty that former IELP students and international students experience when dealing with: vocabulary, negative emotions, speaking to and in front of native speakers of English, relatively less supportive PSU faculty, and the high level of challenge in undergraduate classes.

Overlap in the Quantitative Data

While there was no agreement in the quantitative data about broad skills, there were areas of overlap in the quantitative survey data when the questions concerned more specific tasks. Vocabulary, for example, was among the most frequently chosen difficult

tasks in all groups in two of the six skill areas they were asked about.

Regarding specific grammar tasks, there were two selections that were always in either the first or second position as the most common choice for most difficult: 1) *Using the right articles, prepositions, and word combinations*, and 2) *Using a variety of sentence structures*. There were also two specific grammar tasks that were least frequently selected as the most difficult: 1) *Using active and passive voices correctly*, and 2) *Using the right verb tenses*.

As for specific writing tasks, the groups all had *Making strong arguments* and *Collecting information from good sources* in the top half of their most frequent selections for the most difficult task.

Using a variety of academic vocabulary was among the top responses in each group for most difficult speaking task, along with *Managing time and anxiety during speeches*, while none of the groups had *Creating visual aids for speeches* among their most frequent answers for difficult speaking task.

Vocabulary, again, was among the most difficult tasks in all stakeholder groups in the listening category (namely, *Understanding lecture vocabulary*).

While there was no across-the-board agreement about the difficulty of reading tasks, vocabulary still stood out because three of the four groups most frequently chose *Understanding the vocabulary* as the most difficult reading skill, and while it was not in the top half of the PSU stakeholder group's selections in that category, a full 20% of the PSU faculty participants did chose that option.

As for university skills, *Asking questions in class* was in the top half of responses

in all groups, whereas, *Using the library* was not among the most frequent responses in any group on the topic of difficult university skills.

Overlap in the Qualitative Data

When participants answered the surveys' open-ended questions about former IELP student and international student preparedness for PSU classes, the topic of writing was the most common topic in all groups, with the exception of the PSU faculty group; but for them, writing was still frequently mentioned—it was the third most common topic found in their descriptions of their international students' preparedness for classes. Hence, it was still a common theme for them, but it should be noted that when they answered the question about international student *unpreparedness* that writing was the most common topic, so the PSU faculty members who took part were divided on this issue and had mixed feelings. It is also important to point out that the PSU faculty members in this study are Freshman Inquiry and Sophomore Inquiry (FRINQ and SINQ) professors, and those courses are writing intensive, so they could be biased and more inclined to notice writing problems than professors in some other departments. In addition to writing, speaking was a topic that was broached in all groups' open-ended survey responses when asked about student preparedness, but to a far lesser extent, and as will be discussed below, speaking was also found in all groups' written answers when asked about student *unpreparedness*.

Reading was among the top three most common topics in all of the groups when they were asked how former IELP students and international students were less prepared for PSU classes, as was the topic of students' ability to deal with the high level of

challenge at PSU. However, no group had the subject of the high level of challenge as their number one most frequent response regarding unpreparedness. There were other topics that came up in all four of the stakeholder groups when they were asked about student unpreparedness, but they were less common than the topics of reading and dealing with the high level of challenge; these topics included: U.S. university culture, speaking, a lack of support from PSU faculty, a lack of confidence and comfort, and listening.

As can be seen in Table 17, three themes were found to be present in all four of the stakeholder groups' interview responses: Negative emotions experienced by former IELP students and international PSU students in undergraduate courses; a lack of preparedness for group work by these students in their regular PSU classes; and these students' lack of preparedness to handle the volume of reading required in undergraduate classes.

Table 19

Summary of Consensus Found Among All Stakeholder Groups

Type of data	Instrument	Skill type	Task type	More prepared for	Less prepared for
Quantitative	Surveys	Specific	Grammar	Active and passive voice Verb tenses	Articles, prepositions, word combinations Using a variety of sentence structures Making strong arguments Collecting information from good sources
			Writing		
			Speaking	Creating visual aids for speeches	Using a variety of academic vocabulary Managing time and anxiety during speeches
			Listening		Understanding lecture vocabulary Asking questions in class
			Uni Skills	Using the library	Reading
Qualitative	Surveys	Broad		Writing Speaking (but topic brought up far less than writing, and also present in all groups when asked about unpreparedness)	Speaking (but topic brought up less than reading; also present in all groups RE: preparedness) Listening (but brought up less than reading or speaking) U.S. university culture
		Specific	Uni Skills		High level of challenge Lack of support from PSU faculty Negative emotions
		Other			Volume of reading Group work Negative emotions
	Interviews	Specific	Reading Uni Skills		
		Other			

Note. Bold print indicates *recurring* areas of overlap. A blank or missing box denotes no consensus.

Above, in Table 19, there are a couple of areas I find to be particularly interesting—namely, the two areas labeled “other.” In these boxes, the topics listed were those present in the qualitative responses that participants were not specifically asked about anywhere in the surveys or interviews, which means that they are topics broached by some participants in all of the groups without bias or influence from the questions. All of the specific, closed-ended questions concerned particular elements in the IELP level-5 curriculum, yet when respondents were allowed to discuss what stood out to them in regards to student preparedness, their answers often did not so much concern objectives found in the IELP curriculum. Instead, they were focused on the level of challenge, the supportiveness of faculty, and negative emotions experienced by students.

The bold print in Table 19 represents *recurring* areas of overlap, meaning that a topic came up in all groups in response to more than one question. For one, the difficulty of vocabulary was discussed in all group responses to the questions about both speaking (*Using a variety of academic vocabulary*) and listening (*Understanding lecture vocabulary*). Additionally, speaking to and in front of native speakers of English was perceived as a major difficulty by all groups in both the surveys (*Managing time and anxiety during speeches* and *Asking questions in class*), and interviews (a common theme was being less prepared for group work). The topic of negative emotions came up in all three types of data—the quantitative survey data (*Managing time and anxiety during speeches*), qualitative survey data, and interview data. In the qualitative data, “negative emotions” typically related to students feeling a more general lack of confidence or comfort in regular PSU courses, and example quotes can be found above in Table 18.

My focus was on triangulation and determining the areas of highest overlap, but as I was analyzing the data, I thought a lot about how each group has a unique and valuable perspective that provides an important piece of the puzzle. Thus, although a main intention of this study was to identify these areas of agreement in all of the groups, that is not to say that topics that were not universally agreed upon are less important. Take for instance, the following hypothetical example: Which of these results should carry more weight? 1) Topic A, which was present in all participating groups, but not a popular topic in any group, or 2) Topic B, which was brought up by 100% of the participants in one stakeholder group, but was entirely absent from the responses of the other participant groups. I felt I could not discount a theme, just because there was not a full consensus across the groups; I had to consider not only intergroup agreement, but also intragroup agreement and mismatches, as those may be indications of unawareness on the part of one or more group. For this reason, I included the sum of percentages and the sum of ranks in some of the tables in the results section, as that calculation helped illuminate both kinds of overlap. Table 6 above in the results section has a couple of good examples of this scenario. You can see in that table that large percentages of both IELP and PSU faculty selected *Editing* as the most difficult writing task for the students in question, but the percentage of former IELP and current IELP students who chose that option were less than 10% each. Likewise, *Using a variety of academic vocabulary* was the most frequent selection in both of the student stakeholder groups, yet only 5 and 10%, respectively, of the IELP and PSU faculty respondents chose that option.

The themes that were found to be popular in some groups and less popular or non-

existent in others are areas of mismatch and could represent a lack of awareness by one or more of the groups, and hence, possible opportunities for education, training, or change. Just as Kanno and Applebaum (1995) and Vaught (2009) (discussed on pages 13-17 above) found that the students and teachers in their studies had different ideas of goals, the areas of mismatch in this study are areas where the groups have different perceptions of educational outcomes and needs. As you may recall, using student voices to uncover previously unknown information, as Vaught (2009), Kanno and Applebaum (1995) did, was something I found exciting before I began my research, and this study was designed with that in mind. Just as Primo, Sandler, Goldfrad, Ferenz, and Perpignan (2010) (also discussed on page 13) used such mismatches as the impetus for revisiting program goals, these results could also serve as motivation for changes, especially if the program wants to be better aligned with students' stated wants and needs.

Pedagogical Implications

This study is so rich in data that the findings could be used and interpreted in any number of ways—how the results are used and seen would largely depend on one's role and intent. The findings could certainly be used to further the development of both the IELP and PSU, which, as mentioned in the literature review, is the goal of program evaluation. The results could be especially helpful if the IELP and PSU aspire to be even better aligned with the student needs that stakeholders, particularly, the former IELP students, have identified for themselves. The following outlines some suggestions for IELP faculty and administration, PSU faculty, and perhaps most importantly, PSU as an institution.

While the findings of this study indicated that by and large, stakeholders are satisfied with the IELP and the preparation it provides to students (see pages 37-39), one possible use for the results would be that they could guide improvement projects; the findings could help IELP faculty and administration make decisions and prioritize which endeavors they would like to pursue. One specific idea that seems especially interesting would be the creation of a bridge program allowing transitioning students to take one or more IELP classes that provide them with *just-in-time* support while they are taking undergraduate classes. That way, they can explore strategies for handling the real-life struggles they encounter as they are happening.

As with other process-oriented research, the design of this study allowed me to go beyond the question of whether program objectives were being met. Additionally, I was able to explore unintended findings, as well as the question of whether anything was missing—not only by directly asking whether anything was missing, but also by allowing participants to guide the conversation at times. Based on Table 19, the IELP may want to add elements to the curriculum at each level that address some of the areas in which stakeholders agreed students were less prepared for that do not fall in the predetermined categories (Grammar, Reading, Writing, Listening, Speaking, University Skills), such as interacting with native speakers, dealing with emotional issues, and strategies for students to get what they need from university faculty.

Those instructors or administrators who are in a position to choose any focus for a project or lesson may choose broad skills like reading, which participants in all stakeholder groups clearly indicated was an area where they felt former IELP students

and international students were less prepared, in comparison to other language areas. On the other hand, IELP instructors, who teach courses on broad skills, could use the results section on specific skills to guide their curriculum planning and organization. For example, many participants expressed throughout the study that the IELP already does a particularly good job of preparing students for college writing, but writing instructors can still refer to the results regarding the most difficult writing skills and see, for example, that 73% of former IELP students in their regular PSU classes selected *Using a variety of academic vocabulary* as the hardest writing skill for them.

MA TESOL students who choose projects as their culminating experience, could use these results to design their projects. For instance, one idea would be to use corpus-based data to make discipline-specific word lists of the most popular majors for former IELP students that IELP instructors could use. Such lists could be especially useful at level 5 when students may write essays on topics related to their major.

However, it is important to again remember that, in general, participants reported being satisfied with the IELP (see pages 37-39), so perhaps the pedagogical implications should be focused elsewhere. Although the PSU faculty were not asked specifically about the IELP, they were aware that this research was related to the program, and one PSU faculty member offered the following remark, which echoed sentiments that I heard from other faculty members as well: "I do not think the IELP is the problem--the program is great. The problem is with PSU as a whole, and the departments who depend the most on international students." For one, PSU faculty members want training in how to handle non-native speakers. In fact, all PSU faculty members who took part in my interviews

reported that they wanted and needed guidance or training on how to handle the cultural, language, and assessment challenges of having large numbers of international students in their classrooms, and it is possible that their interest in training influenced their decision to take part in my study. This agreement among those participants is substantial because I did not ask them if they desired training—they each independently mentioned it in the course of our conversations. Perhaps this data could be presented to university administrators as support for an argument that international students generally need more support, some of which could come from PSU professors, whom many in the study reported as being less supportive than IELP faculty. Some made the argument that the university has an ethical obligation to better support international students, especially since PSU actively recruits globally.

Alternatively, another implication of the perceived limited support PSU faculty provide international students is, perhaps, that IELP faculty should push students even harder to be independent and to learn strategies to figure problems out without relying on faculty. One faculty interviewee explained that current students “may be not aware how independent they need to be. We tend to babysit them in the IELP. They are not prepared to work with mainly native speakers of English and often find it very intimidating.” Maybe starting earlier—some student participants suggested in level 3—IELP courses could possibly become more difficult than they currently are; faculty could work on speaking less slowly; they could introduce citations at this point; they could maybe work to foster greater learner autonomy and provide less scaffolding. For example, when it comes to group work, perhaps there should be more of it, and maybe students should

have less say over who they work with so that they are forced out of their comfort zones more often, earlier in the program. On the other hand, it is difficult to say. As one IELP faculty interviewee put it, “That’s a good point. It’s like, what do you do: Try to make them [PSU faculty] nicer or try to make us [IELP faculty] meaner?”

Furthermore, it seems that providing current students more perspective and more exposure to authentic university settings, assignments, and in-class tasks could reduce some of the perceived difficulties and surprises currently associated with the transition from the IELP to PSU. For example, many would like more experience working with native speakers in groups and having native speakers as classmates. Others would have liked more preparation for making presentations in front of a large class.

Future MA TESOL students could design projects around these results. Possible examples include projects that would:

- Connect IELP students with native speakers more frequently;
- Expose current IELP students to more PSU-like classroom environments;
- Increase the use of discipline-specific vocabulary in the program, perhaps through the design of new materials that IELP instructors could use;
- Coach current IELP students on ways to prepare them for the realities of regular college coursework and help them to adjust their expectations so that they realize that it will not be easier when they leave;
- Provide services to support transitioning IELP students at PSU—to help them deal with any emotional issues, coach them in how to advocate for themselves, or connect them with native speakers.

Limitations

Of course this study is not without limitations. Most importantly, the PSU faculty members might not have known which of their international students came through the IELP and which did not—only anecdotally are they aware of which students took IELP courses—so they could not reliably be asked about that specific population or about the program. Additionally, the PSU faculty members who participated were professors of FRINQ and SINQ classes, all of which are writing intensive courses, so they are not representative of PSU faculty and PSU classes as a whole. Hence, the results have been displayed so that anyone interested can remove that stakeholder group and triangulate the data without their input.

There is a self-selection bias in all of the groups because those who are willing to participate may have a different outlook from those who were not willing. Furthermore, Measures were not taken in this study to control or account for the length of time that former IELP students spent in the program before matriculating into PSU, nor did I control or account for the cultures and countries of origin represented, or the proficiency level of the student participants. As a result, the findings could be skewed, especially if students who spent a longer or shorter time in the program, or students of certain skill levels, cultures, or countries were overrepresented in the sample.

This potential variation in the former IELP student population could, in part, explain another limitation of this study—namely, why participants sometimes hesitated, struggled to answer questions, or doubted their expertise. Many qualified their open-ended responses with conditions and caveats like one of the IELP faculty participants

who said, “I think it depends on the individual, and I had a hard time trying to quantify and guess at how many [former IELP students] could actually do the work. It varies from term to term, and sometimes widely.” Similarly, others added that their statements were only true, *if* the former IELP students completed level 5 or *if* the student took advantage of available resources.

It is important to note that the results of this study were based on perception data, the justification for which can be found in both the Literature Review and Methodology. While I stand behind this approach for the reasons previously detailed, I also acknowledge that perception data, while important, is not the same as performance data. Thus, while all of the stakeholders may agree that the students in question may be especially prepared for writing and less prepared for reading, it’s possible that evaluation of the students’ actual reading and writing skills after completing the IELP, based on some kind of graded performance, would tell a different story.

For a few reasons, the results are not necessarily generalizable to the IELP. To begin with, the sample of former IELP students was one of convenience—those who were attending PSU—because those were the students in the target population who I was able to track and for whom I could find contact information. Thus, it is possible that former IELP students who go on to attend other universities have a different experience. Secondly, the demographic makeup of the IELP student population continually changes, particularly in terms of students’ countries of origin. Furthermore, although I was thrilled to get 152 participants, this sample is by no means a large percentage of the students who have successfully matriculated over the years from the IELP into regular PSU classes.

Suggestions for Future Research

In order to complement or meaningfully build upon the results of this study, future researchers could: 1) Make different decisions in the design phase; 2) Design a study that addresses the limitations of this one; or 3) Expand upon and examine a portion of my findings in greater detail.

If a researcher wanted to evaluate the IELP but make decisions that were different from those in this study, they could refer to Table 1 in the Literature Review, which provides an overview of some of the most important choices made early in the thesis process, and take a different route. For example, rather than pursuing a constructivist study, someone could instead evaluate the IELP using criteria based on a specific Applied Linguistics theory—they could look at the IELP, say, through a Freirean lens. Or, instead of using mixed methods they could design something entirely qualitative, for instance.

On the other hand, if someone wanted to pursue a study that had fewer or different limitations, they could do any number of things differently by referring to the limitations section above. To name a few specific ideas: One could replicate the study using PSU Engineering and Business professors as the PSU faculty participants, as those are the most popular majors for former IELP students, and those professors may be less focused on writing in comparison to the FRINQ and SING faculty members. Additionally, the former IELP student group in question could be further narrowed to account and control for cultural background, country of origin, length of time in the program, or proficiency level, so researchers could replicate the study, for example, but the students in question could be only those from Saudi Arabia who spent at least one

year in the IELP and who received above a certain score on either the TOEFL or IELTS test (of course, this would greatly lower the number of participants). Or the study could be replicated with students who completed the IELP after 2015 and then compared to this one, as the demographic makeup is likely to be different.

Alternatively, if a researcher were interested in taking part of this study's findings and expanding upon them, there would be various options, and some of the possibilities that I find most appealing are those that would be fully qualitative. For instance, the most common theme regarding unpreparedness found in the former IELP student written survey answers (discussed by about 16% of all participants in that stakeholder group) was the difficulty of discipline-specific vocabulary in their PSU courses. Thus, a good idea might be to research what exactly the most common words used in various disciplines are. Using corpora, textbooks, and other sources, one could create word lists of high-frequency words used in the most popular majors for IELP students upon leaving the program that could then be incorporated into future IELP course materials and lessons. Since the university skills that were most commonly chosen as the most difficult tasks for former IELP students were all related to speaking to and in front of native speakers, another possibility would be to more thoroughly examine what exactly it is about some of those activities that is so hard for them. One possibility would be to examine the dynamics of group work in regular classes and to try to determine what in particular the former IELP students struggle with in that situation. Or perhaps someone could conduct a case study fully detailing one student's transition from the IELP into mainstream classes, exploring what that's like for them as it is happening.

Final Thoughts

Ultimately, I think the results are informative and interesting, as well as unique, in that there is no other data on this former IELP student population at this point in time. As readers may recall from the literature review, data from studies like this can contribute positively to accreditation, student retention, and recruitment efforts (Davidson-Shivers, Inpornjivit, & Sellers, 2004). While I listed some potential uses for these findings above, ultimately those suggestions are only a small fraction of the possibilities. Some of the best applications of these results may come from those who did not have connections to this study, and I will be interested to see how this work may influence future projects and research. My goal is to continue to share my results so that the data can be useful.

Finally, I think it is important to note something that stood out as I reflected back upon this experience: What I perhaps found most striking as I sifted through the data and spoke with participants was the intensity of emotions that students experience—according to both the students themselves and the other stakeholder groups (see Table 18 for examples of quotes that demonstrate these expressions of feelings). Though the results indicate that, yes, former IELP students are usually sufficiently prepared to handle the IELP's curricular objectives and generally ready for the university (see Table 3), there was still a lot of discussion of anxiety and tears cried during the transition to PSU classes, as well as losses of confidence, and even feelings of worthlessness. I think that any additional improvements to the program or the university that would serve the international students, who are thousands of miles from home, have the potential to prevent or mitigate some of the troubling emotions that they seem to regularly encounter.

References

- Brown, J.D. (1989). Language program evaluation: A synthesis of existing possibilities. In R.K. Johnson (Ed.), *The second language curriculum* (pp. 222-241). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Croker, R.A. (2009). An Introduction to Qualitative Research. In J. Heigham & R.A. Croker (Eds.), *Qualitative Research in Applied Linguistics* (pp. 3-24). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Davidson-Shivers, G. V., Inpornjivit, K., & Sellers, K. (2004). Using alumni and student databases for program evaluation and planning. *College Student Journal*, 38(4), 510-520
- Dörnyei, Z., & Taguchi, T. (2009). Questionnaires in second language research: *Construction, administration, and processing*. New York: Routledge.
- Early, M. (1992). Aspects of becoming an academically successful ESL student. In B. Burnaby and A. Cumming (Eds.), *Socio-political aspects of ESL* (pp. 265-275). Toronto, ON: OISE Press.
- Elisha-Primo, I., Sandler, S., Goldfrad, K., Ferenz, O., & Perpignan, H. (2010). Listening to students voices: A curriculum renewal project for an EFL graduate academic program. *System*, 38(3), 457-466.
- Guba, E.G & Lincoln, Y.S. (1989). *Fourth Generation Evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Harklau, L. (2000). From the "good kids" to the "worst": Representations of English language learners across educational settings. *TESOL quarterly*, 34 (1), 35-67.

- Hatch, A. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in educational settings*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Heslin, E. (2003). *Investigating learning style preferences and program satisfaction in the Intensive English Language Program at Portland State University*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Portland State University, Portland, Oregon.
- Ivankova, N.V & Creswell, J.W. (2009). Mixed Methods. In J. Heigham & R.A. Croker (Eds.), *Qualitative Research in Applied Linguistics* (pp. 135-161). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kanno, Y. & Applebaum, S.D. (1995). ESL students speak up: Their stories of how we are doing. *TESL Canada Journal*, 12(2), 32-49.
- Kanno, Y. & Varghese, M.M. (2010). Immigrant and refugee ESL students' challenges to accessing four-year college education: From language policy to educational policy. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 9, 310-328.
- Kiely, R. (2009). Small answers to the big question: Learning from language programme evaluation. *Language Teaching Research*, 13(1), 99-116.
- Kiely, R. & Rea-Dickins, P. (2005). *Program Evaluation in Language Education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Knickmeyer, E. (2012). Saudi students flood in as U.S. reopens door. *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB1000142405270230483070457749245067667154.html>

- Long, M.H. (1984). Process and product in ESL program evaluation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 18(3), 409-425.
- Murray, D.E. & Christison, M. (2010). *What English Language Teachers Need to Know*. (Vol. 2). New York, NY: Routledge
- Nation, I.S.P. & Macalister, J. (2010). *Language Curriculum Design*. Routledge: New York.
- Norris, J.M. (2009). Understanding and improving language education through program evaluation: Introduction to the special issue. *Language Teaching Research*, 13(1), 7-13.
- Nunan, D. (1989). Toward a collaborative approach to curriculum development: A case study. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23(1), 9-25. Office of Educational Assessment (OEA). (2005). *Program evaluation – FAQ*. Retrieved from http://www.washington.edu/oea/services/research/program_eval/faq.html
- Portland State University (PSU). (2007). Intensive English Language Program – IELP. Retrieved from <http://www.ielp.pdx.edu/about.php>
- Saldaña, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. London: SAGE Publications LTD.
- Stoller, F.L. (1999). Time for change: A hybrid curriculum for EAP programs. *TESOL Journal*, 8(1), 9-13.
- Taut, S. & Brauns, D. (2003). Resistance to evaluation: A psychological perspective. *Evaluation*, (9)3, 247-264.

Vaught, J.A. (2009). *English language learning goals: An analysis of program and student goals in an intensive English language program*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Portland State University, Portland, Oregon.

Appendix A
IELP Curriculum Level 5 Outcomes (Full List)

Outcomes from Grammar 5

With 70% accuracy, students will be able to:

1. Identify their own most frequent grammar and sentence structure errors in their writing and demonstrate ability to identify, analyze, and minimize these errors through self-editing.
2. Demonstrate variety and complexity of sentence structure in their writing through phrases, clauses, and connectors for more effective communication of ideas.

Demonstrate knowledge of specific grammar points through editing tasks and other grammar identification activities. Specific grammar points include:

3. Verb tense consistency and shifts in discourse
4. Articles
5. Prepositions (focus on idiomatic and collocations)
6. Phrases and clauses in complex sentences
7. Unreal conditionals
8. Subordination/coordination
9. Reductions of adjective and adverb clauses
10. Four basic sentence types (simple, compound, complex, compound complex)
11. Active/passive tenses
12. Verbs/auxiliaries for generalizations, support, and reporting ideas
13. Integration of sources and appropriate verb use
14. Perfective infinitives and gerunds
15. Subjunctive in that clauses following nouns, verbs, and adjectives
16. Fronting of structures and inversion

Demonstrate appropriate use of the following in writing:

17. Verb tenses with emphasis on the most commonly used verbs in academic writing (simple present and simple past).
18. Active and passive voice
19. Articles.
20. Prepositions
21. Determiners
22. Hedging Devices
23. Collocations specific to academic writing

Outcomes for Writing 5

24. Choose, narrow, and develop a topic (using given guidelines) appropriate for an 8-10 page research paper.
25. Write 1-3 research proposals.
26. Collect and evaluate information (based on the criteria used in most university contexts) from a variety of sources (from the library and Internet), using a minimum of 8

in the final draft.

27. Judge the reliability, relevance, and appropriateness of sources.
28. Analyze data by taking notes, summarizing, comparing, contrasting, and categorizing concepts from sources in order to build an argument.
29. Write an arguable thesis statement that includes the topic of the paper and its claim.
30. Write an annotated bibliography.
31. Connect body paragraphs to thesis statement using transitional devices.
32. Indicate relationships between ideas within body paragraphs using cohesive devices.
33. Avoid plagiarism by inserting in-text citations and a complete reference list according to the conventions of APA style.
34. Synthesize ideas from a variety of sources in order to construct an argument or analysis supported by appropriate evidence.
35. Contribute ideas for revision and improvement during drafting process and participate actively during conferences.
36. Recognize and self-correct errors which impede clear expression of ideas with guidance from the instructor.
37. Write an in-class essay that uses support from outside sources and demonstrates control of grammar, vocabulary, and topic content.
38. Use a variety of academic vocabulary and sentence structures that clearly show the complex relationships between ideas and with no global errors (errors that interfere with meaning).
39. Accurately employ grammar and vocabulary to create cohesion.
40. Develop comprehensible writing using appropriate and accurate grammar.

Outcomes for Speaking/Listening 5

In an impromptu speech for which students have no more than 30 seconds to prepare:

41. Generate topic ideas.
42. Organize and support ideas by giving reasons.
43. Briefly outline points to be discussed.
44. Employ strategies to reduce nervousness
45. Manage time during speech.
46. Activate appropriate vocabulary instantaneously, including transitional language to frame ideas.
47. Self-assess own skills based on performance.

Be able to do the following in the Informational and Persuasive Speeches:

- 48-9. Use brainstorming methods.
- 50-1. Analyze target audience and decide how to build rapport with that audience.
- 52-3. Select and limit topic.
- 54-5. Gather data to support ideas.
- 56 & 113. Create appropriate electronic visual aids.
- 57-8. Prepare an outline which includes a clear introduction, statement of topic, supporting points and examples, transitional and analytical language, and a conclusion.
- 59-60. Manufacture a single speaking card to be used for extemporaneous delivery.

The following 7 apply to informational, persuasive, and personal experience speeches:

- 61-3. Use extemporaneous (conversational style)
- 11-116 Orally convey organized information in the allotted time with a natural speaking rate and fairly high degree of automaticity
- 64-6. Speak using a level-appropriate degree of grammatical accuracy and variety
- 67-9. Speak using a variety of vocabulary and transitional language
- 70-2. Employ strategies to create understanding through non-verbal means including appropriate body language, facial expression and appropriate eye contact
- 73-5. Employ strategies to clarify meaning through tone of voice, stress, timing, intonation, rhythm (STIR), and pronunciation
- 76-8. Employ strategies to reduce speaker nervousness/fears
- 79-81. Assess self based on video review of speech and reflect upon performance

Do the following in Personal Experience speech:

- 82. Brainstorm about a “peak experience” that has changed speaker in some significant way.
- 83. Recall and select details from experience that vividly describe incident including sights, sounds, smells, tastes and feelings.
- 84. Write a manuscript that consists of exact wording for the speech. Include an attention getter, statement of relevance to audience, thesis, background details, peak experience, the result, a lesson learned from the experience, and a final thought.
- 85. A high level of grammatical accuracy is expected.
- 86. Deliver the speech.
- 87. Speak using a script while maintaining occasional eye contact with the audience and demonstrating dramatic vocal quality.
- 88. (see 2 f ii-vii above).
- 89. Assess self based on video review of speech and reflect upon performance.
- 90. Participating in oral class feedback of peer speeches: asking questions, paraphrasing and summarizing ideas.
- 91. Completing written feedback forms on individual speeches
- 92. Identify individual pronunciation difficulties (instructors are expected to give feedback on students’ pronunciation as noted during activities, impromptus, and presentations.) and demonstrate improvement through independent work (tutoring, pronunciation software, etc.).
- 93. Produce speech with, at most, only minor pronunciation or intonation problems which do not impede listener comprehension.
- 94. Identify individual grammatical difficulties (through instructor and self-analysis) and demonstrate improvement through independent work (tutoring, pronunciation software, etc.).
- 95. Utilize appropriate vocabulary necessary for transitioning ideas, explaining charts and graphs, analyzing data, citing statistics, discussing research (esp. verbs), discussing trends, and expressing judgment and opinion. This includes avoidance of biased or offensive language.

Outcomes for Reading 5

96. Through vocabulary and comprehension tests, demonstrate passive and active knowledge (recognition, comprehension, and usage) of approximately 240 words and word families from the Academic Word sublists 4-5.

Through extensive reading:

97. Through self-reflection and reading log activities express confidence and increased fluency in reading.

98. Read at a rate of 150 – 200 words per minute and comprehend main ideas.

99. Through discussions and reading logs demonstrate cultural competence.

Through intensive reading:

100. Write summaries and responses which demonstrate comprehension of main ideas and the author's purpose, and connect ideas in reading to own knowledge and experience.

101. Demonstrate in writing and discussions higher level critical thinking by connecting themes from a reading to ideas and information outside of the reading.

102. Predict and create appropriate exam questions for exam study purposes.

103. Using language from vocabulary lists and intensive reading materials, demonstrate a minimum degree of fluency and accuracy in written assignments appropriate to undergraduate coursework.

104. Use a dictionary to locate a word, identify part of speech, determine meaning, and identify pronunciation.

105. Recognize affixes and roots to aid in comprehension of unknown words in reading passages.

106. Predict through previewing techniques.

107. Skim for overall comprehension.

108. Scan to locate specific information.

109. Use context clues to aid in comprehension.

110. Match pronouns to their referents.

111. Develop note-taking strategies for study.

112. Locate main idea.

Appendix B

IELP Curriculum Level 5 Outcomes Condensed into Survey Questions

* Each Question lists which Appendix A outcomes played a role in the question's development

After leaving the IELP, how prepared were you to do the following in your regular PSU classes?

Understand and use correct grammar

1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 30, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 64, 65, 66, 84, 85

Use the right verb tenses

1, 3, 7, 11, 17, 18, 25, 30, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 84, 85, 114, 115, 116

Use active and passive voices correctly

1, 3, 11, 17, 18, 25, 30, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 84, 85, 114, 115, 116

Use a variety of sentence structures

1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 10, 15, 16, 25, 30, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 64, 65, 66, 84, 114, 115, 116

Use the right articles, prepositions, and word combinations

1, 4, 5, 14, 19, 20, 23, 25, 30, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 46, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 84, 85, 95, 114, 115, 116

Complete writing assignments and write understandably

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 57, 58, 59, 60, 84, 87, 100, 101, 102, 103, 111

Edit your writing and the writing of others

1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 47, 79, 80, 81, 89, 90, 91, 92, 94

Choose and develop topics for writing and speaking

24, 25, 29, 30, 34, 37, 41, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 82

Collect information from good sources

25, 26, 27, 30, 54, 55, 107, 108

Write effective thesis statements

25, 29, 34, 37, 84

Show relationships in your writing and speaking by using transitions (like *However* and *Additionally*) and other cohesive devices

2, 25, 30, 31, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 42, 46, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 84, 95, 114, 115, 116

Avoid plagiarism by using citations and a reference list using APA style

13, 25, 30, 33

Make strong arguments supported by many pieces of good evidence from a variety of sources

13, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 33, 34, 37, 42

Create good visual aids (like PowerPoint, graphs and charts)

56, 113

Speak understandably

3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 31, 32, 34, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 113, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 83, 114, 115, 116, 84, 85, 86, 87, 93, 95

Manage time and anxiety during speeches

44, 45, 59, 60, 76, 77, 78, 86, 87, 114, 115, 116

Understand the listening

96, 110, 111, 112

Do, understand, and summarize the readings

30, 34, 37, 59, 60, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 112

Use and understand the vocabulary

5, 12, 13, 20, 22, 23, 25, 30, 31, 32, 37, 38, 39, 46, 61, 62, 63, 67, 68, 69, 83, 84, 95, 103, 104, 105, 109, 114, 115, 116

Use a variety of academic vocabulary correctly

5, 12, 13, 20, 22, 23, 25, 30, 31, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 46, 67, 68, 69, 83, 84, 95, 96, 103, 104, 105, 114, 115, 116

Understand the information and ideas

30, 34, 37, 59, 60, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 109, 110, 112

Handle university skills (like registering for classes, paying tuition, note-taking, organization, asking questions, using the library, finding help)?

26, 27, 28, 33, 54, 55, 102, 104, 105, 109, 111

Appendix C

Original Former IELP Student Survey Questions (Before Piloting Surveys)

1. What country are you from?
2. What term did you finish or leave the IELP? (Drop-down list)
3. When you finished or left the IELP, what level were you at? (Drop-down menu:)
4. How long did you spend in the IELP? (Drop down menu)
 - Less than one year
 - Between 1 and 2 years
 - Between 2 and 3 years
 - Between 3 and 4 years
 - Between 4 and 5 years
 - More than 5 years
5. What is your undergraduate major now? _____
6. How ready were for your regular PSU classes?
7. In what ways did you feel prepared or unprepared?
8. Was anything missing from your IELP classes that you needed for regular PSU classes?

After leaving the IELP, how prepared were you to do the following in your regular PSU classes?

9. Understand and use correct grammar	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
10. Use the right verb tenses	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
11. Use active and passive voices correctly	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
12. Use a variety of sentence structures	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
13. Use the right articles, prepositions, and word combinations	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
14. Complete writing assignments and to write understandably	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
15. Edit your writing and the writing of others	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
16. Choose and develop topics for writing and speaking	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
17. Collect information from good sources				

	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
18. Write effective thesis statements	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
19. Show relationships in your writing by using transitions (like <i>However</i> and <i>Additionally</i>) and other cohesive devices	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
20. Avoid plagiarism by using citations and a reference list using APA style	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
21. Make strong arguments supported by many pieces of good evidence from a variety of sources	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
22. Create good visual aids (like PowerPoint, graphs and charts)	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
23. Speak understandably	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
24. Manage time and anxiety during speeches	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
25. Understand the listening	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
26. Do, understand, and summarize the readings	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
27. Use and understand the vocabulary	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
28. Use a variety of academic vocabulary correctly	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
29. Understand the information and ideas	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
30. Handle university skills (like registering for classes, paying tuition, note-taking, organization, asking questions, using the library, finding help)	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
31. Would you be willing to talk to the researcher in person to tell her more about your opinion? If so, please enter your email address below.				

Appendix D

Original Current IELP Student Survey Questions (Before Piloting Surveys)

1. What country are you from?
2. What term did you start the IELP?

(Drop-down list)

Winter
Spring
Summer
Fall

(Drop-down list or possible years)

3. How ready do you think you would be to take regular PSU classes now?
4. In what ways do you feel you would be prepared or unprepared for regular PSU classes?
5. Is anything missing from your IELP classes that you think you need for your regular PSU classes?

How prepared do you think you would be to do the following in regular PSU classes right now?

6. Understand and use correct grammar	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
7. Use the right verb tenses	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
8. Use active and passive voices correctly	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
9. Use a variety of sentence structures	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
10. Use the right articles, prepositions, and word combinations	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
11. Complete writing assignments and to write understandably	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
12. Edit your writing and the writing of others	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
13. Choose and develop topics for writing and speaking	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
14. Collect information from good sources	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not

15. Write effective thesis statements	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
16. Show relationships in your writing by using transitions (like <i>However</i> and <i>Additionally</i>) and other cohesive devices	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
17. Avoid plagiarism by using citations and a reference list using APA style	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
18. Make strong arguments supported by many pieces of good evidence from a variety of sources	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
19. Create good visual aids (like PowerPoint, graphs and charts)	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
20. Speak understandably	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
21. Manage time and anxiety during speeches	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
22. Understand the listening	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
23. Do, understand, and summarize the readings	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
24. Use and understand the vocabulary	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
25. Use a variety of academic vocabulary correctly	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
26. Understand the information and ideas	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
27. Handle university skills (like registering for classes, paying tuition, note-taking, organization, asking questions, using the library, finding help)	Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
28. Would you be willing to talk to the researcher in person to tell her more about your opinion? If so, please enter your email address below.				

Appendix E

Original IELP Faculty Survey Questions (Before Piloting Surveys)

1. What term did you start teaching at the IELP?

(Drop-down list)

Winter

Spring

Summer

Fall

(Drop-down list or possible years)

2. What classes have you taught? (Check all that apply)

[List of all IELP classes with checkboxes]

3. How ready do you think IELP graduates are for their regular PSU classes?

4. In what ways do you think they might feel prepared or unprepared?

5. Do you think anything is missing from their IELP classes that they need for their regular PSU classes?

After completing the IELP, how many students do you feel are prepared to do the following in their regular PSU classes?

6. Understand and use correct grammar

All	Most	Many	Some	Few	None
-----	------	------	------	-----	------

7. Use the right verb tenses

All	Most	Many	Some	Few	None
-----	------	------	------	-----	------

8. Use active and passive voices correctly

All	Most	Many	Some	Few	None
-----	------	------	------	-----	------

9. Use a variety of sentence structures

All	Most	Many	Some	Few	None
-----	------	------	------	-----	------

10. Use the right articles, prepositions, and word combinations

All	Most	Many	Some	Few	None
-----	------	------	------	-----	------

11. Complete writing assignments and write understandably

All	Most	Many	Some	Few	None
-----	------	------	------	-----	------

12. Edit their own writing and the writing of others

All	Most	Many	Some	Few	None
-----	------	------	------	-----	------

13. Choose and develop topics for writing and speaking

All	Most	Many	Some	Few	None
-----	------	------	------	-----	------

14. Collect information from good sources	All	Most	Many	Some	Few	None
15. Write effective thesis statements	All	Most	Many	Some	Few	None
16. Show relationships in their writing by using transitions and other cohesive devices	All	Most	Many	Some	Few	None
17. Avoid plagiarism by using citations and a reference list using APA style	All	Most	Many	Some	Few	None
18. Make strong arguments supported by many pieces of good evidence from a variety of sources	All	Most	Many	Some	Few	None
19. Create good visual aids (like PowerPoint, graphs and charts)	All	Most	Many	Some	Few	None
20. Speak understandably	All	Most	Many	Some	Few	None
21. Manage time and anxiety during speeches	All	Most	Many	Some	Few	None
22. Understand the listening	All	Most	Many	Some	Few	None
23. Complete, understand, and summarize readings	All	Most	Many	Some	Few	None
24. Use and understand the vocabulary	All	Most	Many	Some	Few	None
25. Use a variety of academic vocabulary correctly	All	Most	Many	Some	Few	None
26. Understand the information and ideas	All	Most	Many	Some	Few	None
27. Handle university skills (like registering for classes, paying tuition, note-taking, organization, asking questions, using the library, finding help)	All	Most	Many	Some	Few	None
28. Would you be willing to talk to the researcher in person to tell her more about your opinion? If so, please enter your email address below.						

Appendix F

Original PSU Faculty Survey Questions (Before Piloting Surveys)

1. How long have you been PSU faculty member?
2. What classes have you taught?
3. How ready do you think IELP graduates are for their regular PSU classes?
4. In what ways do you think they might feel prepared or unprepared?
5. Do you think anything is missing from their IELP classes that they need for their regular PSU classes?

How many former IELP students do you feel are prepared to do the following in their regular PSU classes?

6. Understand and use correct grammar	All	Most	Many	Some	Few	None
7. Use the right verb tenses	All	Most	Many	Some	Few	None
8. Use active and passive voices correctly	All	Most	Many	Some	Few	None
9. Use a variety of sentence structures	All	Most	Many	Some	Few	None
10. Use the right articles, prepositions, and word combinations	All	Most	Many	Some	Few	None
11. Complete writing assignments and write understandably	All	Most	Many	Some	Few	None
12. Edit their own writing and the writing of others	All	Most	Many	Some	Few	None
13. Choose and develop topics for writing and speaking	All	Most	Many	Some	Few	None
14. Collect information from good sources	All	Most	Many	Some	Few	None
15. Write effective thesis statements	All	Most	Many	Some	Few	None

16. Show relationships in their writing by using transitions and other cohesive devices
 All Most Many Some Few None
17. Avoid plagiarism by using citations and a reference list using APA style
 All Most Many Some Few None
18. Make strong arguments supported by many pieces of good evidence from a variety of sources
 All Most Many Some Few None
19. Create good visual aids (like PowerPoint, graphs and charts)
 All Most Many Some Few None
20. Speak understandably
 All Most Many Some Few None
21. Manage time and anxiety during speeches
 All Most Many Some Few None
22. Understand the listening
 All Most Many Some Few None
23. Complete, understand, and summarize readings
 All Most Many Some Few None
24. Use and understand the vocabulary
 All Most Many Some Few None
25. Use a variety of academic vocabulary correctly
 All Most Many Some Few None
26. Understand the information and ideas
 All Most Many Some Few None
27. Handle university skills (like registering for classes, paying tuition, note-taking, organization, asking questions, using the library, finding help)
 All Most Many Some Few None
28. Would you be willing to talk to the researcher in person to tell her more about your opinion? If so, please enter your email address below.

Appendix G
Pilot Survey Questions

1. What country are you from? (Drop down list of all countries)
 2. What IELP level are you in?
 3. How long have you been in the IELP?
 4. Do you know any students who have left the IELP and enrolled as undergraduates?
 5. Do you think the IELP prepares students for undergraduate classes?
 6. In what ways do you think that students who leave the IELP are prepared or unprepared for undergraduate classes?
 7. Is anything missing from IELP classes that you think students need as undergraduates?
 8. How well do you think the IELP prepares students to understand and use correct **grammar** in undergraduate classes?
Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
9. Which of these **grammar** tasks do you think would be the most difficult for former IELP students in undergraduate classes? (Drop-down Menu)
Using the right verb tenses	Using the right articles, prepositions, and word combinations
Using active and passive voices correctly	
Using a variety of sentence structures	
10. How well do you think the IELP prepares students to complete **writing** assignments and to write understandably in undergraduate classes?
Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
11. Which of these **writing** tasks do you think is the most difficult for former IELP students in undergraduate classes?(Drop-down Menu)
Editing (your writing and the writing of others)	Using transitions (like <i>however</i> and <i>additionally</i>) and other cohesive devices
Choosing and developing topics	Using citations and reference lists
Collecting information from good sources	Making strong arguments
Writing effective thesis statements	Creating good visual aids in papers (like graphs and charts)
Using a variety of academic vocabulary	
12. How well do you think the IELP prepares students to **speak** in undergraduate classes?
Very	Satisfactorily	Not Quite	Not
13. Which of these speaking tasks do you think is the most difficult for former IELP students in undergraduate classes?
(Drop-down Menu)	Creating visual aids (like PowerPoint presentations)
Managing time and anxiety during speeches	
Choosing and developing topics	Making strong arguments
Using a variety of academic vocabulary	

Using proper and effective body language
and other non-verbals

14. How well do you think the IELP prepares students to understand the **listening** in undergraduate classes?

Very Satisfactorily Not Quite Not

15. Which of these listening tasks do you think is the most difficult for former IELP students in undergraduate classes? (Drop-down Menu)

Understanding lecture vocabulary	Finding a lecture's main ideas
Understanding the information and ideas in lectures	Remembering lectures later
Understanding non-verbal cues in lectures	Taking lecture notes that are helpful to you later

16. How well do you think the IELP prepares students to handle undergraduate **readings**?

Very Satisfactorily Not Quite Not

17. Which of these reading tasks do you think is the most difficult for former IELP students in undergraduate classes?(Drop-down Menu)

Understanding the vocabulary	Finding the main ideas
Understanding the information and ideas	

18. How well do you think the IELP prepares students to handle university skills (like class registration, note-taking, organization, asking questions in class, using the library, finding help)?

Very Satisfactorily Not Quite Not

19. Which of these university skills do you find the most difficult for former IELP students in undergraduate classes? (Drop-down Menu)

Registering for classes	Organizational skills (like using calendars, folders, and binders)
Asking questions in class	Using the library
Note-taking	Finding help when you need it

20. Overall, how well do you think the IELP prepares students for undergraduate work?

21. Why did you answer Number 20 in the way that you did?

22. Would you be willing to talk to the researcher more about your opinion? If yes, please enter your email address below.

Appendix H
Final Official Former IELP Student Survey

Tell Us About the IELP! Some randomly-chosen participants will win a \$25 gift card

Meghan Oswalt, a Portland State (PSU) linguistics graduate student, is researching perceptions about former Intensive English Language Program (IELP) students.

WHAT? A fifteen minute online survey

WHY ME? You are a PSU undergraduate who may have studied in the IELP.

ARE THERE RISKS? Risks in this study are considered minimal.

- Your name could be seen, but we will do all we can to hide it.
- You may feel discomfort or frustration, but you may skip questions you don't want to answer, and you may stop the activity at any time.

WILL YOU PROTECT MY PRIVACY? Yes.

- We won't tell anyone if you take part in this study.
- We'll keep your name & answers private to the extent allowed by law.
- Personal info will be locked away. We need it to track who participated.
- We will use code names when we report our findings.

ARE THERE BENEFITS? You may not gain anything directly, but:

- You may help improve the IELP, which would help future students.

CAN I SAY "NO"? Yes. You do not have to take part in this study.

- Your participation is voluntary.
- You can stop at any time, even if you first said yes.
- It will not affect your grades if you say no.
- Saying no won't hurt your relationship with Meghan, teachers, or PSU.

QUESTIONS?

For questions about this study, form, or thesis, you can contact the researcher, Meghan Oswalt, at smeghan@pdx.edu, or to PSU Office of Research Integrity, 1600 SW 4th Ave., Market Center Building, Ste. 620, Portland, OR 97207; phone (503) 725-2227 or 1 (877) 480-4400, hsrre@lists.pdx.edu, 9a-5p, Mon-Fri.

IF I CLICK "I AGREE" BELOW, WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

By clicking "I agree" you are giving your consent. This means:

- You have read and understood what this form says.
- You are willing to take part in the study by taking an online survey.
- You know you don't have to take the survey and can stop any time.

Please print and keep this page for your records.

(Multiple-choice, single-selection)

- I AGREE
- I DO NOT AGREE

1. What country are you from? (Drop-down menu of all countries)
2. What term did you finish or leave the IELP? (Drop-down menu of possible terms)
3. When you finished or left the IELP, what level were you at? (Drop-down menu)
 - PEP
 - 1
 - 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5
4. How long did you spend in the IELP? (Drop-down menu)
 - Less than 1 year
 - Between 1 and 2 years
 - Between 2 and 3 years
 - Between 3 and 4 years
 - Between 4 and 5 years
 - More than 5 years
5. What is your undergraduate major now? (Text Entry)
6. Do you think the IELP prepared you for undergraduate classes?
(Multiple-choice, single-selection)
 - Yes
 - No
7. In what ways did you feel prepared for your regular PSU classes?
8. In what ways did you **not** feel **prepared** for your regular PSU classes?
9. Was anything missing from IELP classes that you needed for undergraduate classes?
10. After leaving the IELP, how prepared were you to understand and use correct grammar in undergraduate classes?
(Multiple-choice, single-selection)

 Very

 Satisfactorily

 Not Quite

 Not
11. Which of these grammar tasks do you find the most difficult? (Drop-down menu)
 - Using the right verb tenses
 - Using active and passive voices correctly
 - Using a variety of sentence structures
 - Using the right articles, prepositions, and word combinations

12. After leaving the IELP, how prepared were you to complete writing assignments and to write understandably in undergraduate classes?

Very

Satisfactorily

Not Quite

Not

13. Which of these writing tasks do you find the most difficult? (Drop-down menu)

- Choosing and developing topics
- Collecting information from good sources
- Writing effective thesis statements
- Using a variety of academic vocabulary
- Using transitions (like however and additionally) and other cohesive devices
- Using citations and reference lists
- Making strong arguments
- Creating good visual aids in papers (like graphs and charts)

14. After leaving the IELP, how prepared were you to speak understandably in undergraduate classes?

Very

Satisfactorily

Not Quite

Not

15. Which of these speaking tasks do you find the most difficult? (Drop-down menu)

- Managing time and anxiety during speeches
- Choosing and developing topics
- Using a variety of academic vocabulary
- Creating visual aids (like PowerPoint presentations)
- Making strong arguments
- Using proper and effective body language and other non-verbals

16. After leaving the IELP, how prepared were you to understand the listening in undergraduate classes?

Very

Satisfactorily

Not Quite

Not

17. Which of these listening tasks do you find the most difficult? (Drop-down menu)

- Understanding lecture vocabulary
- Understanding the information and ideas in lectures
- Understanding non-verbal cues in lectures
- Finding a lecture's main ideas

- Remembering lectures later
- Taking lecture notes that are helpful to you later

18. After leaving the IELP, how prepared were you to handle the required readings in undergraduate classes?

Very

Satisfactorily

Not Quite

Not

19. Which of these reading tasks do you find the most difficult? (Drop-down menu)

- Understanding the vocabulary
- Understanding the information and ideas
- Finding the main ideas
- Summarizing

20. After leaving the IELP, how prepared were you to handle university skills (like registering for classes, asking questions in class, note-taking, organization, using the library, finding help)?

Very

Satisfactorily

Not Quite

Not

21. Which of these university skills do you find the most difficult? (Drop-down menu)

- Registering for classes
- Asking questions in class
- Note-taking
- Organizational skills (like using calendars, folders, and binders)
- Using the library
- Finding help when you need it
- Working in groups

22. Overall, how prepared did you feel for undergraduate classes after leaving the IELP?

Very

Satisfactorily

Not Quite

Not

23. Why did you answer Number 22 in the way that you did? Could you say a little more? (Text-entry)

24. The researcher would like to interview some participants. Would you be willing to talk to the researcher in person to tell her more about your opinion? If so, please enter your email address below. Thank you! (Text-entry)

Appendix I
Final Official Current IELP Student Survey

Tell Us About the IELP! Some randomly-chosen participants will win a \$25 gift card

Meghan Oswald, a Portland State (PSU) linguistics graduate student, is researching perceptions about former Intensive English Language Program (IELP) students.

WHAT? A 15-minute online survey

WHY ME? You are an IELP student

ARE THERE RISKS? Risks in this study are considered minimal.

- Your name could be seen, but we will do all we can to hide it.
- You may feel discomfort or frustration, but you may skip questions you don't want to answer, and you may stop the activity at any time.

WILL YOU PROTECT MY PRIVACY? Yes.

- We won't tell anyone if you take part in this study.
- We'll keep your name & answers private to the extent allowed by law.
- Personal info will be locked away. We need it to track who participated.
- We will use code names when we report our findings.

ARE THERE BENEFITS? You may not gain anything directly, but:

- You may help improve the IELP, which would help future students.

CAN I SAY “NO”? Yes. You do not have to take part in this study.

- Your participation is voluntary.
- You can stop at any time, even if you first said yes.
- It will not affect your grades if you say no.
- Saying no won't hurt your relationship with Meghan, teachers, or PSU.

QUESTIONS?

For questions about this study, form, or thesis, you can contact the researcher, Meghan Oswald, at smeghan@pdx.edu, or to PSU Office of Research Integrity, 1600 SW 4th Ave., Market Center Building, Ste. 620, Portland, OR 97207; phone (503) 725-2227 or 1 (877) 480-4400, hsrre@lists.pdx.edu, 9a-5p, Mon-Fri.

IF I CLICK “I AGREE” BELOW, WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

By clicking “I agree” you are giving your consent. This means:

- You have read and understood what this form says.
- You are willing to take part in the study by taking an online survey.
- You know you don't have to take the survey and can stop any time.

Please print and keep this page for your records.

(Multiple-choice, single-selection)

- I AGREE
- I DO NOT AGREE

1. What country are you from? (Drop-down menu of all countries)
2. What IELP level are you in? (Drop-down menu of possible terms)
 - PEP
 - 1
 - 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5
3. How long have you been in the IELP? (Drop-down menu)
 - Less than one year
 - Between 1 and 2 years
 - Between 2 and 3 years
 - Between 3 and 4 years
 - Between 4 and 5 years
 - More than 5 years
4. Do you know any students who have finished or left the IELP and enrolled as undergraduates?
(Multiple-choice, single-selection)
 - Yes
 - No
5. Do you think the IELP prepares students for undergraduate classes?
(Multiple-choice, single-selection)
 - Yes
 - No
6. In what ways do you think that students who finish or leave the IELP are prepared for undergraduate classes? (Text Entry)
7. In what ways do you think that students who leave or finish the IELP are **not** prepared for undergraduate classes?
(Text Entry)
8. Is anything missing from IELP classes that you think students need as undergraduates?
(Text Entry)
10. After leaving the IELP, how prepared were you to understand and use correct grammar in undergraduate classes?
(Multiple-choice, single-selection)

 Very

 Satisfactorily

 Not Quite

 Not
11. Which of these grammar tasks do you find the most difficult? (Drop-down menu)
 - Using the right verb tenses
 - Using active and passive voices correctly
 - Using a variety of sentence structures
 - Using the right articles, prepositions, and word combinations

12. After leaving the IELP, how prepared were you to complete writing assignments and to write understandably in undergraduate classes?

Very

Satisfactorily

Not Quite

Not

13. Which of these writing tasks do you find the most difficult?
(Drop-down menu)

- Editing (your writing and the writing of others)
- Choosing and developing topics
- Collecting information from good sources
- Writing effective thesis statements
- Using a variety of academic vocabulary
- Using transitions (like however and additionally) and other cohesive devices
- Using citations and reference lists
- Making strong arguments
- Creating good visual aids in papers (like graphs and charts)

14. After leaving the IELP, how prepared were you to speak understandably in undergraduate classes?

Very

Satisfactorily

Not Quite

Not

15. Which of these speaking tasks do you find the most difficult? (Drop-down menu)

- Managing time and anxiety during speeches
- Choosing and developing topics
- Using a variety of academic vocabulary
- Creating visual aids (like PowerPoint presentations)
- Making strong arguments
- Using proper and effective body language and other non-verbals

16. After leaving the IELP, how prepared were you to understand the listening in undergraduate classes?

Very

Satisfactorily

Not Quite

Not

17. Which of these listening tasks do you find the most difficult? (Drop-down menu)

- Understanding lecture vocabulary
- Understanding the information and ideas in lectures
- Understanding non-verbal cues in lectures
- Finding a lecture's main ideas
- Remembering lectures later
- Taking lecture notes that are helpful to you later

18. After leaving the IELP, how prepared were you to handle the required readings in undergraduate classes?

Very

Satisfactorily

Not Quite

Not

19. Which of these reading tasks do you find the most difficult? (Drop-down menu)

- Understanding the vocabulary
- Understanding the information and ideas
- Finding the main ideas
- Summarizing

20. After leaving the IELP, how prepared were you to handle university skills (like registering for classes, asking questions in class, note-taking, organization, using the library, finding help)?

Very

Satisfactorily

Not Quite

Not

21. Which of these university skills do you find the most difficult? (Drop-down menu)

- Registering for classes
- Asking questions in class
- Note-taking
- Organizational skills (like using calendars, folders, and binders)
- Using the library
- Finding help when you need it
- Working in groups

22. Overall, how prepared did you feel for undergraduate classes after leaving the IELP?

Very

Satisfactorily

Not Quite

Not

23. Why did you answer Number 22 in the way that you did? Could you say a little more? (Text-entry)

24. The researcher would like to interview some participants. Would you be willing to talk to the researcher in person to tell her more about your opinion? If so, please enter your email address below. Thank you! (Text-entry)

Appendix J
Final Frames and Domains

FRAMES	DOMAINS	THEMES
Areas Ss felt prepared or not	Languageskills	Reading
		Writing
		Grammar
		Speaking
		Listening
		Vocabulary
		Spelling
	Classroomactivities	Lectures
		Note-taking
		Discussions
		Group work
	Types of assignments	Presentations
		Research papers
		Summary and response papers
		Reading academic journals
	Elements of assignments	Format, including citations
		Paraphrasing
	Beyond school	Non-academic pursuits
		American culture in general
		Spiritual aspects
		Real life application of skills
		Making friends
	Emotions	
	Continuing their journey (Not done learning when leave IELP)	
	U.S. University Culture	Assessment
		Problemsolving
		Awareness and use of student resources
	Communication	With professors
		With peers
	Comprehension	
Source of preparation/ lack of	Differences between the IELP & PSU	Level of Challenge
		General academic vs. major specific
		Supportiveness of Faculty
		Class size
		Types of assignments
		Ratio of native to non-native speakers
		Types of reading material
		Amount of group work
	Perceived as Responsible for Learning	Teachers
		Students
	Resources Ss were made aware of	
	IELP Classes	