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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The primary goal of this study is to examine the traits and goals of students who have been enrolled in the Adult Basic Education (ABE) English as a Second Language (ESL) program at Clark College in Vancouver, Washington over the course of the last two years, 1991 through 1993. This is being done to assess the degree to which students in the program are aware of the various further educational and vocational opportunities available to them upon completion of the ESL program, and the degree to which they, as a group, are being informed and prepared for the transition from ESL classes to classes on the Main Campus of Clark College or any other institution of Higher Education.

The ESL program at Clark College provides adult students from diverse socio-economic, linguistic and cultural backgrounds with the English language skills as well as the American cultural skills necessary which allow them to adjust to, and participate more fully in their new country.

This is presently accomplished by providing ESL classes at six separate levels with classes being conducted at times deemed to be convenient for the majority of students. These classes have been routinely filled to capacity over the last two years and there has been a waiting list for additional students who wish to take part in the ESL program. It is patently obvious that students are taking advantage of the learning opportunities offered by the ESL program. It is equally clear that there is no sign of an abatement in the numbers of students Clark College's ESL program can be expected to serve.
It has been suggested that as few as 5% of the students who have participated in ESL classes continue on to further education at Clark College. Whether students are aware of the varied continuing educational opportunities at the Main Campus, such as vocational and degree programs, and the degree to which they avail themselves of these opportunities are unanswered questions that deserve attention.

Historically, due to the transient nature of the majority of adult students involved in English as a Second Language (ESL) classes, and the open entry, open exit policy of the ESL programs they participate in, it has been extremely difficult to gather longitudinal data with which to conduct research. As a solution, Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991) point out that longitudinal information can be obtained for the purposes of deducing trends and traits by looking at two or more corpora of cross-sectional data gathered from separate cohorts in similar academic circumstances when other more traditional methods of obtaining longitudinal data are not feasible (p. 14). This approach in obtaining information would appear to be the most productive in gathering information for the purpose of forming any generalizations regarding the groups of students that attend classes in the ESL program at Clark College.

Accordingly, data from two cohorts of students from the ESL program at Clark College was collected on two separate occasions over a two year period. Data from the first cohort (92) is taken from an unpublished study conducted at Clark College during Spring quarter 1992 by Wilkinson, Chalfen and Allen (1992). Data from the second cohort (93) were collected during Spring quarter, 1993. On both occasions, data were collected using a questionnaire designed exclusively for these two studies. The questionnaire solicits data regarding ESL students' language learning backgrounds, current knowledge of computer
technology, current degree of awareness of academic and vocational programs available at Clark College and their educational ambitions for the future.

Consequently, the results of a comparison of the data gathered with these two cross-sectional studies are being examined with the hope of discovering tendencies within the studied student population that will facilitate the broadening of the program to incorporate students' needs with the Colleges' mission. To provide a more human touch to the somewhat detached gathering of data for evaluation, information derived from face to face interviews with students from different levels within the program is used to provide a personal, more rounded picture of the students than numbers alone are capable of doing.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In analyzing the collected information, the following seven areas of concentration were examined with the aim of determining the degree to which the ESL program at Clark College is addressing the needs and goals of the students it serves: 1) What are the demographic backgrounds that the students bring to the program? 2) What are students' current status in the program? 3) What is the work status of the students enrolled in the ESL program? 4) How do students assess their knowledge of the English language? Also, how much time do students devote to language study outside of the classroom? 5) What experience do students have with computer technology, and how interested are they in acquiring computer skills? 6) Are students aware of future educational opportunities and the financial aid programs that will enable them avail themselves of these opportunities? 7) What future educational goals do students have and which of the various vocational and technical programs offered by Clark College are they interested in pursuing?
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

A review of literature in the field of ESL in ABE reveals that studies pertaining to adult ESL students and their progression through a given educational system are, in essence, non-existent. This is best illustrated by the results of several searches of the leading data-base for educational research in the country, Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC). In a search using the keywords "English as a second language" and "longitudinal studies," only nine documents were revealed. Of these nine documents, one deals with bi-lingual education, five deal with kindergarten through twelfth grade (K-12) student populations and the remaining three concern themselves with community college level students.

None of the three dealing with community college populations directly addresses adult ESL student populations; rather, they cover students who are enrolled in grade and credit bearing classes for which students pay tuition and are accountable. There are two exceptions to this lack of directly related literature. Thomas et al, (1992) provide interesting information in the area of ESL students and vocational training (See p. 12.), and the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (1991) has produced an informative report on demographic trends and federal initiatives in adult literacy (See pp. 19-20).
As a result of the lack of direct research in the areas with which this study is concerned, there is a necessary reliance on related literature from the fields of ABE and Adult Literacy (AL) to explore issues that are of concern to adult ESL student populations and to look for parallels that are of relevance to this study. The key issues examined in the literature are those of open entry / open exit programs, current academic information, work situations, computer knowledge, financial aid and further educational plans.

Open Entry and Open Exit Program Issues

Research into related literature for this study reveals the dilemma posed in compiling longitudinal data about a particular group of students in open entry and open exit programs such as the program at Clark College. As the previously mentioned search reveals, captive audiences such as K-12 groups and community college students enrolled in a degree or diploma granting program lend themselves more readily to longitudinal studies (Gosak, 1988; Torres, 1989; Patkowski, 1989).

For ESL programs such as Clark College's, the gathering of longitudinal data in the traditional manner of tracking a particular individual or group over a protracted period of time is difficult, if not impossible. It can be argued that students involved in open entry and open exit programs, and the programs themselves, are negatively stigmatized by the seemingly inherent difficulty in collecting empirical information.

The marked lack of research concerning students in open entry and open exit adult ESL programs points to the difficulty in constructing a realistic representation of these students and the obstacles they face in progressing through the educational system. The information that is available regarding
adult ESL students in articles concerned with ABE and Adult Literacy (AL) provides a degree of insight regarding previous and contemporary thought on the subject that is illuminating, albeit, disturbing.

In the few studies available involving ESL students in ABE settings, ESL students are afforded low status when compared to more easily identified Adult Basic Education (ABE) and "regular" student cohorts. A poignant example of this not so benign neglect is highlighted in the study prepared by Seppanen (1988) for the Division of Information Services and Enrollment Planning of the Washington State Board for Community College Education. She makes it clear, from the title and throughout the body of her work, that ESL students are excluded from the study of nine community colleges "because of their limited ability to complete a written survey "(p. 3). It is difficult to believe that an institution with the resources of the Washington State Board for Community College Education could not find a way of gathering input from this not insignificant number of students, had it wished to do so.

In her study, Seppanen categorizes the various "types" of students enrolled in the Community Colleges studied. The first of these categories is that of "place-bound" adults. Students who, due to family, job or other mitigating circumstances, are unable to relocate for educational purposes. They are typically enrolled in academic and vocational classes and account for 35% to 41% of all students. The second category is one of "Special Needs Students." These students are subcategorized into the following four categories: Low-Income Students 19% - 23%, Single Parents 8% - 12%, Re-entry Homemakers 6% - 10% and Unemployed 3% -5%. It is clear that a significant number of ESL students do belong to one or more of these categories. Implied by the deliberate omission of this group of students in the study is the tacit assumption that ESL
students are not seen as playing a significant role in the vitality of the colleges. This assumption, based upon the author's personal experience in the field and the above mentioned statistics, deserves a closer look.

At the academic level of inquiry, the same attitude seems to prevail. Although it is not stated explicitly, a closer view of the impression that ESL students are not afforded the same status as other adult learners is found in work done by Rowekamp (1988), in which she explores differences in program goals and objectives between adult ESL and academic ESL. Her observation is that "there are major differences in the content between the two; the goals for adult ESL students are focused on teaching language skills and cultural orientation" (p. 9). Also, she notes that "goals for academic ESL focus on teaching language skills for achieving academic success" (p. 9). This delineation points to an area that is problematic for both groups. When expectations between groups differ, both adult ESL and academic ESL students are denied the richness of education. This is to say that "achieving academic success" and the learning of language and cultural skills are in no way mutually exclusive.

In a national research study conducted by Guth and Wrigley (1992), the background and major areas of focus in nine adult ESL programs were examined. This study took place at various sites around the country and lasted for two years. Although this particular study does concern itself with ESL students in general, the area of concentration is that of adult ESL literacy. It is interesting that the authors' definitions of adult ESL literacy might be seen as pejorative in nature. For example, the authors claim that the attributes of an ESL literacy student are in the eye of the beholder; "From the perspective of a provider of a full range of ESL classes, ESL literacy students may be those who
are not able to make normal progress in ESL classes because they have difficulty with written language" (p. 4). This belief is extrapolated to embrace the perspective of an employer and it is suggested that "ESL literacy students are minority employees whose communication skills in English need to improve to facilitate communication, job performance and promotability" (p. 5).

Guth and Wrigley's report neglects to address the reality that all ESL students are also literacy students. This unintentional omission is reflective of much of the writing on the subject of adult ESL students and their educational experiences.

**Current Academic Information**

Although, by convention, information contained under this title is sometimes referred to as 'background' information; in this study, background information and current academic information have been combined. The need to collect baseline data about a particular cohort being studied is, by default, a requirement for gathering sufficient information to form a more thorough picture of the students being represented, since the variables among cohorts studied may have a significant effect on the results of the study.

While there is no particular body of work that addresses what is, and what is not background or current academic information in and of itself, Brown (1988) goes to great lengths to explain the notion of variables in academic research, and the degree to which they play a part in any attempt to draw conclusions when using statistics in research. He points out that most variables change over time. He also notes that in the study of language learning, the typical variables among individuals are, "sex, nationality, first-language background, intelligence,
and language ability" (p. 8). He is quick to add that there is some dispute as to whether intelligence or language ability can vary over time.

Brown also warns of the need to differentiate between variables and constructs, "Both variables and constructs can vary over time or among individuals, a variable is essentially what we can observe or quantify of the human characteristics or abilities involved, whereas a construct is the actual characteristic or ability that it represents in human beings (p. 9)." His illustration of the difference between variables and constructs is one of a particular student's proficiency in Spanish:

Proficiency in Spanish, for example, is something that goes on inside an individual's head. As such, it is difficult to observe and may be different from the indirect observations that a researcher makes (perhaps, scores on a Spanish proficiency test) to define this variable. The construct proficiency in Spanish (the actual human ability) could be represented by the variable test scores in Spanish proficiency (what we can observe and measure of the construct in question). However, it is important to remember that the scores are not the ability but a reflection of the ability. Like any reflection, it may be a blurred or distorted representation of the actual construct in question. (p. 8)

This discussion of constructs and variables is important in understanding the need for collecting background information about students that may or may not affect the outcome of a particular study. This distinction justifies the collection of such data on empirical grounds. Statistical analysis was used in looking at the data in this study and is presented where appropriate. The data gathered from both cohorts are used for the purposes of comparison and progress.

Bach, et al. (1992) conducted a study on the tracking of community college students using computer technology and a program called ADVISE. ADVISE is a computer program designed to facilitate the tracking and advising
of students. The authors of this study point out that Portland Community College (PCC) has an open admission policy, and that the tracking of students could be facilitated by the use of computer technology. For previously stated reasons, adult ESL students were not included in this study, but the positive aspects of the computer program and its potential might well compel those interested in following adult ESL students through their academic experience to consider a closer look at the program and the study. Whether such an innovative manner of tracking and advising students who are in open entry and open exit programs is feasible, or even practicable, is an unanswered question.

**Working situations**

When dealing with adult ESL students, the issue of work is never far removed from the students' day to day lives within and without the classroom. It is putatively a given that the primary reason for the majority of adult ESL students to attend classes is to better their English skills for the purpose of obtaining or upgrading their work situation.

This observation is recognized and reinforced by teachers and materials developers in the field. Such recognition is supported by the reality that it is difficult, if not impossible, to find a contemporary text book for adult ESL students, at all levels, that does not dedicate a significant amount of time to employment job skills, and on the job linguistic and cultural behavior. It is more than likely that the topic of work and jobs is a frequent area of discussion in the majority of adult ESL classrooms.

The working situations adult ESL students find themselves in are as varied as the students themselves. Beyond the theoretical, the bridge between ESL classes for adults and actual entrance into the workforce is not always as
clear to students as instructors might wish. In an abstract of his study for the Massachusetts State Council on Vocational Education, Green (1989) advocates a tighter bond between secondary schools and community college vocational programs. He outlines five goals for such a relationship as defined by previously conducted projects. These are:

1. An inventory of intersystem vocational education agreements that provides current information on the status of articulation, collaboration, and Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) agreements between high schools, community colleges, and service delivery areas.

2. A paper on articulation which correlates significant educational and economic trends with an argument for using articulation as a strategy to meet occupational predictions.

3. An articulation guidebook which explains forms of articulation, reviews benefits and barriers, introduces the importance of formal agreements and plans, and discusses planning processes, implementation activities, financial considerations, and program development.

4. A report on a study of the status of coordination between JTPA and school/college occupational programs that used case studies developed through roundtable discussions and individual interviews in four JTPA service delivery areas.

5. A handbook that describes four different types of coordination practices already in place in Massachusetts.

Although Green's proposals are not intended for ESL students per se, it would seem that the underlying idea of presenting a clearly defined path from the classroom to the workforce would serve both students and teachers well. In his study, Teitel (1989) augments Green's ideas by outlining how such an approach was practiced at four different locations. Such collaboration would suggest that the idea of looking at various employment tracks for students is not new to the community college system. It is noteworthy, once again, that adult
ESL students are not represented in the literature. Surely, by extension, the methods and approaches for strengthening bonds between the academic and the business communities can be utilized for the benefit of adult ESL students as well as for others under the community college's umbrella.

It is somewhat interesting, and more than a little ironic, that the issue of work for adult ESL students is covered more thoroughly than any other issue addressed in this study. As far as relevant and related literature are concerned, perhaps the most helpful to the educator is the handbook produced by Thomas, et al. (1992) for community colleges working with adult ESL students. The handbook is exceptional in its broad coverage of the many issues affecting students at many levels. The authors look at a broad spectrum of issues ranging from employment and financial aid to administrative institutional budget considerations. This work is a bright spot in this area of research in that it covers the plight of the adult ESL student from an administrative point of view that is refreshing rather than dismissive. They write:

Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students face a variety of challenges and barriers to entering and successfully completing vocational programs at community colleges. Some of these obstacles mirror those faced by other adults and economically disadvantaged students. Barriers unique to LEP students stem from their struggle to adjust to a new culture and acquire a new language. Even the concept of "community college" might be totally unknown to many recently arrived new Americans.

In order to achieve successful program initiatives, colleges need to deliberately eliminate and circumvent barriers to entry for LEP students. Potential barriers need to be anticipated at each stage of the student's progress in the college process: entering college, attaining the necessary prerequisites, participating in the program, completing the program, and finding meaningful employment. (p. 15)
Computer Knowledge

A great deal of interest in Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL) has surfaced in recent years in the area of language education. The efficacy of computers in the language learning process is still a matter of heated debate in many circles. What cannot be argued is the fact that keyboarding and computer skills are of vital importance to anyone wishing to compete in current and future job markets. For this reason alone, the issue of whether computers have a place in adult ESL language teaching and learning is moot.

It is noteworthy that Rachal (1993), in his review of experimental literature and the use of computers over the last eight years, explores twelve studies involving ABE students, general equivalency diploma (GED) students and computer assisted language learning (CALL). The studies concerned themselves mainly with reading achievement, although general subjects such as math, vocabulary and GED skills were also tested. All of the subjects in the twelve studies ranged from nonreader to GED preparatory students. Additionally most of the studies took place in ABE/GED programs (also the area where ESL programs are generally found).

Of the twelve studies, six indicated no statistically significant differences between test groups and control groups. The other six studies showed "mixed results or significant differences among the groups studied." Despite what can be viewed as statistically disappointing results in the studies examined, a most important observation is made by Rachal when he notes that in several studies, the cohort using computers "demonstrated increased motivation and self-confidence" (p. 167). Although this observation is of a subjective nature, it should not escape the attention of adult ESL educators.
As Rowekamp (1988) compares basic motivation between ABE and adult ESL learners, she observes that ABE learners are "part of the culture and have chosen to go back to school, but may view learning as a need rather than an interest, which may adversely affect their motivation to learn. ABE learners may also not see the relevance of what they are learning" (p. 8). In contrast, she describes adult ESL learners as being "very motivated to learn the language because they often believe it is the key to belonging, understanding, and success in the country in which they are permanent residents" (p. 9).

Rachal also noted that the dropout rate within the studies he examined was quite high. While he did not elaborate upon the causes of this, it would seem that the factor of motivation plays a substantial part in any student's willingness to continue with a given program of study over a prolonged period of time.

This potential link between motivation and access to computers highlights the need to consider the positive affective influences of having access to computers. It should be made clear that the backgrounds and compelling reasons to pursue education are markedly different between the typical ABE student that took part in the studies reviewed by Rachal and the typical adult ESL student. If, as Rachal and Rowekamp suggest, the use of computers can contribute to self-esteem and motivation while building language and job skills, then there can be little argument as to whether adult ESL students should be exposed to computers and instructor guided CALL as often as is possible.

Financial Aid and Further Education

As described in the previous section, the literature seems to support the idea of the adult ESL learner as a motivated member of his or her community
with aspirations for improvement. The opportunity for this group of learners to pursue further educational goals is highly contingent upon the ability to obtain financial aid for the payment of college tuition. This, in and of itself, is not an obstacle. Financial aid is available after completion of ESL classes and acquisition of a level of English proficiency sufficient to gain admittance into a community college or university.

Thomas, et al. (1992) provide an exhaustive look at the issue of financial aid from both the institutional point of view and that of the student. The authors' suggestions regarding funding at the institutional level are discussed frankly, with an outline of the challenges facing both the institution and the student. Thomas et al. use the term LEP to refer to adult ESL students. Excepting direct quotations, for the sake of continuity and readability, the term adult ESL student will be used in this thesis.

To begin, a review of insights and recommendations regarding funding policy considerations is discussed at length. The following are excerpts that get to the heart of the matter when it comes to funding adult ESL programs:

There can be little doubt that funding for limited English proficient student programs in public higher education institutions is both a politically sensitive and controversial issue. Programs for LEP students require special instructional and support services, which place additional demands on an already stressed system. Fortunately, community colleges have multiple options and directions for securing funding for vocational programs for LEP students. (p. 99)

Three areas of funding suggested in the study are all contingent upon an understanding of the symbiotic relationship between a community and the community college that serves that community's technical and vocational workforce needs. To foster such relationships, Thomas et al. encourage
attempts at outreach on the part of community colleges. This outreach can take the form of fairs, open houses and other self-promotion strategies.

Their second suggestion entails exploring the possibility of looking within the community college to determine whether there are existing internal structures that can serve the adult ESL student population. Third, collaboration with external agencies is suggested as an often fruitful option. The study cites examples of utilizing the public, private, and nonprofit organizations, many of which have "valuable experience and expertise in working with LEP populations and are helping these individuals meet their goals and are redefining their own goals in response to this growing population" (p. 93).

In regard to adult ESL students and their ability to obtain financial aid, the following astute, yet somewhat disheartening overview is presented:

Community colleges generally encourage LEP students to apply for financial aid, and for many LEP students, the standard financial aid package makes higher education possible. Unfortunately, other barriers to entry arise, such as insufficient family funds to handle emergency expenses for housing or transportation, delayed psychological trauma stemming from relocation, medical problems among uninsured students, and cultural misunderstandings. In many cases the LEP student is not aware of available financial aid and other support resources to address these needs. LEP students who fail to meet in-state residency requirements face higher tuition rates and restricted opportunities for financial aid programs. Colleges need to be aware of all of these potential barriers in order to redirect policies and procedures. (p. 109)

The study continues to point out that without the benefit of financial aid, most adult ESL students are unable to enter college-level vocational programs. "Their only option is local adult basic education, which takes much longer for these students to acquire marketable job skills" (p. 110). Thomas' appraisal of this situation is damning, "In many communities the gap between local adult
educational options and college-level vocational training is so wide that the student is permanently blocked from entry" (p. 110).

Possible methods to ameliorate the difficulties faced by students in such situations are presented. Among the suggestions, "... stressing the availability of financial aid during recruitment and outreach needs to be followed by initiating the application process as soon as possible" (p. 110). The following three strategies are presented as remedies to overcoming financial aid hurdles:

- Provide translations of forms and policy statements
- Use native language speakers to guide students
- Hold bi-lingual (multi-lingual) financial aid workshops

The report prepared by Thomas, et al. is remarkably thorough in its overview and presentation of specifics about the intricacies involved in the financial aid situation as faced by both students and programs alike. It provides human insight into the problems facing adult ESL students on their journey through the maze of the American educational system.

Summary

This review of related and relevant literature highlights several aspects involved in the adult ESL student's quest for education and the rewards ascribed to academic success from an exploration of the dilemmas faced by open entry and open exit programs to the difficulties of work. From the rewards of technology based education and ultimately the possibilities and pitfalls in the transition from ABE/ESL programs to higher-education, there can be little question that this group of students requires a greater degree of interest and oversight from all who are involved in their educational progress.
This review provides the backdrop for the results of this study. After considering the points raised by the literature and comparing them to the perceptions, desires and goals of the students at Clark College, it is hoped that the reader questions both aspects of the equation, from the administrative to the individual, and forms ideas that reach beyond theory. To fully appreciate the complexities involved, a brief sojourn into educational theory and its pedagogical offspring is considered appropriate.

Carr and Kemmis (1986), in their exploration of the foundations of contemporary educational theory, provide a detailed outline of the path that has been followed from philosophy to science. They point out that historically, on the whole, educational theory has been greatly influenced, if not completely dominated by popular philosophies, such as those espoused by Plato and Rousseau among others. As a result of these powerful influences, educational theory began to concern itself with passive theorizing to the exclusion of reflecting on actual practice (pp. 52-58).

As the instructor considers questions such as theory and practice, the idiosyncratic perspectives he or she brings to the process, and the task of combining theories and philosophies in the quest to be a better educator, Ovando and Collier (1985) bring one back to basics with their simply stated recommendation of "discovering the student." They begin by quoting a student who states, "I think it would have helped me a lot if the teachers just knew something about me" (p. 15). To take this point a step further, the authors expound on the idea of "the importance of having more than an illusion of knowledge about our students and making time in our schedules to obtain objective data about their lives (p. 15)."
It would seem that in considering Ovando and Collier’s advice, instructors might question and reflect upon some of the theories under which they practice their art. Such reflection and questioning are not simply self-serving. On the contrary, for the language instructor trying to blend theory and practice with his or her own day-to-day experience within the classroom, it is critical. As Usher (1989) views such questioning:

... in a sense, one can see this as a process of putting formal theory as 'product' into a context by explaining the assumptions, concepts, values, and language of formal theory as 'framework'. Thus contextualized it can then be seen as explaining the world in a particular way and from a particular standpoint. . . . (p. 89)

He continues:

Formal theory as a product is very difficult to deal with in the classroom. Review is a dialogical process which mediates formal and informal theory, enabling counterposing and mutual questioning; it is a ‘fusion of horizons’ between formal and informal theory which deepens understanding and opens up the possibility of new experience and changes in practice. Informal theory goes beyond 'commonsense', practice beyond routine, and formal theory is seen as pragmatic and edifying. (p. 90)

Usher’s ideas are certainly worthy of consideration. The melding of theory combined with a review of one’s own background knowledge and the willingness to experiment in the classroom can only be seen as beneficial to the student. The notion that there is a need for teachers and instructors in the adult ESL classroom to push the boundaries of traditional teaching and learning roles can be seen as positive. Also, in light of the ever increasing number of students in adult ESL, it might also be seen as necessary.

In a report produced by The Education Writers Association (1990), the historical pattern of ESL populations is discussed:
Since the immigration spurt began in the mid-1970s, the waves of immigration have followed previous patterns, even though they mostly came from areas of the globe other than the European roots of the past. The first immigrants were well-educated, upper-class families, followed by the military/merchant cohort. A third wave consists of farmers and others with skills less usable in today's economy, who often are illiterate in their own language. (p. 2)

A report produced by the Office of Vocational and Adult Education, Washington, DC (1991) reinforces the above statement and provides a stark look at the growth in the adult ESL population. Over a ten year period from 1980 to 1989, adult ESL has experienced a growth rate increase of 183 percent. This is the largest increase in enrollment of all three federally recognized adult education programs, ABE, ESL and Adult Secondary Education (ASE). This is illustrated in figure 1 below.

![Adult ESL Enrollment Increase from 1980 to 1989](image)

**Figure 1.** Adult ESL enrollment from 1980 to 1989.

The magnitude of growth in this group serves to reinforce the reality that adult ESL is not a passing trend. This being the case, the more information
concerning students in these programs that can be collected, the better equipped teachers and instructors will be to provide their students with the skills needed to participate fully in their communities, and ultimately cross the bridge to higher education, if they desire.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

This chapter will outline and illustrate the methods employed in gathering the necessary data used in conducting this study. As this is a field-based, descriptive study, two means of gathering information were used to provide the broadest view possible. This entailed the use of both questionnaires and personal interviews to gather needed data.

Subjects

With the aim of discovering traits and goals of students enrolled in the ESL program at Clark College, data were collected using a questionnaire from two cohorts at the College. The two cohorts involved in this study were comprised of active students at Clark College in Vancouver, Washington during Spring quarter 1992 and Spring quarter 1993. The cohort of 1992 contained 201 subjects from 27 countries. The cohort of 1993 contained 317 subjects from 28 countries. It should be pointed out that there is an overlap between cohorts due to the nature of the program and that of this study. This will be addressed in chapter V.

Additionally, in order to obtain information of a less structured and restricted nature, a stratified random sample of 10 students was selected from the 1993 cohort to participate in an interview with the researcher. The students
were chosen to reflect equality in gender and ethnic make up for each of the levels. Instructors from levels one through five were asked to select two students from their classes that reflected the makeup of their class. These interviews were guided by the use of a list of five questions.

Materials

A questionnaire was used to gather information from both cohorts. Due to the Limited English Proficiency (LEP) of a majority of the students, translations of the questionnaire were provided for six language populations involved in the study: Vietnamese, Russian, Spanish, Khmer-Cambodian, Japanese, Rumanian. The English questionnaire and the six foreign language translations can be found in Appendix A. In addition to the questionnaires, a set of guiding questions which was used to conduct the interviews is found in Appendix B.

Procedures

The procedures followed in the conducting of this study were those of a traditional field based descriptive study. Accordingly, the first step was the use of a questionnaire designed to gather various types of information. This information includes the language learning and background histories students bring to their studies at the ESL program at Clark College. Additionally, students' current level of awareness of the further technical and vocational educational opportunities available to them upon completion of the basic ESL program, their awareness of, and their experience with financial aid is covered by the questionnaire. Students were also asked to indicate the vocation(s) or profession(s) that they were interested in pursuing.
For the most part, the data gathered is of a nominal nature. The survey instrument (questionnaire) is believed to have both content and face validity. While the questionnaire has not been subjected to intricate measurement concepts, the claim of content validity is based upon prior success with the questionnaire in gathering data that was deemed both relevant and suitable for analysis by instructors and administrators at Clark College in the study conducted in 1992. While the issue of face validity is culturally bound and subjective, it is believed that the formal presentation of the questionnaire in conjunction with first-language translations of the questionnaire, as well as prior comments by both colleagues and students, support the claim of face validity.

In recognition of the need to avoid language errors due to the Limited English Proficiency (LEP) of a majority of the students and the desire to establish face validity with lower-level students, the translated questionnaires discussed in the preceding section were used.

A final step in the gathering of information was an interview with a stratified random sample of ten students, two from each of the five levels of the ESL program, where gender and ethnic background were the selection criteria. The interviews were conducted using the previously mentioned set of guiding questions found in Appendix B. The list of questions was composed of questions deemed by the author, based upon personal teaching experience of over three years with this particular population, to elicit nuances of perception about the program and desires for change that were not reflected from the data obtained by the sole use of questionnaires.

The interviews were followed by questions posed with the aim of drawing out responses, attitudes and expectations of a more personal, less structured nature. In cases where the interview questions were too complex for students in
the lower levels to respond to in an informative manner using English, students
from higher levels with the same language background served as translators.
This was required for the six students in levels 1 through 3. The use of
translators permitted the collection of data that would have been otherwise
unobtainable.

Analysis

The information obtained from this questionnaire for both 1992 and 1993
was entered into a database (Microsoft Excel 4.0) by the author. The output for
both years was grouped according to the outline of the questionnaire and was
organized to reflect what changes, if any, had occurred over the two years.

Subsequently, a statistical consultant, Erik Terdal, was asked to review
the data collected and to subject appropriate areas to statistical analysis. The
statistical software program STATVIEW was employed in this analysis. While
outside help was solicited to improve the quality and validity of this study, the
author accepts full responsibility for the results presented herein.

Due to the inherently subjective nature of any analysis of personal
interviews, the results of the interviews will be outlined in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

INTRODUCTION

This chapter will present the results of the questionnaires and a comparison of the two cohorts. The 1992 cohort has a sample size of 201. The 1993 cohort has a sample size of 317. Data collected from the questionnaires is presented in the form of tables and figures which reflect percentages rather than raw numbers. This is done to provide a clear distinction between cohorts due to the disparity in sample sizes.

Where appropriate, the results of statistical analysis performed on the collected data of the two cohorts will be discussed. As is conventional in language studies, the significance level is $\alpha < .05$. The majority of the data collected is nominal. In looking at frequency data, the $\chi^2$ (chi-square) and $\chi^2$ with continuity correction analysis are used. Where interval data is concerned, the Mann-Whitney U test was performed (Nunan, 1992).

Additionally, following the presentation and discussion of questionnaire results, the results of the personal interviews conducted with a stratified random sample from the 1993 cohort will be presented in a narrative manner. The results of comparison between cohorts are presented in the order in which the questions are ordered on the questionnaire.
QUESTIONNAIRES

Age

There is no statistical significance in age between the two cohorts (p = .91). As can be seen in figure 2, the mean age for both cohorts was thirty-seven years of age.

![Pie chart showing age distribution]

**Figure 2.** A comparison of the average age of students from both cohorts.

Gender

The outcome of the comparison between both cohorts in the area can be equated with flipping a coin and having it land on its side (p = .9989). As figure 3 illustrates, there was absolutely no statistical difference in gender makeup for both years. Given the difference in sample size between the two cohorts, such an occurrence can only be seen as an unlikely coincidence. Statistically, it does
rule out the variable of gender as an influencing variable in any attempt at correlating gender with another variable. There is not a statistically significant level of difference between men and women for either year.

![Gender comparison between cohorts](image.png)

**Figure 3.** Gender comparison between cohorts.

**Native Countries**

Due to the balkanization of Eastern Europe and several of the satellite countries of the former Soviet Union, it was decided that rather than present the percentage of each country represented by the students in the study, students' countries were placed into geographically based groups. Raw data and percentages of students citing a particular country as their native country can be found in Appendix I.

Table I below shows the grouping of cited countries into meaningful groups based on geographic proximity. Figure 4 below presents the percentage
changes taken from the graph in an effort to present a clearer view of the changes in student populations over the course of the last two years.

**TABLE 1**

**GROUPING OF STUDENTS' COUNTRIES BY GEOGRAPHICAL AREA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Central &amp; South America</th>
<th>Central &amp; NE Asia</th>
<th>Eastern Europe</th>
<th>Former Soviet Republics</th>
<th>Middle East</th>
<th>North America</th>
<th>Southeast Asia</th>
<th>Western Europe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Bosnia</td>
<td>Crimea</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>Kurdistan</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Rumania</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Moldavia</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moldavia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 4. Population change by geographical area between 1992 and 1993.*
First Language

The following figure and table illustrate the change in students' first language (L1). Figure 5 shows language groups with changes between the two cohorts that had a change over the two year period that was greater than 1%.

Figure 5. First language changes.

To further clarify the results of a comparison between the two cohorts, Table II also presents the degree of change between the two cohorts.

TABLE II

CHANGES IN STUDENTS' FIRST LANGUAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST LANGUAGE</th>
<th>93</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHINESE</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAPANESE</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHMER</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOREAN</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>+2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUMANIAN</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSSIAN</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>+15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPANISH</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKRAINIAN</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>+2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIETNAMESE</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Languages

Students were asked whether they knew another language. There was a statistical difference between cohorts. $X^2$ analysis with continuity correction resulted in $p = .5157$. Figure 6 shows the percentage differences between responses for individual cohorts.

![Knowledge of Other Languages](image)

**Figure 6.** Knowledge of other languages.

English Study before Arrival in US

Students reported the number of months they had spent studying English before coming to the United States. See figure 7 below. There was a significant statistical difference between cohorts. Mann-Whitney U analysis resulted in $= .0001$. The 92 cohort reported having studied English approximately three months longer than the 93 cohort before coming to the United States.
Length of Time Spent in the United States

Students reported the number of months they had been in the United States. Figure 8 below shows the average length of time spent in the United States by each cohort.

Figure 7. Months of study before arrival in US.

Figure 8. Time spent in the United States.
There was no significant statistical difference between cohorts. The 93 cohort reported having been in the United States approximately six months longer than the 92 cohort.

**Quarters Spent in the ESL Program**

Students were asked to report the number of quarters they had spent in the ESL program. The 93 cohort reported having spent approximately the same amount of time in the program as the 92 cohort, 2.5 quarters. Figure 9 below shows the average number of quarters spent in the program by each cohort.

*Figure 9. Quarters in program.*
Quarters Students Plan to Stay in ESL Program

Students indicated the number of quarters they planned to stay in the ESL program. There was a significant statistical difference between cohorts of $p = .0001$. Figure 10 below shows the average.

![Number of Quarters Plan to Stay in Program](image)

**Figure 10.** Number of quarters students plan on staying in ESL program.

The 92 cohort planned on spending approximately two quarters longer in the program than the 93 cohort.

**Level ESL Program Begun**

Students were asked to report the level at which they entered the ESL program at Clark College. Figure 11 below shows the percentage per level for both cohorts. Additionally, Table III below Figure 11 shows the degree of change between cohorts from 1992 to 1993.
Figure 11. Beginning Level in ESL program.

TABLE III
BEGINNING LEVEL AND PERCENTAGE CHANGE FROM 1992 TO 1993

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beginning Level</th>
<th>93</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>69.40%</td>
<td>57.21%</td>
<td>+12.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.83%</td>
<td>19.40%</td>
<td>-4.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.62%</td>
<td>10.95%</td>
<td>-4.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.94%</td>
<td>7.46%</td>
<td>-0.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.21%</td>
<td>4.98%</td>
<td>-2.77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Level in ESL Program

Students were asked to report their current level in the ESL program at Clark College. Table IV below shows the percentage change per level between cohorts from 92 to 93 for both cohorts. Additionally, Figure 12 shows the percentage of change between the 92 and 93 cohorts.
### TABLE IV

CURRENT LEVEL AND PERCENTAGE CHANGE FROM 1992 TO 1993

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Level</th>
<th>93</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>45.11%</td>
<td>37.81%</td>
<td>+7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>25.37%</td>
<td>-2.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.73%</td>
<td>13.93%</td>
<td>-3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>13.43%</td>
<td>+4.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.47%</td>
<td>9.45%</td>
<td>-5.98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12. Current Level in ESL program.
Has ESL Program Helped You with English

Students were asked whether the ESL program had helped them with their English skills. There was a significant statistical difference between cohorts. $X^2$ analysis with continuity correction resulted in $p = 0.003$. Figure 13 shows the percentage differences between responses for individual cohorts. There was an increase of approximately 8% from the 92 to the 93 cohorts.

![Figure 13. ESL program helped with English.](image)

Learn of Other Programs at Clark College

Students were asked whether they had learned of other educational programs available at Clark College. There was a significant statistical difference reported between cohorts. $X^2$ analysis with continuity correction
resulted in \( p = .0001 \). Figure 14 below shows a decrease of approximately 50% from the 92 to the 93 cohorts.

**Figure 14.** Learned of other programs.

**Take Classes at Main Campus**

Students were asked whether they had taken classes at the Main Campus of Clark College. Figure 15 below shows the percentage differences between responses for individual cohorts.

**Figure 15.** Percentage of students who took classes at the Main Campus.
There was a significant statistical difference of $p = .0002$ between cohorts. There was an increase of approximately 9% from 1992 to 1993 cohorts.

**Working Situation**

Students were asked whether they were working. There was no significant statistical difference between cohorts. Figure 16 below shows the percentage differences between responses for individual cohorts.

![Figure 16. Percentage of students who are working.](Image)

**ESL Helping with Jobs**

Students stated whether ESL classes had helped them with their jobs, if they were working. There was a significant statistical difference between cohorts. $X^2$ analysis with continuity correction resulted in $p = .0001$. Figure 17 below shows the percentage differences between responses for individual cohorts. There was an increase of approximately 17% in positive responses from the 92 cohort to the 93 cohort.
Students Wanting Work

Students reported if they wanted work. Figure 18 below shows the percentage differences for individual cohorts.
English Ability

Students were asked whether they believed they spoke English well. There was a significant statistical difference between cohorts. $X^2$ analysis with continuity correction resulted in $p = .0001$. Figure 19 shows the percentage differences between responses for individual cohorts. There was an increase of approximately 48% in the percentage of students who did not believe they spoke English well from the 92 to the 93 cohorts.

![Figure 19. Percentage of students who believe they speak English well.](image)
**Additional Study**

Students were asked whether they studied English outside the classroom. There was a significant statistical difference between cohorts. Figure 20 below shows the percentage differences between responses for individual cohorts. $X^2$ analysis with continuity correction resulted in $p = .0199$. There was an increase of approximately 8% from the 92 to the 93 cohorts.

![Figure 20. Percentage of students who study outside of the classroom.](image)

**Hours of Additional Study**

Students reported how many hours per week they studied English outside the classroom. There was a significant statistical difference between cohorts. Mann-Whitney U analysis resulted in $p = .0001$. The 93 cohort spent four hours...
more per week than the 92 cohort. Figure 21 shows the average number of hours spent studying English outside of the classroom by each cohort.

![Figure 21. Average amount of hours spent studying English outside of the classroom.](image)

**Problems in Learning**

Students were asked to list particular problems they felt affected their ability to learn English. This question was an open question and the results are those generated by the students. The results are presented in Table V below.
TABLE V

PROBLEMS IN LANGUAGE LEARNING REPORTED BY STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROBLEMS</th>
<th>93</th>
<th>92</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAMMAR</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISTENING</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMORY</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO PROBLEMS</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRACTICE</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRONUNCIATION</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEAKING</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPELLING</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERSTANDING</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRITING</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prior Computer Use

Students were asked whether they had used computers prior to attending the ESL program at Clark College. Figure 22 shows the percentage differences between responses for individual cohorts.

Figure 22. Percentage of students who used computers prior to entering the ESL program.
Computer Use in ESL Program

Students were asked whether they have used computers in the ESL program at Clark College. There was a significant statistical difference between cohorts. $X^2$ analysis with continuity correction resulted in $p = .0224$. Figure 23 shows the percentage differences between responses for individual cohorts. There is an increase in the percentage of students who have used computers in the program of approximately 7% from 1992 to 1993.

![Figure 23. Percentage of students who have used computers in the ESL program.](image)

Want to Learn Computers in ESL Program

Students were asked whether they wanted computer training while attending the ESL program at Clark College. There was no significant statistical difference between cohorts. Figure 24 shows the percentage differences between responses for individual cohorts.
Figure 24. Percentage of students who want computer training in the ESL program.

Computer Use

Students were asked whether they planned to study computers at Clark College. Figure 25 shows an increase of approximately 26% from 1992 to 1993.

Figure 25. Percentage of students who plan to attend classes at Clark College to learn about computers.
There was a significant statistical difference between cohorts. $X^2$ analysis with continuity correction resulted in $p = .0001$.

**Knowledge of Financial Aid**

Students were asked whether they had learned of financial aid in the ESL program. There was no significant statistical difference between cohorts. Figure 26 below shows the percentage differences between cohorts. There was a decrease of approximately 2% from the 92 to the 93 cohorts.

![Figure 26](image)

*Figure 26. Percentage of students who learned about financial aid in the ESL program.*
Applied for Financial Aid

Students were asked whether they had applied for financial aid. Figure 27 shows the percentage differences between responses for individual cohorts. There was an increase of approximately 6% from the 92 to the 93 cohorts.

![Applied for Financial Aid](image)

Figure 27. Percentage of students who have applied for financial aid.

Want to Learn of Financial Aid

Students were asked whether they wanted to learn about financial aid opportunities at Clark College while in the ESL program. There was not a significant statistical difference between cohorts from both years. Figure 28 below shows the percentage differences between cohorts.
Knowledge of Advanced English Classes

Students were asked whether they knew that advanced English classes are available at Clark College. There was a significant statistical difference between cohorts. $\chi^2$ analysis with continuity correction resulted in $p = .015$. Figure 29 shows the percentage differences between responses for individual cohorts. There was a decrease in the percentage of students who knew of these classes of approximately 11% from the 92 to the 93 cohorts.
Knowledge of Advanced English Classes at Clark College

Figure 29. Percentage of students who know advanced English classes are available at Clark College.

Knowledge of Tuition Costs

Students were asked whether they were aware that the advanced English classes required the payment of tuition. Figure 30 below shows the percentage differences between responses for individual cohorts. There was a decrease of approximately 8% from the 92 to 93 cohorts.

Figure 30. Percentage of students who know they must pay for advanced English classes at Clark College.
Knowledge of Availability of Financial Aid

Students were asked whether they knew that financial aid was available for advanced English classes and other programs. Figure 31 shows a percentage decrease of approximately 3% from the 92 to the 93 cohorts.

![Knowledge of Available Financial Aid for Advanced English Classes](image)

**Figure 31.** Percentage of students who know that financial aid is available for advanced English classes.

Plan on Continuing Education

Students were asked whether they planned on continuing their education after completing the ESL program. Figure 32 below shows a percentage increase of approximately 3% from the 92 to the 93 cohorts.
Plan on Continuing Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>93</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None Stated</td>
<td>23.34%</td>
<td>32.84%</td>
<td>-9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Preference</td>
<td>17.35%</td>
<td>5.47%</td>
<td>+11.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark College</td>
<td>59.31%</td>
<td>61.69%</td>
<td>-2.38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 32.** Percentage of students who plan on continuing their education.

**Location of Future Studies**

Students indicated where they would pursue their education after completing the ESL program. Table VI shows the percentage differences between the two cohorts.

**TABLE VI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Preferred Location for Further Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None Stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Preference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clark College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vocational and Skill Areas**

The percentage for each cohort is listed in conjunction with the change in percentage from 1992 to 1993 in Table VII below.
TABLE VII

VOCATIONAL AND SKILL AREAS OF INTEREST TO ESL STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOCATIONAL/EDUCATIONAL AREAS OF INTEREST</th>
<th>93</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE/HORTICULTURE</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>+2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTO/DIESEL TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>+5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOLOGY/FORESTRY</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>+2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEMISTRY/PHARMACY</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>+1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPUTERS</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOKING/CULINARY ARTS</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENTAL HYGIENE</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>DNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRONICS</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOLOGY</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOURNALISM</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>+2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACHINE TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATHEMATICS</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSIC</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>+1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSING</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>DNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHOTOGRAPHY</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELDING</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>+2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERVIEWS

Personal interviews were conducted with the ten students selected to participate in face to face interviews with the author. Table VIII below shows the
ethnic and gender makeup of those students selected to participate in the interviews. To maintain the anonymity outlined in the proposal for research to the Human Subjects Research Committee, the names used are pseudonyms.

**TABLE VIII**

**BACKGROUND OF STUDENTS INTERVIEWED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>NATIVE COUNTRY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nadia</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sergey</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lucien</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Rumanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Thien</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hieu</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Olga</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yelena</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Trung</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Carla</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jin Li</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overview of Guided Interviews**

Overall, the results of the face to face interviews were insightful, and supportive of the results obtained from the questionnaires. In general, there were similar responses from all the participants, regardless of gender or ethnic background. However, there was one markedly noticeable difference in responses from male and female interviewees regarding the changes they would like to see in the program. Four of the five women felt that some type of child-
care should be provided, so that students could concentrate on learning English rather than worry about their families.

**Changes in Feelings about Education**

There was general agreement from students at all levels, and particularly from students in the upper two levels, that the education system in the United States was superior to those of their respective countries. For the most part this seemed to be due to the opportunities adults had to get an education. As Carla in level 5 stated, "We can never go back to school like this in my country. School is for the young people. Old people work, that's it."

Students from the lower three levels seemed less impressed with the opportunities provided by the American educational system than with differences in the teachers and their teaching techniques. As Nadia in level 1 said, "Better teacher and teaching."

**The Best Things about the ESL Program**

Students from all levels seemed to be in agreement that the best things about the ESL program were the opportunities to speak. Students from the upper three levels indicated satisfaction with the opportunity to use computers and an emphasis on writing and reading skills.

**What Should Be Changed in the Program**

Feelings as to what should be changed about the ESL program seemed to be influenced more by the interviewees' current level within the program than any other factor that could be determined. Lucien, in level 2, wants more testing. Hieu, in level 3, wants a pronunciation class. Yetena, in level 4, was emphatic about the need for baby-sitting or child-care facilities. Although the majority of
women supported Yelena’s concern for child care facilities, it was evident that Yelena had reached a point where she was making crucial education and life decisions about her future in conjunction with attending to the needs of her young children. Her need to reconcile the two worlds of student and homemaker were foremost in her mind as obstacles that should be removed. Jin Li, in level 5, thinks all is well and that no changes are needed. His classmate, Maria, thinks there is too much repetition, and that more emphasis needs to be put on writing, listening and testing.

**Are You Going to Continue beyond the ESL program**

Every student interviewed said that he or she planned on continuing to study when finished with the ESL program. Only the two students from level 5 had clear ideas on fields of study they would pursue. Maria wants to combine business with translating skills in a financial area. Jin Li is interested in continuing his studies in chemistry once his English skills are satisfactory (in his opinion).

**What Would You Tell Someone New to the Program about it**

All ten students said that they would tell someone new to the program that it was very helpful. Trung, in level 4, said that it was, "... crazy not to take the classes." Sergey, in level 1, said, "The classes are normal, of course you should go." Hieu, in level 3, said he would tell them, "Which teachers and classes are good, and which teachers and classes are bad." He wasn’t asked to elaborate.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

INTRODUCTION

This study was conducted to examine the traits and goals of the students enrolled in the ESL program at Clark College over the last two years in order to assess changes, where they have occurred, within the program and within the student body as a whole. Students from two cohorts were surveyed using a questionnaire designed to illuminate any such changes. The survey was performed to gather and allow the presentation of information that will contribute to the teaching and learning environment at Clark College's ESL program, and to foster change where it is seen as helpful to this process.

QUESTIONS

In chapter I, seven areas of questioning were presented. In the interest of clarity and continuity, discussion of the study will follow the format of the questionnaire used to gather the information. Conclusions derived from the results will follow or be interwoven with the discussion of particular areas as is warranted.

Background Information

This first area of concentration on the questionnaire was designed to derive information about students that allows instructors and administrators to
form a general profile of the students with which they work. Based upon the results of this study, the following profile of the students in the ESL program emerges.

1. The average age of the student-body is thirty-seven. This should be considered when designing curriculum and materials. It stands to reason that these students bring considerable life experience to their learning, regardless of their current level of English proficiency.

2. There was no difference in gender makeup between the 92 and 93 cohorts. Nor was there more than a six month difference in age between men and women in either year. While gender makeup of a class might well differ somewhat from level to level, overall, gender makeup should probably not be a major concern within the classroom.

3. As is illustrated in Figure 4, there have been significant changes in geographical population groups over the last two years. The most significant of these changes is the increase of 17% in students from the former Soviet Union. In 1992 this group comprised 37% of the students surveyed, in 1993 they comprised 54%. This group is the only group showing such a substantial increase. Two other groups showed a small increase; they are the Middle East and Western Europe with an increase from 0% up to 1%. Three of the groups showed no change. They are North America with 6%, Central and South America with 1%, and Africa with 0%. Also, three groups showed a decline in percentage of student body makeup. They are Central and Northeast (NE) Asia with a decline of 8%, Southeast Asia with a decline of 6% and Eastern Europe with a decline of 5%. It should be noted that the actual number of students from Central, Southeast and Northeast Asia has increased from 1992 to 1993.
It is only when these groups are viewed as a percentage of a particular cohort that their numbers appear to have decreased. The impression that the student-body's population shift is away from countries in North, Central and Southeast Asia towards those countries and satellites of the former Soviet Union is not true, however, their percentage of the surveyed student-body has changed.

What this change entails is not yet clear. Perhaps the change warrants the inquiry into the materials currently being used and their relevance to the lives of peoples from Eastern European backgrounds. Much of the research in the field of adult ESL has been conducted over the last fifteen years, when Southeast Asians comprised the majority of students in ESL programs throughout the country.

4. The changes in first language correlate with the change in population detailed above. Students who state Russian as their first language increased by 15% from 1992 to 1993, and students stating Chinese or Vietnamese declined by 10%.

5. About 50% of all students speak another language other than their native language.

6. Students do study English prior to coming to the United States. There is a noticeable difference in the number of months spent studying by each cohort. The 1992 cohort studied approximately three months more than did the 1993 cohort. Perhaps this is explained by the fact that many of the students in the program in 1993 were also in the program in 1992 and have become more comfortable with the language, and as a result do not spend as much time studying.
7. Students in the 1993 cohort reported having spent six months longer in the United States, on average, than the 1992 cohort. The longitudinal nature of these two studies most probably accounts for this difference.

Current Information

This second area of concentration was aimed at obtaining information about students’ current and planned future status within the ESL program. It is with this information that tendencies in participation and continuation in the program can be discovered. Based on the results of the study, the following information and conclusions are provided.

1. Students from both cohorts have spent approximately 2.5 quarters in the ESL program. That there is not a significant difference between cohorts suggests that students are moving through the program at a regular rate. If there was an inclination towards stagnation within the program, one would expect to see a two to three quarter progression from the 1992 to the 1993 cohort due to the longitudinal nature of this study.

2. Interestingly, students from the 1992 cohort planned on spending approximately two months longer in the program than the 1993 cohort. There are no clear reasons for this change. Perhaps it can be attributed to a growing realization on the part of contemporary students that they must move from the shelter of the classroom to the workplace.

3. There is an increase of 12% in the number of students who entered the ESL program at level one in 1993. There was a decrease in the number of students who entered the program of 4% for both levels two and three. There was no real change for level four. Students entering at level five decreased by approximately 3%. It is clear that the number of students
with lower levels of English language proficiency entering the program is increasing.

4. From 1992 to 1993 there has been an increase of approximately 7% for level one and 5% for level four. Levels two and three have had a decrease of approximately 3%. Level five has had a decrease of almost 6%. The increase in level one can be attributed to the increased percentage of students entering at that level. The increase for level four reflects genuine movement through the program. The decrease in level five deserves attention; either students are not continuing on from level four, or they are skipping level five to enter classes on the Main Campus, or they are leaving the program altogether.

5. The percentage of students who felt that the ESL program was helping them with their English skills dropped approximately 8% from 1992 to 1993. It is the author’s belief that this is most probably attributable to the possibility that students who have been involved with the program for a longer period of time have also been dealing with the realities of the workplace and other ‘real-life’ issues. The result may well be a growing realization on the part of these students that they have reached the point where conversational skills alone are not sufficient in their daily lives, and higher level English skills are needed to progress.

6. There is a reported decrease of approximately 50% of students who have learned of other programs available at Clark College. This number is striking, in that an effort has been made (by several instructors in the ESL program at different levels) to provide a stronger link between the ESL program and Clark College. Obviously, this has not been effective and needs to be pursued more vigorously.
7. Contradicting the above mentioned statistics, there was an increase of approximately 9% of students who have taken classes at the Main Campus of Clark College. The most plausible explanation for this apparent discrepancy is that the level five classroom is located on the Main Campus.

Working

This third area of concentration is aimed at obtaining information about the working lives of the students. Also, it was designed to get an idea of the impact ESL studies had on their working situations. Based on the results of the study, the following information and conclusions are provided.

1. 25% of the students in the 1993 cohort reported working. This is up from 21% for the 1992 cohort. Despite the current reports of a lagging economy, ESL students are finding work.

2. By an increase of 10%, students from the 1993 cohort reported the feeling that their ESL classes had helped them with their jobs. This increase, along with the increase in students who are finding work, can be viewed as a positive result for the program as a whole.

3. Approximately 75% of the students from the 1993 cohort want to work, or are actively looking for work. This is an increase of 5% up from the 1992 cohort.

Current English Skills

In the fourth area of concentration, students assessed their abilities and skills with the English language and were asked to specify their biggest problems with language learning. They were also asked to indicate if they studied outside of the classroom, and how many hours per week they studied.
This information might be seen as reflective of the degree of motivation students bring to the program. Based on the results of the study, the following information and conclusions are provided.

1. Surprisingly, students report a decrease of approximately 39% in the belief that they speak English well. As was mentioned previously, this might be interpreted as a growing awareness on the part of the students as to what constitutes "speaking English well," or it may well reflect a lack of confidence on the part of the students in their abilities. A more plausible explanation is, of course, the increased number of students in the lower levels and a decrease in the number of students in the upper levels. This alone would account for the initial two suggestions as to the cause of the decrease.

2. Students who study English outside of the classroom increased by 8% from 1992 to 1993. This is most probably attributable to the composition of the program. More students are entering the program at level four, where more effort is required. Also, the increase in students entering at level one with the motivation and drive new students bring to their studies could well be a factor.

3. Students from the 1993 cohort are studying English approximately 4 hours more per week than those of the cohort of 1992. This increase seems to be directly connected to the factors listed above. The realization that outside study is required to progress with one's language skills is positive for the students and for the program.

4. Students listed particular problems they had with the learning of English. For the most part, responses were personal and did not provide the insight to reach particular conclusions. However, a positive note is the
decrease by 13% of students who listed any problems whatsoever. Speaking and listening were the two areas that were indicated as being problem areas. Again, this might well be due to the increase in students entering at lower levels, where these skills have not yet been acquired.

**Computer Knowledge**

The fifth area of concentration was aimed at obtaining information regarding students' experience with, and interest in, computer technology. The results of this particular area of inquiry can be used to justify the use of new technologies in conjunction with language teaching and learning. Also, it explores the degree of awareness on the part of the students as to how necessary computer skills are for the job market. Based on the results of the study, the following information and conclusions are provided.

1. Roughly 8% of both cohorts reported having used computers prior to their enrollment in the ESL program.

2. There was an approximate increase of 7% from the 1992 to 1993 cohorts in the number of students who had used computers while in the ESL program at Clark College. This is undoubtedly a result of having a new computer lab as part of the ABE/ESL facilities. Also, students in levels four and five are taking part in research projects using the computer lab.

3. 75% of the students from the 1993 cohort want computer training as an integral part of the ESL program. This is an increase of 5% from the cohort of 1992. Clearly, the need for knowledge of technology and computer skills is recognized by the students. Equally clear is the reality that computer skills can only be seen as beneficial to the development of the students.
4. Students indicated an interest in attending computer training classes on Clark College's Main Campus by an increase of 28%. This is once again a reflection of students' awareness that knowledge of computers will contribute to their ability to manage in this culture.

Knowledge of Opportunities

This sixth area of concentration is concerned with students' awareness of future educational opportunities and the financial aid programs that will enable them to progress through the system of higher education should they so wish.

Based on the results of the study, the following information and conclusions are provided.

1. Under 25% of both cohorts reported having learned about financial aid at Clark College. If administrators and instructors wish to facilitate their students' pursuits of goals for a better standard of living through higher education, then this lack of information provided the students must be corrected.

2. From 1992 to 1993 there was an increase of 6% in the number of students currently in the ESL program who had applied for financial aid. This seems to contradict the results of question 1, discussed above. Perhaps students are learning of financial aid from sources other than instructors in the ESL program. Regardless of how students come about this knowledge, it should be reinforced in the ESL program to illustrate the connection between the ESL program and further educational opportunities.

3. Approximately 60% of students from both cohorts expressed the desire to learn about financial aid. Obviously, the majority of those students who
have not learned of financial aid opportunities, or taken advantage of those opportunities, wish to acquire the knowledge. It would seem to be extremely important for this issue to be more thoroughly addressed in the current curriculum. It is information that students not only want, but genuinely need.

4. An 11% decrease from 1992 to 1993 in students who were aware of the availability of advanced English classes at Clark College is, on first glance, quite alarming. However, it is plausible that this decrease might be attributed to students from the 1992 cohort having moved out of the program, and the increase in lower level students in the 1993 cohort that may not be interested in such classes at the present time. Regardless, from the earliest opportunity, students should be shown how their participation in the ESL program is part of a larger dynamic. Knowing that further education is available can only aid in this process.

5. Similar results to those presented above revealed the degree to which students were aware that tuition was required for the advanced English classes, and that financial aid is available for these classes.

Further Education and Vocational Opportunities

This final area of concentration combines the further education desires of the students and areas of interest in the various vocational and technical programs offered by Clark College. Based on the results of the study, the following information and conclusions are provided.

1. Above 80% of both cohorts expressed a desire to continue their education.
2. The majority of students from both cohorts indicated that Clark College was their school of preference for pursuing further education. This highlights the need to emphasize the links between the ESL program and the Main Campus, and to encourage instructors and administrators to facilitate more formal links between the two entities, with the aim of helping student fulfill their goals and potential.

3. The full list of vocational and skill areas can be found in Chapter IV on Table VII. As a matter of interest, computers and culinary arts were the preferred areas of study for both cohorts. The fact that computer knowledge remains a constant area of interest in the eyes of the students reinforces suggestions that more attention be given to the use of computers at all levels of the curriculum, and not be confined solely to the upper level students.

LIMITATIONS

As is the case with many studies of this nature, hindsight serves to point out questions, techniques and modalities that would have enhanced the study. This is also true of this study. Limitations to this study are noted below and suggestions for correcting oversights and improving the design of the study are presented.

The most blatant limitation entails the realization that there is an overlap between the two cohorts. This does not diminish the importance of the data collected, nor does it detract from the results obtained from comparing the two groups over a protracted period of time. It does, however, call into question the utility of the data collected from the 92 cohort in developing a longitudinal study.
Possible remedies for making use of the data from both cohorts will be addressed when suggestions for further research are presented.

Also, in looking at the number of Chinese and Korean students, it is clear that a translation of the questionnaire used in collecting data should have been utilized for these two groups of students. This raises the question as to how well the 26 students from the 93 cohort and the 16 students from the 92 cohort actually understood the questions they were answering. Again, this oversight is easily remedied and will be discussed in the following section.

SUMMARY

This research has examined the knowledge base and the future aspirations of students enrolled in the ESL program at Clark College for the past two consecutive years. This was done with the aim of discovering particular traits of the adult ESL population in the program, so that they might be better served by the program. Additionally, information about the goals held by the students, for themselves, was solicited, examined and documented. In all of the literature discovered and consulted in the preparation of this study, the issue of students' goals, as articulated by the students were not addressed. This study is a beginning. While observation of the results of the comparison between the two cohorts gives a good indication of the traits and goals of the students, it is clearly only a beginning. The information has intrinsic value and should be viewed as a beginning rather than a terminal examination of the issues raised.

Among many possible uses of the information gathered are simple applications of students' stated areas of interest and career goals to the manner in which Instructors may wish to consider when designing curricula and lesson
plans. Administrators might be persuaded to consider the child care issue that has been raised. Also, it might stand the administration in good stead with the growing community of non-native speakers to provide more of an outreach. It is the author's perception that there are many resources that are available to non-traditional students. Simply informing new-comers to the community of the existence of these programs and making them available to this particular group of students might enhance the College and the community.

Suggestions for Further Study

In order to develop an accurate picture of the students served by the ESL program over an extended period of time, it is suggested that this study be replicated yearly for a protracted period of time. This would be easily accomplished given that the questionnaires and their translations, excepting Korean and Chinese versions, have already been created and utilized.

In the limitations section, the issue of an overlap between cohorts was discussed. The most efficacious method of continuing this study and making use of the information already gathered would be to consider the data collected from the 92 cohort as a pilot study, providing baseline data. The information from the 93 cohort can be used as a point of departure in conducting a longitudinal study. Future replications would only need to add the question, "Did you complete this questionnaire last year?" With such information, clearly defined and distinct cohorts could be formed and a more statistically valid longitudinal study within this type of program could be conducted and perpetuated. As far as the qualitative data derived from the interviews is concerned, this too can be looked at over the course of time to determine if there are reoccurring issues that need the attention of administrators and faculty.
As was mentioned in Chapter 1, the notion that continual cross-sectional studies may be concatenated to create a longitudinal study is encouraging. It is with such longitudinal data generated by the students themselves that objective data providing a window into the goals of the students and the degree to which they are obtaining their goals can be measured.
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APPENDIX A

ENGLISH QUESTIONNAIRE
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS IN THE ESL PROGRAM

A) BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
What is your age? 
Are you a man or a woman? 
What is your native country? 
What is your first language? 
Do you know other languages? 
How long did you study English before coming to the U.S.? 
How long have you been in the U.S.? 

B) CURRENT INFORMATION:
How many quarters have you been in the ESL program? 
How many quarters will you stay in the ESL program? 
At what level did you begin? 
At what level are you now? 
Has the ESL program helped you with English? 
When in ESL, did you learn of other programs at Clark? 
Did you take any classes on the Main Campus? 

C) WORKING:
Are you working now? 
If yes, what is your job? 
Did ESL classes help you prepare for your job? 
If you aren't working, do you want work? 

D) CURRENT ENGLISH SKILLS:
Do you speak English well? 
If not, what is the biggest problem? 
Do you study English at home or someplace else? 
How many hours a week do you study? 

E) COMPUTER KNOWLEDGE:
Did you use computers before the ESL program at Clark? 
Have you used computers in the ESL program? 
If you have used computers, do you plan to attend Clark College and learn more about them? 
If you have not used computers, do you want to use them in the ESL program?
F) KNOWLEDGE OF OPPORTUNITIES:

Did you learn about financial aid at Clark College? YES / NO
If yes, did you ever apply for financial aid? YES / NO
If no, are you interested in learning about financial aid for full-time students? YES / NO
Do you know there are advanced English classes at Clark College? YES / NO
If yes, do you know you must pay for the classes? YES / NO
Do you know financial aid is available for classes? YES / NO

G) FURTHER EDUCATION:
Do you plan on continuing your education? YES / NO
If yes, where? __________

OPPORTUNITIES:

Clark College offers many different courses to help you find good jobs. Here are some of the programs. If you are interested in any of these programs, put a X by the names.
Art: _____
Journalism: _____
Engineering: _____
Geology: _____
Computers: _____
Machine Technology: _____
Auto/Diesel Technology: _____
Cooking/Culinary Arts: _____
Agriculture/Horticulture: _____
Chemistry/Pharmacy: _____
Photography: _____
Music: _____
Mathematics: _____
Welding: _____
Electronics: _____
Biology/Forest Management: _____
Nursing: _____
Dental Hygiene: _____.
APPENDIX B

RUMANIAN QUESTIONNAIRE
A) INFORMATII DESPRE PERSOANA DV:

Care este virsta dv?  
Sinteti barbat sau femeie?  
Care este tara de origine a dv.?  
Care este limba de origine a dv.?  
Cunoasteti si alte limbi?  
Cit timp ati studiat Engleza inainte de a veni in S.U.A.?  
Cit timp in S.U.A.?  

B) INFORMATII ACTUALE:

Cite trimestre ati fost in programul de Engleza la Clark?  
Si/SAU Cite trimestres veti mai sta in program?  
La ce nivel ati inceput dumneavoastra?  
La ce nivel ati sfirsit?  
Va ajutat programul de Engleza?  
Cind erati in programul de Engleza, ati invatat si despre existenta altor clase/cursuri?  
Ati lat si alte clase in cladiria principala a colegiului?  

C) LUCRU:

Lucrați in prezent?  
Daca da, ce si unde?  
Va ajutat programul de Engleza sa va pregati pentru actualul servicii?  
Daca nu lucrati, sinteti in doriti sa lucrati?  

D) INDEMINARI ACTUALE:

Va descurcati in Engleza acum?  
Daca nu, care este cea mai mare problema?  
Studiați Engleza acasa si pe altundeva in prezent?  
Daca da, cite ore pe saptamina?  

E) CUMOSTINTE DESPRE COMPUTERE:

Ati folosit computere inainte de merge la programul de Engleza de aici?  
Ati folosit computere in programul de Engleza de la Clark?  

DA/NU

DA/NU

DA/NU

DA/NU

DA/NU

DA/NU

DA/NU

DA/NU

DA/NU

DA/NU
Daca ati folsit computere, doriti sa frecventati la Clark College si sa invatati mai mult despre ele?
DA / NU
Daca nu ati folsit computere, doriti sa invatati sa le folsiti in programul de Engleza ca a doua limba?
DA / NU

F) CUMOSTINTE DESPRE OPORTUNITATI:

Ati fost informati despre ajutorul financiar pentru stedenti la Clark College?
DA / NU
Daca da, ati aplicat vreodata pentru ajutor financiar?
DA / NU
Daca nu, sinteti interesat (a) despre ajutor financiar pentru studenti cu program intreg (full-time)?
DA / NU
Stiati ca sint clase de Engleza mai avansate in cladirea principala a colegiului?
DA / NU
Daca da, stiti ca trebuie sa platiti taxa pentru aceste clase?
DA / NU
Stiiti ca este oferit ajutor financiar pentru aceste clase?
DA / NU

G) EDUCATIA VIITOARE:

Planuiti sa va continuieti educatia?
DA / NU
Daca da, unde?

OPORTUNITATI:

Clark College ofera multe diferite cursuri care sa va ajute in gasirea de servicii bune. Aici sint enumerate citeva din programe. Daca sinteti interesat (a) in vreunul din aceste programe faceti un semn in spatiul alocat.

Arta:
Jurnalism:
Inginerie:
Geologie:
Computere:
Tehnologia Masinilor:
Automobile si Tehnologia Diesel:
Gatit / Arta Culinara:
Agricultura / Horticultura:
Chimie / Farmacie:
Fotographie:
Muzica:
Matematica:
Sudura:
Electronica:
Biologie / Conducerea Padurii:
Infermira:
Hygenica Dental:
APPENDIX C

RUSSIAN QUESTIONNAIRE
ВОПРОСЫ ДЛЯ СТУДЕНТОВ ПО ПРОГРАММЕ ESL.

A) ИНФОРМАЦИЯ О ВАШЕМ ПРОШЛОМ.

Ваш возраст?
Какого вы пола мужского или женского?
Какая ваша родная страна?
Какой ваш родной язык?
Знаете ли вы другие языки?
Сколько вы учили английский язык до приезда в Америку?
Сколько вы живете в Америке?

B) ТЕКУЩАЯ ИНФОРМАЦИЯ.

Сколько семестров ESL программы вы прошли в Клапк?
Или сколько семестров вы желаете быть в программе ESL?
С какого класса вы начали?
Какой класс вы закончили? Или в каком классе вы сейчас?
Помогла ли вам программа ESL с вашим английским?
Когда вы были в ESL программе учили ли вы другие программы в Коледже?
Взяли ли вы какие-нибудь уроки в главном здании Коледжа?

C) РАБОТА.

Работаете ли вы сейчас?
Если да, какая ваша работа?
Помогла ли вам программа ESL подготовиться к вашей работе?
Если вы не работаете, хотите ли вы работать?

D) ЗНАНИЕ АНГЛИЙСКОГО.

Хорошо ли вы разговариваете по английски?
Если нет, какая самая большая проблема?
Учите ли вы английский дома или где либо еще?
Сколько часов в неделю вы учите английский?

E) ЗНАНИЕ КОМПЬЮТЕРА.

Пользовались ли вы компьютером дрежде ESL программе в Клапк Коледже?
Пользовались ли вы компьютером на ESL программе в Клапк Коледже?
Если вы пользовались компьютером планируете ли вы
посещает Клапк Коледже и узнать больше о компьютерах? ДА/НЕТ
Если вы не пользовались компьютером, хотите ли научиться использовать им в ESL программе? ДА/НЕТ

F) ЗНАЙМЕ О ВАШИХ ВОЗЖЖНОСМЯХ:
Учили ли вас о финансовой помощи в Клапк Коледже? ДА/НЕТ
Если да, подавали ли вы на финансовой помощи? ДА/НЕТ
Если нет, хотите ли вы узнать о финансовой помощи для студентов полного дня? ДА/НЕТ
Знаете ли вы о классах совершенствования английского языка в главном здании? ДА/НЕТ
Если да, знали ли вы о том, что вы должны платить за обучение в этих классах? ДА/НЕТ
Если да, знали ли вы о том, что финансовая помощь возможна для этих классов? ДА/НЕТ

G) ДАЛЬНЕЙШЕЕ ОДУЧЕНИЕ:
Лланируете ли вы ваше дальнейшее? ДА/НЕТ
Если да, где?

ВОЗЖЖНОСМЯХ:
Клапк Коледже предлагает много различных классов которые ищут вам найти хорошую работу. Здесь перечислены некоторые программы. Если вы интересуетесь какой-нибудь из этих программ, отметьте какую вы хотели изобрать.
Искусство:
Журналистика:
Инженерное Дело:
Геология:
Компьютера:
Технология Машин:
Технология Автомобили / Дизайн:
Кухня / Кулинарное искусство:
Сельское хозяйство / Садоводство:
Химия / Фармацевтика:
Фотография:
Музыка:
Математика:
Выращивание и продажа цемент:
Сварка:
Электроника:
Биология / Управление лесным делом:
Медсестра:
Зубная Гигиена:
APPENDIX D

SPANISH QUESTIONNAIRES
CUESTIONARIO PARA ESTUDIANTES DEL PROGRAMA ESL

A) INFORMACIÓN ANTECEDENTE:

¿Cuál es su edad? 
¿Ud. es hombre o mujer? 
¿Cuál es su país de origen? 
¿Cuál es su idioma de origen? 
Puede hablar otros idiomas? 
¿Cuánto tiempo estudió inglés antes de venir ha los E.E.U.U.? 
¿Cuánto tiempo tiene de vivir en los E.E.U.U.? 

B) INFORMACIÓN PRESENTE:

¿Cuántos trimestres ha tomado en ESL en el programa? 
¿Tenderá cuántos triemestres en el programa? 
¿En cuál nivel comenzó Ud.? 
¿En cuál nivel se encuentra ahora? 
¿Le ha ayudado el programa ESL con su inglés? 
¿Cuándo estaba estudiando ESL, averiguó de otras clases? 
¿Ha tomado alguna clase en El Centro Universitario de Clark? 

C) TRABAJO:

¿Está Ud. empleado ahora? 
¿Si está empleado, cuál es su trabajo? 
¿Le ayuda el ESL ha prepararse para su trabajo que tiene? 
¿Si no está trabajando, está buscando o quiere empleo? 

D) ENTRENAMIENTO:

¿Es su inglés suficiente para comunicar? 
¿Si no, cuáles son sus peores problemas? 
¿Estudia Ud. inglés en casa o en otro lugar? 
¿Cuántas horas por semana estudia Ud. inglés? 

E) CONOCIMIENTO DE COMPUTADORAS:

¿Ha usado computadoras antes de comenzar en el ESL? 
¿Ha usado computadoras en el programa ESL en Clark? 
¿Si ha usado computadoras, está planeando assistir Clark College e aprender mas de ellas? 
¿Si no ha usado computadoras, quiere aprender usarlas en el programa de ESL?
F) CONOCIMIENTO SOBRE DE OPORTUNIDADES:

¿Ha obtenido información sobre de ayuda financiera para estudiantes en Clark College?  Sí / NO

Si es sí, Ud. aplicado por ayuda financiera?  Sí / NO

¿Si es no, está Ud. interesado de averiguar acerca de ayuda financiera para estudiantes en tiempo completo?  Sí / NO

¿Ha sabido Ud. que hay clases de inglés avanzado en el centro universitario de Clark College?  Sí / NO

¿Si ha sabido, sabe que tiene que pagar costo de enseñanza para estas clases?  Sí / NO

¿Si ha sabido, sabe también que hay ayuda financiera para estas clases?  Sí / NO

G) EDUCACIÓN ADVANZADA:

¿Planea en continuar con su educación?  Sí / NO

¿Dónde?

OPORTUNIDADES:

Clark College ofrece muchas clases diferentes para ayudarlo para encontrar buenos trabajos. Aquí hay unos de los programas. Si está interesado en algunos de estos programas, ponga una X al lado del nombre.

Arte:  
Periodismo:  
Ingeniería:  
Geología:  
Computadoras:  
Tecnología de Máquinas:  
Tecnología de Automóviles/Diesel:  
Arte de cocina:  
Agricultura/Horticultura:  
Química/Farmacía:  
Fotografía:  
Música:  
Matemáticas:  
Soldadura:  
Electrónica:  
Biólogía/Planificación Florsestal:  
Infermera:  
Higiénica Dental:  
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APPENDIX E

VIETNAMESE QUESTIONNAIRES
CÂU HỎI CHO HỌC VIÊN CHƯƠNG TRÌNH ESL

A) LÝ LỊCH

Anh (chi) được bao nhiêu tuổi? ______
Anh (chi) là phái Nam hay Nữ? ______
Đất nước của Anh (chi) là gì? ______
Tiếng me de của Anh (chi) là gì? ______
Anh (chi) có biết thêm ngoại ngữ nào nữa hay không? CÓ / KHÔNG
Anh (chi) đã học ngoại ngữ được bao lâu trước khi đến Hoa Kỳ? ______
Anh (chi) đã đến Hoa Kỳ được bao lâu? ______

B) BÁO CÁO HIỆN TẠI

Anh (chi) đã theo học được bao nhiêu tam ca nguyệt trong chương trình ESL tại Trường Clark? ______
Và/Hay là Anh (chi) se theo học chương trình này trong bao nhiêu lâu nữa? ______
Anh (chi) đã bắt đầu học từ trình độ (lop) nào? ______
Hay Anh (chi) hiện đang học ở trình độ (lop) nào? ______
Chương trình ESL có giúp Anh (chi) về Anh ngữ không? CÓ / KHÔNG
Trong lúc đang theo học ESL, Anh (chi) có biết về những lớp học khác nữa hay không? CÓ / KHÔNG
Anh (chi) có theo học một lớp nào ở Trường Chánh hay không? CÓ / KHÔNG

C) LÀM VIỆC

Có phải Anh (chi) hiện đang làm việc? CÓ / KHÔNG
Nếu có, Anh (chi) đang làm việc gì? ______
Chương trình ESL có giúp cho Anh (chi) chuẩn bị cho việc làm hiện tại không? CÓ / KHÔNG
Nếu Anh (chi) không có việc làm, Anh (chi) có tìm việc làm/Anh (chi) có muốn làm việc? CÓ / KHÔNG

D) XẢO NÁNG HIỆN TẠI

Anh (chi) hiện đang tiến triển với môn Anh ngữ? CÓ / KHÔNG
Nếu không, thì vấn đề trong đại nhất là gì? ______
Hiện nay Anh (chi) có học Anh ngữ tại nhà, hay một nơi khác? ______
Nếu Anh (chi) có học, thì một tuần học được bao nhiêu giờ? ______

E) HIỂU BIẾT VỀ DIỄN TOÁN

Anh (chi) đã xử dụng máy diễn toán trước khi vào học chương trình ESL tại đây? CÓ / KHÔNG
Anh (chi) đã xử dụng máy diễn toán vào chương trình ESL tại
Trường Clark?
Nếu Anh (chi) đã xữ dùng máy điện toán, Anh (chi) đưa dinh theo học Trường Clark và học thêm nửaa về môn này?
Nếu Anh (chi) không có xữ dụng máy điện toán, Anh (chi) có muốn học cách thức xữ dụng no vào trong chương trình ESL?

F) HIỂU BIẾT VỀ CÓ HỌI
Anh (chi) có biết về tro cấp tài chánh có Sinh viên tài Trường Clark không?
Nếu có biết, Anh (chi) đã có xin tro cấp tài chánh chưa?
Nếu không biết, Anh (chi) có quan tâm khi được biết về việc tro cấp tài chánh cho học sinh học trong buổi?
Anh (chi) có biết có những lớp Anh ngữ cao cấp ở Trường Chánh?
Nếu có biết, Anh (chi) có biết phải trả học phí cho những lớp này không?
Nếu có biết, Anh (chi) có biết rằng tro cấp tài chánh sẵn sàng cho những lớp này không?

G) HỌC XA HỌN NƯỚC
Anh (chi) có kế hoạch để tiếp tục cho việc học của mình không?
O đầu?
CÓ HỌI
Trường Đại Hoc Clark cung cấp nhiều môn học khác nhau để giúp anh (chi) tìm những việc làm tốt. Đây là vài môn học của chương trình. Nếu Anh (chi) quan tâm về môn nào trong chương trình này, đánh dấu tên môn học do.

Nghề thuật:
Nghe làm báo:
Có Khi:
Địa Chất Học:
Diễn Toán:
Kỹ Thuật Cơ Khi:
Xe Hội và Kỹ Thuật Máy Điện-Sên:
Nấu ăn / Nghệ Thuật Nấu Nướng:
Canh Nong / Nghệ Láam Vườn:
Hoa Học / Duốc Học:
Nhiệp Anh:
Âm Nhạc:
Toán Học:
Hoa Kien:
Hàn Xì:
Diễn Tư:
Sinh Vật Học / Quản Lý Rừng:
Nursing:
Dental Hygiene:
APPENDIX F

KHMER-CAMBODIAN QUESTIONNAIRE
2. Clark's Office

Has the office been cleaned recently?

Where is the nearest library?

Where is the nearest post office?

Where is the nearest bank?

Are there any restaurants nearby?

Is there a cafe nearby?

Would you recommend coming again?

How was the service?

Would you recommend this place to friends?

Is there a parking lot?

Is the location convenient?
Art: சீட்செய்
Journalism: கண்ணைதலைபாது
Engineering: கல்லூரி பெண்
Geology: கல்லூரி பெண்
Computers: கல்லூரி பெண்
Machine Technology: கல்லூரி பெண்
Automobile and Diesel Technology: கல்லூரி பெண்
Cooking/Culinary Arts: கல்லூரி பெண்
Agriculture/Horticulture: கல்லூரி பெண்
Chemistry/Pharmacy: கல்லூரி பெண்
Photography: கல்லூரி பெண்
Music: கல்லூரி பெண்
Mathematics: கல்லூரி பெண்
Floristry: கல்லூரி பெண்
Welding: கல்லூரி பெண்
Electronics: கல்லூரி பெண்
Biology/Forest Management: கல்லூரி பெண்
APPENDIX G

JAPANESE QUESTIONNAIRE
E S L プログラムの学生への質問

A）経歴に関する質問

＊年齢
＊性別
＊出身国
＊母国語
＊日本語以外に知っている外国語はありますか？
＊アメリカに来る前にどの位英語を勉強しましたか？
＊アメリカにどの位滞在していますか？

B）現在の状況

＊クラークカレッジのE S Lのコースを何ターム（学期）取りましたか？
＊あと何タームこのE S Lのコースを取る予定ですか？
＊あなたはどのレベルから始めましたか？
＊どのレベルを終えましたが、または、どのレベルにいますか？
＊E S Lのコースは英語力向上に役立ちましたか？
＊E S Lにいた時、メイン・キャンパスのクラスについて聞きましたか？
＊メイン・キャンパスで何かクラスを取りましたか？

C）仕事

＊現在あなたは働いていますか？
＊もしそうであれば、どんな仕事ですか？
＊E S Lのコースは現在のあなたの仕事の助けになりましたか？
＊もし働いていなければ仕事を探していますか？又は、働きたいですか？

D）現在の英語力

＊現在、英語でやっていけてますか？
＊もしそうでない場合、何が一番の問題ですか？
＊現在、家又は他の所で英語の勉強をしてますか？
＊そうであれば、一週間に何時間位ですか？
E）コンピューターに関する質問
1. クラックバレッジでE S Lのクラスを取る前にコンピューターを使ったことがありますか？
はい／いいえ
2. クラックバレッジのE S Lのクラスでコンピューターを使ったことがありますか？
はい／いいえ
2 a. 2番で「はい」と答えた人
クラックバレッジへ入って、コンピューターを習う予定ですか？
はい／いいえ
2 b. 2番で「いいえ」と答えた人
クラックバレッジへ入って、コンピューターの使い方を習う予定ですか？
はい／いいえ

D）経済援助に対する知識
＊クラックバレッジには、学生のために経済援助があるというのを知っていたか？
はい／いいえ
＊もしそうであれば、それに対策したことがありますか？
はい／いいえ
＊（知らなかった人）フルタイムの学生のための経済援助について知りたいですか？
はい／いいえ
＊メインキャンパスに上級の英語のクラスがあるのを知っていますか？
はい／いいえ
もしそうであれば、このクラスには授業料を払わなければならないことを知っていましたか？
はい／いいえ
＊メインキャンパスの上級の英語のクラスに経済援助があることを知っていましたか？
はい／いいえ

E）将来における展望について
＊E S L終了後、さらに勉強を続けるつもりですか？
はい／いいえ
＊もし続けるのならば、どこで続けるつもりですか？
＊クラックバレッジには仕事に役立つように、いろいろなコースがあります。下記のコースはいくつかの例ですが、あなたの興味のあるコースに印（ ）をつけてください。

美術
ジャーナリズム
工学（エンジニアリング）
地質学
コンピューター
機械工学
自動車工学

クッキング、料理法
農芸、園芸学
化学、薬学
生物学、森林管理学
写真
音楽
数

溶接
電子工学
看護学
歯科衛生学

JAPANESE
APPENDIX H

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
Guided Interview Questions.

Student's Level

1. How have your feelings toward education in America changed since you attended the ESL program?
2. What do you think are the best things about the ESL program?
3. What do you think should be changed in the program?
4. Are you going to continue your education when you finish the ESL program?
5. What would you tell someone new to Clark College about the ESL program?

Notes on follow up questions:
APPENDIX I

RAW DATA FOR BOTH COHORTS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>36.854</td>
<td>36.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATIVE COUNTRY</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOSNIAN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAZIL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BULGARIAN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMBODIAN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIMEA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGYPT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHIOPIA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGIA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUATEMALA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONDURAS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONG KONG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAPAN</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JORDAN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAZAKSTAN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOREA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KURDISTAN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAOS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATVIA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITHUANIA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEXICO</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOLDAVIA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICARAGUA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERU</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILIPPINES</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLAND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORTUGAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROMANIA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSSIA</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAIN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRI LANKA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAIWAN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THAILAND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKRAINIAN</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIETNAMESE</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIRST LANGUAGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMHARIC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARABIC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BULGARIAN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINESE</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farsi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGIAN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAPANESE</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHMER</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOREAN</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KURDISH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATVIAN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITHUANIAN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLISH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORTUGUESE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUMANIAN</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSSIAN</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERBO-CROATIAN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPANISH</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAGALOG</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAMIL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKRAINIAN</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIETNAMESE</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER LANGUAGES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRE US ENG STUDY (mos)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.807</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.368</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOW LONG IN US (mos)</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>20.634</td>
<td>14.815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUARTERS IN PROGRAM</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.738</td>
<td>2.611</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOW MANY QTRS WILL STAY?</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.982</td>
<td>7.186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEGINNING LEVEL</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT LEVEL</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM HELPED ENG.</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEARN OF OTHER PROGRAMS</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TAKE CLASSES AT MAIN CAMPUS.</strong></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WORKING?</strong></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESL HELP W/JOB?</strong></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WANT WORK?</strong></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPEAK ENGLISH WELL</strong></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADDITIONAL STUDY?</strong></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HRS. / WEEK?</strong></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>10.293</td>
<td>6.258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROBLEMS</strong></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOOKS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAMMAR</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIFE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISTENING</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMORY</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRACTICE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRONUNCIATION</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>READING</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEAKING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill/Question</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPELLING</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STAMMERING</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TIME</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNDERSTANDING</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VOCABULARY</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WRITING</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NONE</strong></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>317</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPUTERS PRE CLARK?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>289</td>
<td></td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>317</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>USED COMPUTERS AT CLARK?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>269</td>
<td></td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>317</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLAN TO STUDY COMPUTERS AT CLARK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>317</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WANT COMPUTER TRAINING IN ESL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>239</td>
<td></td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>317</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEARN ABOUT FINANCIAL AID AT CLARK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>317</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APPLIED FOR FINANCIAL AID?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>269</td>
<td></td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>317</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WANT TO LEARN OF FINANCIAL AID?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>317</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KNOW ADVANCED ENGLISH AVAILABLE AT CLARK?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>235</td>
<td></td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>317</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOW MUST PAY FOR THESE CLASSES?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOW FINANCIAL AID AVAILABLE?</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FURTHER EDUCATION</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHERE?</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOCATIONAL/SKILL AREAS</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOURNALISM</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOLOGY</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPUTERS</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACHINE TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTO/DIESEL TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOKING/CULINARY ARTS</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE/HORTICULTURE</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEMISTRY/PHARMACY</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHOTOGRAPHY</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSIC</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATHEMATICS</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELDING</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRONICS</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOLOGY/FORESTRY</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSING</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENTAL HYGIENE</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>